

Kings xviii. 4), and godly men in other periods of persecution (Heb. xi. 38), sought concealment in caves. They were also resorted to by lawless or distressed classes (1 Sam. xxii. 2) to escape the restraints or burdens of society; but they were not used as places of permanent abode until they were occupied for this purpose by the hermits of a later period. Tradition indicates certain grottoes as the scene of our Lord's nativity (Luke ii. 7), and of various other events of the sacred history, but, so far as appears, without any good foundation.

Booths are only spoken of as constructed for cattle (Gen. xxxiii. 17), or to afford temporary shelter in case of need, as in the case of Jonah before Nineveh (Jon. iv. 5), of gardeners and husbandmen (Job xxvii. 18; Isa. i. 8), and of the entire people at the feast of tabernacles. Lev. xxiii. 42.


Nomad tribes dwelt in tents, which could easily be transported from place to place. Judg. vi. 5; Isa. xiii. 20; Hab. iii. 7. So did soldiers under arms (2 Kings vii. 7) and shepherds whose care of flocks obliged them to lead a roving life. Isa. xxxviii. 12. Jabal, the son of Lamech (Gen. iv. 20), is said to have been the "father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle." The patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob lived in tents in Canaan as pilgrims and shepherds (Gen. xviii. 1; xxvi. 17; xxxiii. 18), though their ancestors and relatives in Mesopotamia had houses and settled abodes. Gen. xxiv. 10, 23. Tents were sometimes covered with skins or mats, but mostly with cloths, or, as they are called, curtains, woven from wool or from goats' hair. Ex. xxvi. 7, 14. Those of goats' hair were black. Cant. i. 5; iv. 1. These cloths were stretched over one or more upright poles and fastened to the ground by cords and pins. Ex. xxxv. 18; Judg. iv. 21; Jer. x. 20. Tents, whether round or oblong, were divided by hangings into two, or those of the better class into three, apartments, one for the women and children, one for the men and one for ser-

vants or cattle. Wealthy families had separate tents for women. Gen. xxiv. 67; xxxi. 33. The towns and castles of the sons of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 16) and the villages of Kedar (Isa. xlii. 11) were collections of tents or nomadic encampments.


Houses were sometimes built of brick, either burned, as at Babel (Gen. xi. 4), or simply dried in the sun, as those made by the children of Israel in Egypt, in which straw was mingled with the clay. Ex. v. 7. The use of the latter explains the fact that it was possible to dig through a wall (Ezek. xii. 5, 7), and that a house neglected and exposed to the vicissitudes of the weather would be reduced to a heap of dirt. Dan. iii. 29. Stone was, however, regarded as the nobler and better material (Isa. ix. 10), the use of which is presupposed in the narrative of the tower of Babel (Gen. xi. 3), as well as in the law of leprosy. Lev. xiv. 40, 42. The temple (1 Kings v. 17) and palace of Solomon (1 Kings vii. 9) and the residences of the rich (Amos v. 11) were of hewn stone, which were often very costly, so that the term "precious stones" is used both of those employed in building (2 Chron. iii. 6; Isa. xxviii. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 4) and of gems. 1 Kings x. 2; 1 Chron. xx. 2. We read of marble among the materials of the temple (1 Chron. xxix. 2) and in the palace of Ahasuerus. Esth. i. 6. The festivity connected with laying the corner-stone of public edifices is alluded to. Ezra. iii. 10; Zech. iv. 7; Job xxxviii. 6, 7. The cement used at Babel was slime, Gen. xi. 3—*i. e.*, bitumen or asphaltum. Isaiah (xxx. 12) speaks of lime, and the same word is rendered plaster. Deut. xxvii. 4. Mud was also used for mortar (Lev. xiv. 42, 45, where the word so translated means properly "dust" or "earth"). The acquaintance of the ancient Hebrews with the structure and use of the arch is directly vouched for, if this is intended, as able scholars suppose, by the words improperly translated "eminent place" (Ezek. xvi. 24) and "troop." Amos ix. 6. The

BV 1533 .P7 1875 c.1

Preparing to teach



PALESTINE.



✓✓
PREPARING TO TEACH.

FOR STUDY

BY

SABBATH-SCHOOL TEACHERS AND TRAINING CLASSES.

BY

✓ JOHN HALL, D.D.; EDWARD P. HUMPHREY, D.D., LL.D.;

WM. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.; FRANCIS L.

✓ PATTON, D.D.; AND J. BENNET TYLER.

PHILADELPHIA :
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION
1334 CHESTNUT STREET.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1875, by
THE TRUSTEES OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

WESTCOTT & THOMSON,
Stereotypers and Electrotypers, Philada.

INTRODUCTORY.

SOMETHING more than one year ago the undersigned, after careful and laborious consultation, agreed on a plan of elementary study by them deemed suitable to be pursued by Sabbath-school teachers and candidates for this most important office. They further agreed to recommend the plan under their own names, in the hope that it might encourage the formation of normal classes for systematic study as a preparation for more efficient teaching. The form of recommendation was expressed in the following words :

“In view of the widespread and growing interest in the training of Sunday-school teachers, the undersigned, Christian workers, who have given the subject special study and acquired experience in its methods, unite in recommending the formation of normal classes in connection with Sunday-schools and seminaries of learning for the benefit of those who would become proficient Bible teachers.

“We agree also in recommending the main features of the subjoined outline of elementary study, with the understanding that such modification may be made in our respect-

ive MANUALS as will not destroy the essential unity of the plan.

“J. BENNET TYLER.

“J. H. VINCENT.

“H. CLAY TRUMBULL.

“WARREN RANDOLPH.”

The outline agreed on, as above indicated, has been in the main kindly followed by the gentlemen who have prepared this manual.

It is meant to be a class-book for teachers and such as design to become teachers. It claims to be only an outline of the topics treated, and presupposes regular study of the subjects which in so brief a space can be little more than barely stated, and, if practicable, organized classes and competent teachers. Profoundly convinced of the imperative need of a higher order of teaching in our Sunday schools, of a larger number of teachers who are proficient in Bible knowledge and measurably trained in methods of teaching and in management of classes, this volume is submitted to the great army of Sunday-school workers and such as will some day enter the field, in the fervent and prayerful hope that it may meet a want, and be helpful to such as desire to do good and successful work for the Master in this most hopeful and important department of Christian activity.

CONTENTS.

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

	PAGE
LESSON I.—INSPIRATION.—The Bible claims God as its author.— Transmission of the Scriptures.....	9-18
LESSON II.—EVIDENCES OF INSPIRATION.—How did the book attain its present authority?—Miracles.....	18-23
LESSON III.—PROPHECIES.....	24-28
LESSON IV.—STRUCTURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.....	28-34
LESSON V.—ORDER AND DESIGN OF NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.....	34-38
LESSON VI.— “ “ “ “ “ “	39-44
LESSON VII.—RULES OF INTERPRETATION.....	45-49
LESSON VIII.—HELPS TO INTERPRETATION.....	49-54
LESSON IX.—TYPES AND SYMBOLS.—1. Suggested by circumstances.— 2. Authority for finding types.—3. Correspondence between types and the circumstances of the messenger.—4. Unity in Scripture types.....	55-61
LESSON X.—DIFFICULTIES IN SCRIPTURE, AND HOW TO DEAL WITH THEM.—1. Where the ideas conveyed seem incredible.—2. Difficul- ties in the nature of the book.—3. Difficulties from error in tran- scription	61-67

CEREMONIAL INSTITUTES.

LESSON I.—SACRED PLACES.—Historical origin.—Designations.—The tabernacle.—Its structure.—Furniture.—As a whole.—Its imme- diate uses.—Symbolical meaning.—After history.—The temple of Solomon.—Of Zerubbabel.—Of Herod.....	71-78
LESSON II.—SACRED PERSONS.—Origin and history of the priest- hood.—Divine vocation of the sacred persons.—Dress.—Cere- monial holiness.—Functions of the priesthood.—Symbolical mean- ing.—Typical lessons.—Christ as priest.....	78-85
LESSON III.—SACRED RITES.—Distribution into offerings and purifi- cations.—1. Offerings, Characteristics of.—Whole burnt-offering. —Sin-offering.—Trespass-offering.—Peace-offering.—Bloodless- offerings.—Rites.—The blood.—Offerings of the poor.—2. Purifi- cations.—Ceremonial uncleanness.—Significance of purification..	85-92

	PAGE
LESSON IV.—SACRED TIMES.—1. Distribution.—2. The Sabbath.— 3. Other seasons.—Historical relations of the Sabbath.—Feast of trumpets.—Feast of convocation.—Pentecost.—Feast of taber- nacles.—Day of atonement.—Remarks.—1. Efficacy of Mosaic ritual.—2. Allowed departure from institutes.....	92-99

BIBLE HISTORY.

LESSON I.—FROM THE CREATION TO THE EXODUS.....	102-111
LESSON II.—FROM THE EXODUS TO THE DEATH OF DAVID.....	111-120
LESSON III.—FROM THE DEATH OF DAVID TO THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.....	121-129
LESSON IV.—THE LIFE OF CHRIST.....	130-139
LESSON V.—THE LABORS OF THE APOSTLES.....	139-147

GEOGRAPHY OF THE BIBLE.

LESSON I.—PALESTINE.—Its mountains.....	149-157
LESSON II.—PLAINS AND VALLEYS.—Seas, lakes and rivers.—Cli- mate.—Inhabitants and civil divisions.....	157-165
LESSON III.—CITIES.....	165-174
LESSON IV.—OTHER BIBLE LANDS.....	174-183

ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE BIBLE.

LESSON I.—FOOD.....	185-193
LESSON II.—CLOTHING.....	193-202
LESSON III.—DWELLINGS.....	203-210

SUMMARY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

INTRODUCTORY.....	213
LESSON I.—THE FACTORS IN RELIGION, MAN AND GOD.—1. Man.— 2. God.—Belief in God universal.—Atheism condemned.....	214-224
LESSON II.—THE RULE OF FAITH.—Where are we to find a standard of truth?—Reason.—The Church.—The Bible.....	225-238
LESSON III.—SIN.—Its nature.—Inability.—Original sin.—Adamic relation.....	238-244
LESSON IV.—THE ATONEMENT.—Socinian view.—Sacrificial view.	245-251
LESSON V.—THE PERSON OF CHRIST.—The Humanitarians.—Arians. —Nicene doctrine.....	251-260
LESSON VI.—THE TRINITY.—Sabellian doctrine.—Athanasian...	260-267

	PAGE
LESSON VII.—JUSTIFICATION.—Nature of.—Ground of.—Means of.— Effect of.....	267-280
LESSON VIII.—REGENERATION.—Nature of.—Mode of.....	280-285
LESSON IX.—ELECTION.—Arminian view.—Calvinistic.....	286-291
LESSON X.—SANCTIFICATION.—1. Subjectively considered.—Antino- mianism.—Perfectionism.—Perseverance.—2. Objectively consid- ered.—Divine agency.—A work.—Means.....	292-299
LESSON XI.—THE MEANS OF GRACE.—The word.—The sacraments. —Baptism.—The Lord's Supper.—Prayer.....	299-314
LESSON XII.—THE FUTURE STATE.—The second advent.—Resur- rection.—Judgment.—Between death and judgment.—Sleep of the soul.—Hades.—Purgatory.—After the judgment.—Hell.— Heaven.....	315-324

HOW TO TEACH THE BIBLE.

LESSON I.—PLACE AND PURPOSE OF THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.....	327
I. ITS RELATIVE PLACE.—Not a substitute for the home.—Not a sub- stitute for the church.—Not a secular school.—The most import- ant arm of the Church.—Entitled to supervision and support.— Care in selection and training of teachers.....	327-330
II. THE PURPOSE OF THE SCHOOL.—A Bible school.—More than a school.—Reaching the heart.—Supplementing the home.—Subserv- ing the church.—A mission agency.....	330-333
LESSON II.—ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT.....	333
I. ORGANIZATION.—Sympathy with the Church.—Officers, and how chosen.....	333, 334
II. MANAGEMENT.—Qualifications of superintendent and teachers.— Secure the best.—The office magnified.—Uniformity in class teaching.....	334-337
LESSON III.—THE TEACHER'S OFFICE.....	337
I. ITS SANCTITY AND DIVINE APPOINTMENT.—The practice of the early Church.—Our Lord's example.....	337-339
II. THE TEACHER'S POWER.—Its divine source.—The nature of the truth.—The manner of presentation.—Its gratuitous character.— The susceptibility of the taught.—Confidence easily won.....	339-343
LESSON IV.—HOW TO STUDY A LESSON.....	343
I. THE IMPORTANCE OF PREPARATION.—We teach wide-awake pupils. —We teach most important of all truth.—Teaching is an art.—It is a work of dignity.....	343, 344
II. STUDY OF A GIVEN LESSON.—It involves work.—Keeping ahead of work.—Early study.—Plan of the lesson.—Rules for study.— Helps to study.—Utilizing knowledge.—Odds and ends of time.— Study as a means of grace.—Prayerful study.....	344-349
LESSON V.—HOW TO TEACH A LESSON.....	349
I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES.—Simplicity.—Clearness.—Ambiguity.— Accuracy.—Style.—Conditions of effective teaching.....	349-354
II. MANNER IN TEACHING.—Patient.—Polite.—Encouraging.—Af- fectionate.....	354, 355

	PAGE
LESSON VI.—HOW TO TEACH A LESSON, CONTINUED.....	356
METHODS.—Have a plan.—Review.—Recitation.—Simultaneous teaching.—Geography and history.—Pictorial.—The exact lesson.—Teach something well.—Illustrative teaching.—Lecturing.—The catechetical.—Spiritual import.—Jesus only.—Application.—The true conception.—Common errors.....	356
LESSON VII.—HOW TO WIN AND HOLD ATTENTION.....	364
I. THE NECESSITY OF ATTENTION.—Attention must be won.—Surroundings important.—Change of posture.....	364, 365
II. HOW TO WIN IT.—By quiet determination.—By a quick eye and ear.—By simple devices.—By avoiding monotony.....	365-367
III. HOW TO HOLD IT.—By exciting interest.—By adaptation.—By recapitulation.—By judicious questioning.—By pictorial teaching.—By teaching how to study.—By winning love.—Four maxims.....	367-371
LESSON VIII.—PLACE AND MANNER OF QUESTIONING.....	371
I. THE PLACE.—Importance gaining attention.—It excites thought.—It fastens truth.—Adapted to average teachers.....	372-374
II. THE MODE.—General principles.—Pupil's knowledge the base.—Link the known to what is taught.....	374, 375
III. CLASSIFICATION.—Avoid vague, unreasonable.—Telling too much.—Rebuffing.—The simultaneous method.—The direct.—The logical.—Seven rules.—Review.....	375-380
LESSON IX.—POWER AND METHOD OF ILLUSTRATION.....	380
I. IMPORTANCE OF METHODS.—Selection.—Adaptation.—Figurative.....	380-383
II. CLASSIFICATION.—Verbal.—Narrative.—Visible.—Blackboard.—Maps.—Pictures.—Object teaching.—Object illustration.....	383
LESSON X.—THE TEACHER'S WEEK-DAY WORK.....	388
The teacher should know scholars—Confidence must be won.—Must be a real friend.—Choose fit times for visitation.—Avoid faultfinding.—Invite to the house.—Write letters.—Speak to each scholar alone.....	388-392
LESSON XI.—JESUS THE MODEL TEACHER.....	392
Our Lord's lowly lot.—His self-abnegation.—His tireless zeal.—His exhaustless patience.—His affectionate manner.—His exaltation of Scripture.—The great Teacher's method.....	392-397
LESSON XII.—THE HOLY SPIRIT THE TEACHER'S GUIDE AND HELPER.....	397
I. NEED OF MENTAL CULTURE.—Education.—Knowledge of childhood.—Of methods of illustration.—Bible study.....	397, 398
II. SPIRIT'S AID ESSENTIAL.—Better than miraculous power.—Than personal presence of Christ—Intangible potential force.—On all alike.—Positive teaching power.—Power a mystery.—It gives comfort.—Joy.—Promotes Christian growth.—Quickens the intellect.—Absolutely essential.....	398-403
APPENDIX.—A Sunday-school constitution.—Helps.....	405-408

PREPARING TO TEACH.

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY THE REV. JOHN HALL, D.D.

LESSON I.

INSPIRATION.

WE have received from our fathers, and they from the generation that preceded them, a collection of short treatises, which we call the Bible, and on which we rest our religious convictions. Have we evidence that the book can sustain these convictions? Is it what it claims to be? and if genuine, is it inspired?

What *is* evidence in a particular case depends on the nature of the case. Assertions concerning matter demand proofs of a material kind. No one proves that twenty packages are a ton weight by moral considerations. On the other hand, no one proves that a lie is wrong by weights and scales. So, to fix the date of an event, like the Declaration of Independence, no one employs mathematics; nor would the historical truths that are here pertinent give any aid in solving a problem in Euclid. In other words, each separate line of inquiry requires evidence *of its own kind*. Have we appropriate evidence that we may rest our religious convictions upon the Bible?

Suppose a book put into your hand as a guide to California, whither you expected to go and to require such a book.

You would look into the book, and you would inquire about it. If the book avowed itself to be wholly occupied with minerals, if the style were plainly that of an uneducated person, if it obviously and certainly contradicted itself or what you certainly know independently, you would seek a better guide. Or if the bookseller in whose judgment you have confidence should assure you of its known worthlessness, you would wisely reject it.

On the same general principle let us ask, (1) What does this book say for itself? (2), What can be said for it?

I. The Bible claims to have God* for its author. Its opening books bear the name, as they record the words and works, of Moses. But he was a prophet: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren *like unto thee.*" Deut. xviii. 18. But from Ex. iv. 14-16 we know that a prophet is one who speaks words from the mouth of another, and a prophet of God is one who speaks "from the mouth of God." See Isa. li. 16; Jer. i. 9. The other prophets claim to speak from the Lord: "the word of the Lord" comes to them, or "the hand of God was upon them." In the New Testament, Jesus speaks as God, or as uttering the words of the divine Father. The apostle Peter says of the writers (2 Peter i. 21), "Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." So they say of themselves. Among the last words of David we read (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." Ezekiel, like the rest of the prophets, constantly says, "The word of the Lord came

* We do not set out with an argument in proof of the being of God. We assume that our readers do not require this; that they feel within themselves that there must be a cause for all we see around us; that by the things that are made are declared to them "His eternal power and godhead." Rom. i. 20. The Scriptures assume this belief on the part of the reader, and set out with "In the beginning God created," etc. Gen. i. 1.

unto me, saying," and he rehearses it as Aaron repeated the words of Moses. No one can doubt that the book claims for itself that its writers give "the word of God."

That is what we call "inspiration." So the book says of itself, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2 Tim. iii. 16. This inspiration the book assigns to the divine Spirit. Christ says that David "by the Spirit" called himself Lord. Matt. xxii. 43. David's words in the second Psalm, ver. 1, are ascribed to God in Acts iv. 25: "Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said." The writers of the Old Testament say of themselves, or it is said of them by the writers of the New, that they were inspired by the Holy Ghost. Comp. Heb. x. 25 with Jer. xxxi. 33.

The New Testament writers tell us of this Spirit being promised to them (John xvi. 13), of the fulfillment of this promise at Pentecost (Acts ii. 4), and they claim to speak and write in the Spirit—that is, with the mind of the Holy Ghost. See 1 Thess. ii. 13 and 1 Cor. xiv. 37. The question here is not whether they were right or not. The point is that they assert that they give their writings by inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

They do not say, "I have thought out this," or "I can prove this," or "I have learned this from man," or "My conscience teaches me;" but they say, "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." 1 Cor. ii. 10.

The question is not now as to how much they know of themselves, and by natural means, as when John describes in the gospel what he witnessed, nor is the question as to some parts being more important than others. The leaf on the tree is God's work because the tree is his work, and the book claims for each part that it is inspired of God because the whole is inspired.

It is no objection to this claim that the style, and even the language, of David differ from those of Paul. They claim to be employed *as they are*. When Ahasuerus pro-

claimed liberty to the Jews (Esther viii. 9) to defend themselves, and sent his edict "unto every people after their language," it was his proclamation, no matter in what hand or tongue the scribes wrote it; and to have made it uniform in style and speech to all would have been unnatural and to most of the people useless. A proclamation from the President of the United States in German, Scandinavian and English is his proclamation, and its fitness to the end is gained only by its going out in different forms. Nor are we embarrassed here with any question as to *how* the Spirit inspired the writers. The *fact* that they claim to be inspired stands by itself, quite separately from the question of the *manner* in which it is realized. We know of creation, of two natures in one person, of resurrection and of regeneration as facts, but are ignorant of the mode; even those who make the most of the power of reason admit their ignorance of the mode in which spirit and flesh are joined, but they own the fact.

Nor, finally, are we troubled by the general resemblance of this book to other books in figures of speech, formation of sentences, varieties of words and methods of stating truths, and variations of language in the statement of fact. Moses was like any other man when he was God's messenger. The word written is like the Word incarnate (John i. 14), who was so human in speech, feeling and experience that they who only look at one part of his life count him nothing but human: "Is not this the carpenter's son?" Matt. xiii. 55 But those who saw other parts of his life said, "This was the Son of God." Matt. xvi. 16; xxvii. 54. He was both. So the Bible has its human aspect in words, style, poetry, prose, history, sermon or letter, but it has, to those who look deeper, its divine side. It is the word, the oracles, of God.

A person of candor and fair education who took the pains to know the Bible, finding in it this claim of inspira-

tion, would notice many things that support, as far as they go, this claim. He would say to himself, "If this book be inspired of God, then it has really one author throughout; it ought, therefore, to have unity as a book.'

This *unity* he finds in its representation of God, of man, of sin, of goodness, of sin's effects and of heaven. "The seed of the woman" is in Genesis (iii. 15), and is not lost sight of till the end. Here are forty writers, with great differences among themselves, but they have one purpose. They aim at building up virtue and goodness with perfect harmony and in God's name. Can they be toiling to make known the truth, well knowing themselves to be liars, and publishing on themselves the most dreadful sentence?

He would further be likely to say, "There is much in this book which *I feel* to be true. It tells me so much that I have done!" He might add, too, "It describes truly my needs, my restlessness, my fears, my sorrows, and it certainly undertakes, if I will receive it, to disclose enough for them all—bread for my hunger, pardon for my sin, peace for my conscience, rest for my soul."

Looking further into the matter, he would find that around him which harmonized with the Bible. It speaks much of the Jews as favored of God, living in Canaan, worshiping in synagogues, keeping the Sabbath, separate from others, cast out for sin, scattered over the earth; and here are the Jews in exact harmony with all this, claiming, and able to prove their claim to any man of ordinary education, to have been for three thousand years as the Old Testament represents them; and here again are the Christians described in the New Testament, keeping the Lord's day, reading this book, setting up churches, preaching the gospel, as they claim to have been doing for over eighteen hundred years, and as scholars admit they have been doing, and all this as it is declared in the New Testament.

Pushing his inquiries still further, he would find Egypt

and Canaan described at great length. "Now," he would say, "these lands are open to us; let us see if the book and the lands suit each other." He finds history, geography, manners, customs and government all as in the book, and moreover that buried monuments, out of sight for thousands of years, only being unburied and read now, corroborate the claim this book sets up.* He might well say to himself, "Everything in the book looks like its being true; and it alleges that it is inspired; it is worth my while to see what is said about it." This leads to the examination of evidences over and above the Bible's account of itself.

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

The Reformation in Germany took place in the early part of the sixteenth century. At that time the Scriptures were in many libraries in the Hebrew and Greek exactly as we have them now. How do we know this? Among many other ways, by the public controversies and discussions between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant writers. It would be just as easy to deny the Reformation itself as to deny this fact.

But discussion did not begin with the Reformation. Jews and Christians disputed; Christians disputed among themselves; synods and councils were held for the discussion of unsettled points, and books enough were written on the controversies in the early centuries of the Christian era—books that still remain—to make a library. They prove that the Scriptures were then in substance what they are now.

* A careful and candid thinker might further say to himself, "The believers in this book must feel very sure of its truth. If it were a fiction in any form, the unchanging East gives the means of detecting the fraud. But it is the Christians who go to the expense of sending exploring parties to the lands of the Bible that exact and precise information may be gained and circulated. They have no fear of furnishing the means of refuting the claims of their Bible."

The New Testament furnishes proof that the Old Testament existed, and as now, when the evangelists and apostles prepared their writings. They quote (Luke xxiv. 44) from every great division of them. The "second Psalm" is quoted thus in Acts xiii. 33. The events recorded in the Old Testament, and only there—such as creation, the fall, the flood, the call of Abraham and the history of the kings, Saul, David, Solomon—are reasoned and commented upon in such a way as shows that they were accepted as facts on Old Testament authority. See 1 Tim. ii. 13–15; Rom. v. 14, 15; Matt. xxiv. 38, 39; Rom. iv. 1; and Acts vii. 45–47. But we are not left to the New Testament for proof here. At least two hundred years before Christ there was made, at Alexandria in Egypt, a Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, of which the circulation was very large. That translation, called the Septuagint, is evidence not only of the integrity of the book at that time, two thousand years ago, but also of the importance attached to it and the veneration in which it was held as the sacred book of a multitude of people.

Nor is it necessary we should believe all that has been written of the manner of its translation in order to feel the force of this argument. If any one should allege the Greek of Homer to be a concocted book, prepared by schoolmasters of this century for educational purposes, and rendered interesting as a story to beguile the pupils into learning dialects and metre, the ready answer would be (apart from their ability to produce it, and apart from all other evidences of its origin) that this could not possibly be the case, since Alexander Pope published a translation of our present Homer in 1720. Now, the proof is not more complete that the Greek translators found our Hebrew Bible two centuries before Christ than that Homer was found by Pope, as we have it, in the beginning of the last century.

We do not dwell upon the testimony of Josephus, a learned Jew, who prepared several works, historical and controversial, in which the history and opinions of the Jews are fully laid bare for the information of the Romans, and in which the sacred books of the Bible are not only acknowledged, but enumerated in the Hebrew fashion, and distinguished from the Apocrypha. His works are in general and deserved circulation. The value of this testimony can be illustrated easily. Suppose at some future time a blundering foreign historian should confound the revolutionary and civil wars, and declare that the United States had their rise between 1860 and 1870, a single page of Bancroft's History would be sufficient refutation. "Why," it would be enough to say, "the preface to Mr. Bancroft's great work is dated *Boston, May, 1838*, and the United States must have been then a considerable, recognized power, to warrant a man in writing a large history of them." It would be as easy to disprove the revolutionary war of this country as to disprove the fall of Jerusalem.

The sacred Scriptures are not the only ancient books that have come down to us. We have Latin works, like Cæsar's Commentaries and Virgil's Eneid; and Greek works, like the history of Herodotus, and the history of Cyrus by Xenophon. These have been preserved, as the Scriptures were, in manuscript, carefully written on parchments and treasured up in libraries. They bear traces of their antiquity as real and distinct as the signs of age in old armor or old pictures. Indeed, this comparison falls short of the truth, for the attention bestowed upon armor, pictures and such objects of antiquarian interest bears no proportion to that given, and most justly, to ancient manuscripts, many of which, being very rare, costly and of great literary value, were the boasted possession of kings, nobles, and rich corporations. No reasonable doubt exists that we have in substance Cæsar's Commentaries or the history of Herodo-

tus, of both which innumerable editions have appeared during the last three hundred years.

But when we compare the authorities in ancient manuscripts for our present copies of Herodotus with those for our present copies of the New Testament, we see how ample the ground is for our confidence. Be it remembered that the question is not here as to the truth or otherwise of the books; it is only the question of their being in substance what was written and given out as inspired books by the evangelists and apostles.

According to Isaac Taylor (1859), about *fifteen* manuscripts of Herodotus are known to critics; of these several are as late as A.D. 1450, several others of the twelfth century, and none *proved* to be older than the tenth century. This is *above* the average number of copies of classic authors, though some more ancient classical manuscripts exist, a Virgil in the Vatican claiming to be of the fourth century, but the bulk of such copies are between the tenth and fifteenth centuries.

Now, when we come to the Scriptures, we find that editors have had under examination nearly *five hundred* ancient manuscripts of the Greek New Testament or parts of it, that there are copies from widely different sources, translations having been made, says C. Tischendorf, into Latin, Syriac, Coptic and Gothic, "between the second and fourth centuries," and that we have at least two copies assigned to the middle of the fourth century, one of them possibly a specimen of an edition of fifty copies issued by the emperor Constantine in A. D. 331, under the care of Eusebius the historian.

It is not necessary to follow farther this line of argument. The Scriptures were widely circulated, were in the hands of persons of different nations and tongues, were often in controversy, were producing changes and making monuments of themselves, were rendered into versions, were

being quoted extensively and with every variety of purpose, and were often imitated in vain. It is not too much to say that if we have any evidence of a *genuine* work of antiquity coming down to us—say, from the Augustan age, such as the works of Virgil or Horace—the proof for the genuineness of the Scriptures is ten times as strong.

LESSON II.

THE EVIDENCES OF INSPIRATION.

Now that we have in our hands a book that claims to be from God, and to have been produced, not by man's effort, but by the Holy Ghost, it is impossible to avoid asking, Does the book show its peculiar origin by anything peculiar in itself, or is it a book that could have been made by mere men?

This question is very important. If made by mere men, it may be untrue, may mislead us, may be shown by and by to be in error, as Virgil and Socrates have been shown to be mistaken. But if it be from God, since we are sure we have it in substance as it came from the writers, it cannot but be a perfect rule for all the purposes for which it was given.

Various lines of inquiry here open to us. We may ask of the book itself (*a*) how it came to be where it is now. In other words, we may argue that it could not have gained its present influence unless it were of God. We may ask (*b*) if its authors show by their knowing more than other men that they were inspired. This leads us to examine the prophecies. Or we may ask (*c*) if the style and general character of the book differ in any such degree from common books as to show an uncommon origin. And finally, we may inquire if the fruits it has brought forth imply the heavenly origin of the seed.

It will not be possible in our space to follow out all these lines, but something will be said on each that will show how they can be followed.

1. How did the book attain its present authority? Its earliest portion, the Pentateuch, came from Moses, the leader of Israel. He conducted the people out of Egypt against the will of Pharaoh, who demanded proofs that he had a right to interfere. Ex. vii. 9. Moses gave as he had received from God (Ex. iv. 2-7), and showed to the people (Ex. iv. 30) the miraculous proofs that the Lord sent him. The magicians said in effect, These do not prove anything; we can do the same. Or they said, in effect, Our gods are as strong as this Jehovah. Ex. vii. 12 and viii. 7. The plagues that followed proved Moses' and disproved the magicians' assertion; and though they did not soften Pharaoh's heart, they convinced all Israel that the Lord was speaking to them by Moses. "How do we know that?" it may be said. Because the people did such things as no people would do unless so convinced. They left their homes in a most fertile land (Gen. xlvii. 6), where they had abundance (Ex. xvi. 3), set out for Canaan, engaged in dangerous wars, and submitted to heavy tithes and numerous burdensome regulations in dress, manners, food and worship. But how do we know they did so except from the book itself concerning which we are inquiring? We know it from abundant authority outside the book, such as Josephus and the Greek and Latin writers. And, best of all, we know it from the actual people themselves, whom God has scattered over all lands, alike illustrations of the oldest and also of the latest portions of his book. In other words, Judaism was established over the minds of a race by a series of miracles, including the manna and others in the wilderness, and in the conquest of Canaan, which did not prove the truth of the things said directly, but which proved that the Lord was with Moses and Aaron. The fair in-

ference was that they should be obeyed. They had credentials from the Almighty.

The Hebrews did not, alas! adhere to God's worship. He was offended with them, and often chastened them. Among other means employed for their good, he raised up, as he had promised by Moses (Deut. xviii. 18), reformers whose office it was to bring back the people to obedience. Such men were Samuel, Elijah and Elisha. They spoke in God's name. But how was it to be known that he had sent them? Partly by their speaking the same things as God had said in his law. But the people did not know, or, knowing, no longer believed in, that law. Then the credentials were renewed, and Samuel (1 Sam. xii. 17), Elijah (2 Kings ch. i., etc.); and Elisha (2 Kings ch. iv. and v.) presented them to the people, who received them, and acted upon the message so attested, as in the slaying of the prophets of Baal. 1 Kings ch. xviii.

In the "fullness of time" Christ came. The nation was corrupt; the sceptre was departing; the heathen were in the ascendant. The Roman power had opened up much of the world to safe journeying, and the Greek language had been learned over all the principal countries. Just as one can travel over this continent and be understood everywhere in English, so, then, one reigning race and one tongue of the learned prevailed, so that while Israel was under Roman sway there was opportunity for any message through Israel, to the world, to go abroad. Then Jesus Christ came (Gal. iv. 4); he was a Jew (Rom. ix. 4, 5), and his message was counted at first a Jewish message. Acts xvi. 3.

But the Redeemer of men was a babe, a man, counted "the carpenter's son," poor among poor men. How should it be known that he came from God? How should men be assured that he had authority to require and execute reforms? He replied by the works which he did. John v. 36. "The works that I do in my Father's name, they testify of

me." John x. 25. So he offered evidence to John's disciples on the question, "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" Luke vii. 19-23. And on all candid minds the evidence produced the due and intended effect. Nicodemus speaks for all such: "No man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him." John iii. 2. By his miracles, of healing for the most part, by his resurrection and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and by the continuance of this power of working miracles for a sufficient time in the world, men were convinced that God was speaking by him and to them. And if so, then this message must be true. If he says, "I and my Father are one," it must be true. If his disciples say, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house," it must be true. So men argued. So we would be bound to argue now if the like work were proceeding before our eyes.

It is not meant, bear in mind, that this is all that the miracles were meant to do. They were far more than displays of divine power. They showed character and feeling as well as might. He fed thousands by a miracle, for "he had compassion on the multitude." Matt. xv. 32. He raised the widow's son to life because "he had compassion on her." Luke vii. 13. They who saw him raise Lazarus saw him weep with Martha and Mary (John xi. 35, 36), and they drew the right conclusion: "Behold how he loved him." But it is not on the moral but the evidential value of the miracles we are now dwelling.

By such signs and wonders Jesus led men to believe him to be from God, and a band of disciples gathered around him. They were men of ordinary talents and observation, moving in his own rank and living with their Master. They had opportunity to judge of him living, and to identify him when risen as the same who was crucified. Themselves believing him the risen Lord, they persuaded

others of it, till the cities were filled with his doctrine, and in every land there were preachers and churches of Christ. Acts xi. 1 ; xix. 26.

How do we know this except from the book the truth of which we are proving? We are not dependent on the Scriptures for the evidence. Heathen writers like Pliny, the edicts of Roman persecutors and the researches of modern historians like Gibbon, furnish the proof. It would be vastly easier to show that Columbus did not discover America, but that it was always just as it is now, than to disprove the history of the planting of Christianity.

But, it may be said, why did not miracles remain with the preachers of Christ? We may not know all God's reasons, but we are sure he wastes no power. The wooden support remains under the solid arch only till the cement has hardened, and the fastenings remain on the graft only till it has united with the tree, and the splints remain on a fractured limb only till the parts have knit; and so miracles remain with the New Testament Church until a living body of Christian worshipers has been raised up in succession to the Jewish Church and the New Testament dispensation has gained a footing in the earth.

But it may be said that miracles have been wrought by others than the Lord's messengers; and if so, how can they prove a divine commission? We reply, There is no evidence of a real miracle ever having been wrought in the world but by God's servants and for the vindication of his truth. Miracles appear to be the seal appended to the commission of God's messenger whenever a new kind of communication is proceeding from him. That seal has been imitated with more or less success. There have been and will be forgeries of it, but it is, we may be sure, entrusted to no hand but those of God's servants.

But, it may be said, did not the Egyptian magicians do as Moses did? They appeared to do so, but it was not by

the finger of the true God, or even any god, but by their enchantments. When they had due notice and had time to make their preparations, they copied the miracles sufficiently to give color to Pharaoh, who wished not to believe. When they had no notice and no preparation, they were impotent (Ex. viii. 12), and said, "This is the finger of God." See Ex. ix. 11. From this time onward they stand aside, powerless sufferers, with the rest of the Egyptians; and "the thing that has been is the thing that will be."

But does not the New Testament forewarn us that "signs and lying wonders" will be wrought (2 Thess. ii. 9) in furtherance of "that wicked"? True; but why should we not understand the efforts of the modern, in the same sense as we are compelled to do those of the ancient, magicians? Why not understand these wonders to be addressed to ignorance, and not only intended to bolster up lies, but themselves lies? Men who want to believe or to disbelieve are easily convinced. Miracles have won men to Christ against their natural corruption. The show of them is sufficient to justify to men their belief of Christ's opponents and rivals.

The conclusion, we think, is established that the Scriptures are attested to us by miracles; that each succeeding commission from God has, as it were, his sign manual; that the Scriptures teach us their value as evidence; that they had and have power to prove that those who wrought them came from God; and that to have deceived the disciples and the multitudes, and set up Christianity on evidence that was not overwhelming, would itself have been a greater miracle than any credited by Christians.

LESSON III.

THE PROPHECIES.

THERE is no need to draw a sharp line between miracles and prophecies, which, in point of fact, are miracles of knowledge. The turning of water into wine is something impossible to man's power; to announce the mode, time and circumstances of an event out of all human probability, centuries before it happens, is impossible to man's wisdom. Divine power appears in one, divine knowledge in the other.

But the wisdom and goodness of God appear in giving these two kinds of evidence. The miracle of power impresses the beholder directly; the miracle of knowledge awaits the developments of time to give it convincing force. We in the nineteenth century do not behold the miracles. The contemporaries of the prophets and apostles appear to have in this an advantage over us. But they could not see the force of prophecy, as we do, in its fulfillment. The nearer the miracle of power, the greater its convincing force; but the convincing force of the prophecy increases with time. There is equality of privilege, therefore, and we are no losers of evidence by the ages intervening between us and the messengers from God.

In weighing the argument from prophecies, we leave out of account the Old Testament predictions fulfilled in the New, because he who denies the divine origin of the Bible might allege that the forger of the prophecy forged the fulfillment, as the writer of a novel makes the second volume to correspond with the first. We dwell on those predictions in the Scriptures for the fulfillment of which we look entirely outside of the Bible records.

Two things, therefore, are necessary to the understanding of this evidence—a knowledge of what is written in the

word, and some knowledge of the facts of secular history. The latter need not be technical. No one need be deterred from the investigation by want of time for extensive reading. An ordinary good education either affords, or puts within one's reach, the requisite historical knowledge.

To indicate the method of examination without lengthened statement will be sufficient. Many scholars now occupy themselves with the study of ancient remains. The site of Babylon is rich in these. Brick was used in building, and the ancients often inscribed names and dates on their bricks. Rich, Ker Porter, Rawlinson and others in English, like Niebuhr in German and M. Mohl in French, have described and compared the ruins of ancient Babylon, fixing sites by the aid of Herodotus and others who have minutely described the greatness of this once magnificent capital. Let any one now read the description of the site and the words of Jer. li. 37, 43, 44, 58; Isa. xiii. 21, 22, and xiv. 22, 23. These prophets described not only what came long after their own time, but what has continued until our own. Nor are we dependent upon the Scriptures for an account of the greatness or the fall of Babylon. Berosus, Herodotus and Xenophon have written of it; and the evidences dug from the heaps of ruins explain difficulties left in the histories, and show the Bible account to be accurate, while Xenophon's is partly a romance.* The drunken orgies of the defenders, the refusal of the invaders to be bought off, the suddenness of the capture and the name of the victor,—all these are among the particulars mentioned by Isaiah. Josephus tells us of the steps taken by Cyrus in consequence of the prophecies of Isaiah one hundred and forty years before. See Ezra i. 1-4.

Layard's *Nineveh* is now a popular and well-known book. It lays bare sculptures buried out of sight for over two

* See Rawlinson's article on "Babylon" in Smith's *Biblical Dictionary*.

thousand years in the ruins of the city, and which prove at once its former greatness and the accuracy of Scripture notices of the place. Jonah iii. 3. The value of these remains has been recognized by all Oriental scholars, many of whom are successfully engaged in translating the disintegrated records. With his accounts the student can compare Nahum i. 8-10; Zeph. ii. 13, 14, 15. One of the most convincing elements in this argument is founded on the fact that for a long time, owing to error or ignorance, there appeared to be inaccuracies in the Scripture accounts such as a forger never would have left behind him, but which modern research has shown to be only in appearance.

The same kind of comparison may be followed up between the Moab of Scripture (Isa. xv., xvi.; Jer. xlviii.) and the Moab explored by Graham and Porter (*Cambridge Essays*, and *Five Years in Damascus*). So we may place Edom and the Ammonites of Jer. xlix. in the light of reports made by Burekhardt, Mangles, Lord Lindsay, and other recent travelers. Egypt, as depicted by the book of Exodus and verified to us by Wilkinson, may be studied in Jer. xlvi. 19, Ezek. xxx. 13, and in the works of modern writers sufficient of themselves to form a library. The same remark applies to the Tyre of Solomon's time (1 Kings v. 9), of Isa. xxiii., of Jer. xxv. 22; xxvii. 3, of Ezek. xxviii. 2-12, of Zech. ix. 3, 4, with the descriptions of it by Harris, Pococke, Hasselquist, Volney, Robinson, Stanley and Renan.

It is quite worthy of notice that increasing travel and the research and literary enterprise of our time are bringing this department of the evidence of divine inspiration into prominence at the same moment that men, pursuing other lines of scientific inquiry, reject the supernatural and deny the existence of miracles. God does not "leave himself without a witness."

But if there be any who cannot find the means of making

such examination as the foregoing, there is another line open to them. When a court chaplain was asked to give an argument for the divine origin of the Christian religion in the shortest and most intelligible form, he replied, *The Jews*. There could not have been a more effective reply. Let us see how the argument stands as regards this remarkable people. The Hebrews had a land of their own, given them by God, after long foregoing promise, with most impressive accompanying circumstances, and under solemn covenant. If any race could be supposed to own and be expected to retain their land while they continued to exist, the Jews might have been counted upon as that people. They had a divinely-appointed ritual, with a hereditary priesthood, and a definite and well-appointed system of sacrifices, through which sin was confessed, divine anger deprecated and divine favor entreated. The abandonment of this ritual by the people was a most unlikely event.

The nation was singularly compacted together by race, by history, by religion, by possessions; and its dispersion over the earth might have seemed among the most improbable of vicissitudes. We could conceive of the nation being crushed out, or of the fragments of it preserving the sacrificial rites, or of the poor remains of the separated race holding together like the tribes of our own Indians; but not one of these contingencies has occurred. The magnificent kingdom as it stood in Solomon's time is no more; the temple is the ruin of a ruin; Jerusalem has none of its former glory; the land, as compared with what it was once, is desolate; the altar no longer smokes with sacrifice in Palestine or elsewhere; the people are scattered; tribes are lost; the priesthood is of little account, though rabbis may be found attached to the synagogues, in which are read, as of old, in the old Hebrew, the sacred books of the nation. There is enough distinctness about the people to mark them off from other races and to render emphatic

and indisputable the fulfillment of the ancient predictions. Who can tell where are the representatives of ancient Egypt, of Assyria, of Carthage, of the empire of Rome? But as to the Jews—who build their places of worship among us, and shut out from professions, and formerly from the occupation of land and from politics, have concentrated their great energy on money-making—who can doubt their identity with the people whom the Lord brought out of Egypt, whom David ruled, who crucified Jesus, whom the Romans subdued and dispersed?

Now, in the light of these familiar facts, to doubt which would be to doubt all history and to question the evidence of the senses, one may study with advantage the language of the great lawgiver to the people in Lev. xxvi., in which one finds every feature of the present condition of the Jewish people. And yet their condition now is one of honor and peace compared with what it once was over all the world, when “Christian” princes gratified at once their avarice and their fanaticism by persecuting and plundering the Jews; for the time was when there was literal truth in the language inscribed on a lowly stone in the corner of the necropolis at Glasgow where Jews are buried—

“The wild bird hath her nest, the fox his cave,
Mankind their country, Israel but the grave.”

LESSON IV.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THAT collection of works which we call the *Old Testament* contains thirty-nine separate treatises. Some of them are historical, like Exodus; some are poetical, like the Psalms; some are, like Daniel, part history and part prophecy. These books, by many different authors, were pro-

duced at widely different periods, stretching over at least a thousand years. The earlier writers could have known nothing of what was to be produced by their successors. Nor could their successors possibly know the place to be given to their works if preserved for future generations. Yet it must be obvious to every careful reader that these treatises have a true unity among them. Examine an Encyclopedia or Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, and you see at a glance that there was an editor who corresponded with various writers, assigned their parts, and took care that each should have his place. You would not be likely to believe that without concert or a common purpose all these writers had *happened* to contribute each a share, which when put together *happened* to make an Encyclopedia. But when the writers are unknown to one another and are spread over a thousand years, such an accident is out of the question.

Then was it by the choice of the copyists or the book-binders of later time that we have these books as they now stand? Or is there arrangement, such as one sees in the building of a house with foundations, walls, windows, roof? Is there a structure such as one sees in the human body, each part fitted to the other parts and to the whole?

Suppose for a moment our Bibles began with any other book than Genesis; in the absence of that book what a host of unanswered questions we should have! Imagine Exodus the first book. Who is Joseph? Levi? Israel? The God of Abraham—who is he? and the further on in the volume we suppose it to begin, assuming it to be given, the more numerous the questions. But this book begins at the beginning of the world, as we have it, and of the race. "What am I? and from whence?" are questions that must be answered by any one to whom a Bible is in the least intelligible. These questions the opening book answers.

How did the existing state of things begin? "Matter

is eternal," said man. "No, it was created," this book replies. "Matter is evil," say the dualists, who thought there were two rival principles, the good and the evil, the latter having to do with matter. "No," says this book; "God made it, and all very good." "These heavenly lights are God," said Eastern nations. "No," says Genesis; "God created them, and all else." So that nature, which is before grace, is accounted for and put in its proper place in Genesis, and without one line of unnecessary or bewildering detail.

But if all was made "very good," how is it that we have so much evil? The record of the fall is the answer. But why should the sin of Adam and Eve do so much evil? Because, among other reasons, men form a race. Then why are not they found with one tongue, if one race? The record of Babel is the reply. Then why is there any distinction among these scattered fragments of a race? Because God chose out of all a people of whom Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were the heads, to bear his name and receive his law.

But perhaps these are only mythical accounts, half poetry, half religion, intended to satisfy men. Then is Joseph mythical? or Egypt? or Moses? Are the sacrifices mythical? or the Jews of our day? Where does the myth end and the history begin? The book of Exodus is the answer to the question with which a reader of Genesis would lay down the book. Did God visit the people? Did he bring them out? and when they were brought out, how did he train them? What was done with them? The remainder of the Pentateuch settles these questions.

And not only so, but it provides as it were for its own preservation. The right of the people to their land, of each tribe to its inheritance, of the priests to their maintenance, of the debtor to the return of the land with which he had been forced to part at the jubilee,—all this was set

tled in the law of Moses. The dress, habits, rites, taxes, and civil affairs of the people were determined authoritatively by this law. They might, and, alas! did often, turn away from its moral and spiritual precepts, but they were held fast as a people by its social and political arrangements. The legislation of the Pentateuch made the Jewish people, and the Jewish people attest the Pentateuch.

The succession of the book of Joshua to those of Moses is as natural as his elevation to power after the death of his great leader. How God fulfilled "the promises made to the fathers" is here set forth, and the faithfulness of God is proved. God is true, though every man be a liar.

But suppose the record closed with Joshua; we should be left with many natural yet unanswered questions. Did the people follow the law fully? Was the ominous announcement of decline, made by Moses (Deut. xxxi. 16) and renewed by Joshua, realized? Did repentance follow punishment, as the Lord said? The book of Judges (of which Ruth is an appendix) replies with its various apostasies, humiliations, and restorations by the means of judges whom God raised up for the purpose.

The judges form the connecting link between Moses and the theocracy he guarded so well and the new form of government, in their choice of which, though God gave the people the desire of their hearts, yet he beheld a departure from himself. 1 Sam. viii. 7. The kingdom becomes historical. Suppose we had not the books of Samuel and the Kings; we should be sorely perplexed by the record on brick and stone from Nineveh and from Assyrian palaces now becoming legible to men. Moabite stones, instead of being helps and proofs of Scripture, would be hopeless puzzles to us. "We have the theocracy of the early Jews," men might say, "and we have the scattered modern Jews without king or priest in a condition very unlike that of their fathers, indeed; but here is notice of

Hebrew kings, their wars, their victories, their defeats. What is the meaning of this?"

The books of Samuel and the Kings reply to this question. They illustrate further still the declensions, guilt, and punishment of the people, and show us how the Prophets rose to influence and authority. A rebellious people forgets God's law. The knowledge of himself is in danger of dying out. These men are raised up, the counterpart of the judges, to reform, to teach the people, to vindicate God, and to prepare the Jews—that is, the Church of God as it then stood—for a new and different state of things, in which the priest should be esteemed only historically and as he foreshadowed Jesus Christ, the great High Priest.

He who visits Rome or reads Roman history cannot help becoming acquainted in some degree with the Hebrew temple. The arch of Titus recalls it. Suppose we had not these books; how incomplete our knowledge would be! "Here," one might say, "we have Moses and a tent in which the sacred vessels of the Hebrew religion are stored; and in later times we have the scattered Hebrews without even that; what is the meaning of this temple?" The history of Solomon is the answer. But it would not be intelligible—his prayer, for example, at the dedication—if we had not the history of David. Nor would that history be intelligible without that of Saul and the wars in which the house of Saul disputed the throne with David. The narrative, however, of Solomon's enormous outlay of money, zeal, and taste on the edifice replies to all these questions, and explains, moreover, the eager attachment of the race to Jerusalem and their national temple.

But was all this career of rise and fall, revival and decay simply for the maintenance of a kingdom? No, truly. The rational was in order to the moral, and this in a twofold sense.

1. The Hebrews were to be trained in the fear and love

of God. Was the training a total failure? No. How do we know this? The devotional writings of David and others of his time furnish the reply. The heart of the Church in all ages has beaten in response to their testimonies. In love to God, trust in his word, sense of his majesty, admiration of his mighty acts, cleaving to him, thirsting after him, the heart of the Church has never risen above these sacred compositions. They are the evidences that the institutions were in order to something higher, that the Jewish system was the scaffolding for a great spiritual building, and that it was not, after all, reared in vain. Besides, these psalms, to be fully intelligible to us, require the history, precisely as the Epistles of the New Testament require the Acts of the Apostles.

2. The Hebrews had a relation to the nations of the earth, to whom they were by their laws and institutions to give light. Ex. xxxiii. 16. And so, without any will of theirs, they were in contact not only with the Egyptians, at that time the first of the nations, but later with Assyrians, Medo-Persians, Grecians, and Romans. The great empires of the world had brought to their notice the Lord God of the Hebrews. The record of this is given us in the closing portions of Kings and Chronicles and in Daniel, and the remainder is matter of prophecy, of which the New Testament and later history give the fulfillment. Nor is this overlooked in the composition and structure of the Old Testament, for the books of Ezra and Nehemiah illustrate the influence of the Jews on surrounding nations, and at the same time, through the temple, connect together the Old Testament and the New.

It only remains to say that the prophets—commonly distinguished as the four major and the twelve minor—were at once the teachers of their time, the organs through which God declared his will and the duty of the people, and the means through which the divinely-given re-

ligion was and is attested to men, some of their predictions receiving fulfillment within the time covered by the Old Testament, and yet others within the time of the New Testament, while some still remain unfulfilled to exercise and sustain the faith of the people of God. They are most wisely placed at the end of the volume, because the transition is made through them from a state of things in which the priest is the prominent actor and leader to another condition of affairs in which "apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers" become the appointed means of maintaining divine service. Eph. iv. 11.

These various component elements of the Old Testament were in three divisions in the Jewish method of arranging, the third including the devotional writings, which they called *Hagiographa*, and at the head of which they placed the Psalms. Hence our Lord said, at once setting his seal on the Old Testament and showing the real unity of the whole, "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." Luke xxiv. 44.

LESSON V.

THE ORDER AND DESIGN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

PURSUING in substance the same plan here as in the last chapter, we inquire, concerning the treatises composing the New Testament, Did the transcribers and roll-makers settle their order? Is it by an accident in the process of collection and transmission that they lie as they do, the Gospels preceding the "Acts of the Apostles," and this book followed by the Epistles, the whole closing with "Revelation"?

For it is to be borne in mind that we have no apostolic manuscripts. Such venerable documents, had they remained

to us, would have been worshiped as relics. In the *Muratorian Fragment*, of which the date is between A. D. 160–170, the books are in the order in which we have them now, except that the Epistle to the Romans is placed after those to other churches. The catalogue of Eusebius (A. D. 340), which may be regarded as that of a royal edition of the Scriptures under Constantine, gives our present order. Athanasius (A. D. 373) repeats this order, and drops all mention of “controverted” books, which some persons thought inspired, while some doubted. The council of Carthage, which enjoyed the presence of Augustine, gave a catalogue varied from ours in this only, that it places James the last, except Jude and Revelation.

The Syrian Bible, often called the *Peshito Version*, and the old Latin Bible, of which the Vulgate is the later representative—that is, the Scriptures of the East and of the West—give us our present order. The substance of these statements is that the Church nearest the time of writing, when the history, relations, and uses of the component parts of the New Testament were understood, was led, in the watchful and controlling providence of God, to settle upon that order with which we have become so familiar. The time of the composition of the several treatises was disregarded, and natural fitness determined the arrangement. In the Koran we might as profitably begin with the middle or the later parts as with the beginning. It would matter little in what order Bacon’s Essays are arranged. Not so this collection of works. Books of science usually set out with formal statement and set forth “orderly results.” But we seem to see the New Testament grow as we proceed with the study of its successive portions.

Its two main elements come to us in this wise :

(1.) Christ Jesus, in person, illustrates and enforces certain truths to his disciples, of which we have the record in the Gospels.

(2.) He promises to them his Holy Spirit for their further enlightenment, which promise is fulfilled, and under such divine guidance the rest of the volume is furnished to the Church.

This is the New Testament revelation. All decrees of councils, all opinions of venerable fathers and ancient writers, all creeds, symbols of belief, confessions of faith, only represent degrees of human comprehension of this revelation, and have authority over the human conscience in so far as they can support themselves on this revelation.

Look more minutely at the plan of this New Testament. We open the book and begin with the Gospels. Here is God in the flesh, Christ the revealer of God. He comes from the bosom of the Father; he stands in the presence of men. Behind him is the mystery of the eternal and the infinite; before him is the human race in need of light as to that infinite. He has something in common with both God and man. He will tell us what we wish to know. He is the source of doctrine as well as the subject of the Gospels. Now that he has given the revelation, what will men do with it? The response is in the Acts of the Apostles. Here is the truth of God in human hands in actual contact with men; what is the result? As the pupil learns grammar or arithmetic in school, it is common to give abstract rules illustrated by appropriate examples. The Gospels give us the Saviour's doctrines; the "Acts" present them, so to speak, in actual application.

As this application is made to various conditions of the human mind, some truths need to be unfolded, some defended and some guarded. Some will assail truths, and they must be defended; some find them obscure, and they must be set in clear light. The Epistles furnish the result, and we have anticipated and met in them the difficulties, objections and perversions of succeeding races of men.

But this religion of the New Testament creates a community as well as saves individuals. What will be the fate

of the community? The book of Revelation is the answer. A man standing on a hill overlooking a battle, though unable to comprehend each order and manœuvre, yet can see if the troops that held a particular position in the morning are driven from it and their opponents hold it at night, and so judge of the decisive result. So, as we seem to watch the opposing hosts in this wonderful book, hear the trumpets, although as we gaze bewildered on the vicissitudes of the struggle we may not comprehend every evolution or see the object and end of every movement, yet we are in no doubt *at the end*, when Satan's kingdom is "not found," and the followers of the Lamb occupy all the ground. All the details we cannot master, but our faith rejoices in this certain result.

And this revelation comes like the Gospels, and yet with a difference. Christ in person gives the Gospels, but it is in humiliation. He also gives the Revelation with its unfolding of the war he wages from his throne, but it is as the glorified and ascended Saviour and in vision to his servant, and it is a fitting close not only to the New Testament, but to the entire Bible. Man begins in Genesis, in Eden. He is in communion with God. He has the tree of life. He is lord of all, under God. He is perfectly happy. Sin comes and makes fearful wreck. Is its sway to be permanent? Is its ruin to be repaired? Let the answer come to us from the "Revelation of John the Divine." Here is the paradise of God again. Another and a better Eden blooms. Man is in it. Here is the tree of life. The tabernacle of God is with men. All tears are wiped away. Sin is cast down; its author is conquered, and over it, among a redeemed and glorified multitude, Jesus is enthroned victor, and God is all in all.

He who candidly studies this New Testament must see that one pervading mind runs through it all. That mind is Christ's. It is the Testament of Jesus Christ. Whoever

preaches, reasons, persuades, or records his visions, Jesus Christ is the inspiring guide.

His religion rests not on speculation or a system of reasoning, but on definite, historical facts, proved, like other facts, by appropriate evidence. It is fitting that they should be placed in the foreground. So they are in the word. These facts touch human interests; the statement of them in relation to men constitutes doctrine, and the doctrines, as they act on men's minds, make Christian experience. This experience is illustrated, unfolded and estimated in the succeeding portions of Scripture.

Men act on some such plan as this in their common affairs. Book-keeping rules are learnt or the maxims of law are studied in classes, but the proficient in either completes his professional training by actual practice in the application of these rules. And such is the order in which the New Testament educates the Church of God, with its statement of great truths, and its ample delineation of the working out of these truths in the experience of the individual, the formation of Christian churches, and the prophetic view of the whole community.

Reserving for another lesson a more detailed view of the New Testament plan, we close this by commending to readers who desire to follow out this most interesting department of study Bernard's *Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament*, than which few books more amply reward careful examination.

LESSON VI.

ORDER AND DESIGN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

(CONTINUED.)

OPENING the New Testament, we find four Gospels, each occupied with the life and death of the same Person, and all four having much in common. A thoughtful person might ask, Why four? might not one orderly and continuous narrative have been given us, embodying in their natural place the addresses and works of this divine Person? might we not have been saved, on this plan, from the need of "Harmonies of the Gospels," and from the labor of reconciling slight apparent disagreements?

But there are objects of which one view is entirely incomplete. A building, for example, is not fully represented to us by one picture. The architect will give us ground plan, front elevation, side elevation, and section of the edifice if our conception is to approach accuracy and completeness. Why may not this wonderful life of Christ, so important to us, so many-sided in itself, have required as many as four pictures of it from different points of observation in order to render it approximately complete to our minds? And it must be admitted that these four writers seem bent on giving us each a view of this life and nothing else. In how many uninspired biographies do the writers turn aside from the narrative to give their own impressions! There are memoirs of notable persons that might almost be regarded as the opinions of the writers, with notices of the subject. How often one hurries over these opinions searching for the facts, and overleaping the reflections! You never do this in the calm, colorless narratives of Matthew and his fellow-evangelists. They are nothing. Christ is everything. He does stupendous works. They are not seen in the attitude

of wondering admiration or heard uttering their plaudits. Each work is reported, or each pithy reply is chronicled, and the writer hurries on to the next point to be presented in that busy, varied, marvelous life. "Tell us what happened," one is tempted to say to many a voluble recorder, "not what you thought." One never says that in studying the evangelists. You are put as nearly as possible in the attitude of a hearer of those authoritative words, a spectator of those mighty deeds. And if there be apparent slight discrepancies, who shall say that there has not been a gain from them in the greater and closer scrutiny to which they have led? There is undoubted and positive gain in the proof they supply that there was no collusion, no writing for effect, and no other desire than to state facts as each had the means of knowing them.

But there is adequate reason in the substance of the four Gospels for there being so many. Many of the early Christians—a majority in the first century, probably—were of Jewish birth. Their minds were formed and their religious thought was moulded by the Old Testament. The stream of their feeling will run in the old channel and direction. The Gospel of Matthew meets and suits them. It follows the prophets in natural sequence. It shows the fulfillment of their words in Jesus, the Messiah descended from David and Abraham. Ch. i. 1. It reports the sermon on the mount and gives the New Testament interpretation to misconceived statements of the Old. It quotes the Old frequently. It breaks down prejudice, conciliates, instructs Jews who would "see Jesus."

But a very important class of men joined the early Church who grew up as Romans, came to Palestine, and learned the truth. They were men of action, prompt, candid, decided, like the centurion of the crucifixion, or Cornelius. They were important gains; they represented much. John Mark, Barnabas' nephew, with (how given

we know not) a Roman name, who was Peter's companion and animated by much of Peter's spirit, writes a Gospel for them. As Peter opened the door of faith to the Gentiles in his ministry, so does his friend and son in the faith (1 Pet. v. 13), Marcus, open it in a permanent written record. Terse in style, pithy, rapid in movement, picturesque in the details filled in, his brief Gospel has a business-like directness about it. It begins, with little introduction, with Christ's public career, and crowds into its pages those words and deeds which make him appear, what at length Rome recognized him to be, Lord of the visible and the invisible worlds.

But the gospel is for the world, Jew and Gentile, and the life of Jesus is to be seen as in harmony with this grand design. Accordingly, Luke writes it. The companion of Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, an educated man, with the breadth of mind and tenderness of heart of a "beloved physician," he depicts the Saviour as one whom all the world may receive and trust, and who in orderly and precise narrative is traced up as the "son of Adam, which was the son of God."

And now the Church has three pictures of the world's Saviour: for a time these are enough. But by and by she comes in contact with modes of thought sometimes reverent, sometimes scoffing; and new questions begin to be put: Who is this Redeemer? Son of man? Son of God? Human? Divine? Or is he both? or is he neither? Who is so fit to give information on these momentous topics as John, who writes with the calm sobriety of age, his life lengthened out for this purpose? He leaned on the Master's bosom. He was his beloved friend.

His Gospel begins with the "*Logos*"—"the *Word* made flesh"—and presents to us the amplest statements we have as to the dignity, the divinity, of our Lord and his unity with the Father. It ends with the avowal (ch. xx. 31), "These

are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing ye might have life through his name.”

Even such a hurried glance at the evangelists as this, serves to show the fitness and propriety of four Gospels, that each has a distinct function, and that each supplements the rest. Shall we be willing to part with Matthew, with his view of Jesus a lawgiver; or with our view of the indefatigable worker, of Mark; or of the friend of universal man, of Luke; or that of the divine Revealer of the Father, the Son of God, in John?

This divine Teacher not only gives the world doctrines to be believed; he founds a society by which the truth shall be held, illustrated and diffused. Who so fit to report the growth of that Christian society in which is “neither Jew nor Greek,” *as such*, as Luke? Hence the Acts of the Apostles, from the pen of Paul’s companion, follow the “former treatise” (with “all that Jesus began to do and teach” till his ascension), with the continuation of what he did after he was taken up. For the book may be as fitly called the “Acts of Jesus Christ” as of the apostles. He is still here in action, meeting the twelve, sending the Spirit, working the miracles, sending Philip, turning Saul of Tarsus to himself, and watching over his infant Church. Here we have the truth in its action on men—Hebrews, Romans, Grecians, philosophers, and barbarians. It is presented to them as men to be awakened, enlightened, evangelized. But if the Church is to continue with organic life, there will be aspects of Christian truth, not presented to them, yet really needed by the evangelized. Converts are to be built up. They too, having come under the influence of truth, will ask questions and require information. How good it would be if a man could be found to give it who had a Gentile connection and some familiarity with Gentile modes of thought and life! Paul is just such a man. But he will suit Gentiles only? No. He is an Hebrew of the Hebrews, and fitted to ex-

pound the significance of Hebrew rites and ceremonies. Has he not been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel? Paul is with us as a worker in the Acts, but let us see him as a writer in the Epistles.

Now we come to a new department—namely, the training of the members of the Christian family. The method is appropriate. Familiar letters—not oracles, and not treatises—convey the lessons. Christian experience is to be guided. Christians are to be directed how to turn to account the positive truth; and when it is assailed by Judaism or by heathenism, they are furnished with the arguments with which the assault is to be repelled.

Nor is Paul alone in this department. Corroborative testimony is given by Peter, James, and John—"pillars," as Paul calls them—and one of whom formally endorses Paul. 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. Seven churches are addressed in this way, representing, we may well believe, the various types of Christian life. The Epistle to the Romans follows naturally the Acts, in the close of which Paul is left teaching at Rome. It deals fully, like the letters to the Galatians and the Corinthians, with errors in doctrine and practice of which Christians need to beware. Three other Epistles are marked, like John's Epistles, by their practical delineations of experimental godliness, those to the Philippians, Colossians and Ephesians. The church at Thessalonica is exercised about great coming events, and the letters to that church—the latest in time—are a fitting preparation for the book of Revelation.

So we are carried intelligently into a new dispensation. Priest, altar, and sacrifice of the common kind have sunk together, and Christ is all in all. But is this new condition of things to be regarded as a censure on the things of the past, as if they had been useless or unmeaning?

By no means. There is the Epistle to the Hebrews, with its direct appeal to the Hebrew mind, its penetration into

the heart of things, its firm grasp of the Old Testament facts, and its clear views of Old Testament principles. It shows how the New Testament Church is the intended, expected development of the seed planted around the base of Sinai, but that, following the divinely-given light, God's saints have now come to "Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels; to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Heb. xii. 22-24.

But how is this organized body to be perpetuated, and with what method of arrangement and action? It is not the *great* question, but it is an important question, and is not beneath the notice of Him who is "not the author of confusion, but of peace as in all churches of the saints." 1 Cor. xiv. 33. Hence we have the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, with directions for the kinds of officers, the qualities to be sought in candidates, the regard due to them, the nature of their functions and the results at which they are unitedly to arrive as the members of one living body filled and governed by one Holy Spirit. So—for we have already noticed the aim of the book of Revelation—this wonderful collection of treatises constitutes one organic whole, to conceive of which being made up of a number of accidental contributions honestly or fraudulently put together by mere unaided men is as difficult to us as to conceive of a mass of molten metal running into a steam engine, or the colors of a paint-shop accidentally running on a canvas and producing "The Transfiguration" of Raphael.

LESSON VII.

RULES OF INTERPRETATION.

THE Bible is written in Hebrew (with a little Chaldee) and Greek, the languages of the men through whom it was given, and for whom its several parts were, at the time when they were given, intended. These are now dead languages—that is, they are not now in use in the speech of man.

This is a disadvantage, but it is difficult to see how it could be otherwise. To have placed among men a revelation in a modern language would have given no aid to them. Not understanding it, and not having any means of gaining a knowledge of its nature as we have of ancient documents, they would have had no motive for its preservation. As it is, the divine wisdom appears in bestowing a book which men understood and valued at the time, out of which their character and their institutions grew, and which as human speech changed made inquiry and research necessary, and so contributed in no small degree to the scholarship of the world.

We have the means of determining the general sense of the Old Testament in the Greek translation made in the first half of the third century before Christ, at Alexandria, and in common use among the Greek-speaking Hebrews before our Lord's time. We have a corresponding aid to the understanding of its history in the works of Josephus. The New Testament being in Greek, in which Josephus and Philo wrote, and being accompanied and followed by many Greek writings, as those of the rabbis, the Greek classic authors and the early Greek-speaking Fathers, we have a rich abundance of what are called *collateral* means of understanding its peculiarities.

If, therefore, defective translations of either Testament be put into circulation, the means exist for detecting and ex-

posing the defects; and instead of these means becoming fewer, they increase from age to age. Never, for example, were there so many checks upon any deception and so many appliances for discovering errors, if any exist, as at this moment, when in all civilized lands there are so many scholars, and in all the lands of antiquity there are so many travelers and explorers. The ancient Scriptures are like the pyramids of Egypt; they are old, and some mystery shrouds their early history, but more persons know of them now, and more living persons have seen them, than at any former period of the world. A thousand years ago the removal of one of the pyramids would have excited little notice. Of such an event the world would now have notice in a few days.

We need not feel, therefore, that we are material losers by our dependence on translations, to the right interpretation of which the following rules apply. Those who make the translation are bound—as we are when we can consult the original—to ascertain the meaning of the words by dictionary, grammar, and the collation of contemporary or similar writers, and to learn the usage of speech at the time. And having faithfully done this, they stand exactly where the general reader stands who has in his hand a good translation; and they must apply the same rules of interpretation.

But having ascertained by the aids proper to the case the exact meaning of words, we are bound farther to consider the drift and aim of the writer and the sense in which he would employ terms. For example, the word “conversion” is used in one sense by the historian when he describes a change of religious faith, in another by the chemist when he describes, for example, the conversion of water into ice, in a third by the lawyer when he brings an action against a fraudulent officer, in a fourth by a logician when he describes the putting of the subject in place of the predicate,

and in yet a fifth by the theologian when he means a radical change of heart. Now, a candid reader is clearly bound to consider the general aim of a writer when he finds ambiguous words; and in the nature of the case many words must have a common and a religious sense.

In addition to this general fact, it is not uncommon for a writer to have a usage of language peculiar to himself, not difficult to find out, and which we are bound to remember. In many acts of legislatures the uses of words are defined, because great minuteness and accuracy are required; in some authors definitions are provided, as in mathematics, and we feel bound to interpret by them throughout. This is not usually done, in form, in ordinary treatises constructed as are the treatises composing the Scriptures, but it is often done, in fact, if we attend closely to what we read. For example, in Paul's letters such words as "flesh," "righteousness," "justification," are employed by him in a very distinct sense; and if he did not define them, it is because he and they to whom he wrote both knew what he meant.

It is obvious enough that sympathy with the aim and theme of the writers, and the capacity to put one's self in their place, is a help to understanding them. We should say so regarding any other form of compositions: and so regarding the Scriptures. Blackstone we expect to be best expounded by a lawyer, Adam Smith by a practical man of business, a poet by a man of poetical faculty. If it be said that on this plan we shall make a sense for ourselves, every eye seeing its own beauty, and every mind catching the echo of its own convictions, the reply is, No; the check upon that tendency is furnished by the necessity laid on one, as mentioned already, to ascertain at the beginning, by ordinary helps and rules, the simple meaning of the language employed. For we are to go to the Bible, not to find in it what we desire or think, but what its writers meant to convey. Our sympathy with them aids us in catching that

intention. A letter of your friend is being read by a stranger, who hesitates and stumbles over it. You take it in hand and read it through, not only because familiar with his hand, but with his turn of mind and the modes of expression he is likely to adopt.

In this connection it is a good rule to keep in mind that the Scripture writers do not aim at effect, are not ambitious of literary honor, and are marked, where history, instruction, and warning are their themes, by great simplicity—simplicity which is not shallowness. In portions of the Scripture it is designed, indeed, that “dark sayings” should be uttered, retaining their obscurity till the events make them plain; but the things we need to know for salvation are usually in plain and direct language. See as examples the Gospel of Mark, Christ’s conversation with the woman of Samaria, the tenth chapter of John, the sermon on the mount, the Epistles of John, the sermons of Peter, the narratives of Paul, and the accounts of the crucifixion. Take a good picture, and a child will see its meaning at a glance, for to tell its own story is surely the first requisite in any work of art, even of a ballad; but the artist who has himself painted, sees more in it than the child. And so the parable of the prodigal son carries its meaning—the meaning it has for him—to a schoolboy, while the theologian sees in it the materials for a volume. “The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin” has been apprehended by the child and the unlearned with inexpressible gladness; and yet what depths of meaning it has revealed to the profound thinker, who sees in it the majesty of law, the boundlessness of love, the mystery of Deity, the needs of humanity, and the glory, at once, of divine grace and truth!

When types and symbols are employed in Scripture, it is a wise rule, before searching for the basis of them in outside literature, to examine the Bible itself. Many of these in the prophetic books have their origin in the historical.

A vine out of Egypt in the Psalms (lxxx. 8) is best understood in the light of the Pentateuch. The birth "of water and the Spirit," of John iii. 5, is intelligible in the light of Ezekiel xxxvi. 25-27. The picture of the paradise of God in Revelation is found in its elements in Genesis, and even the battle of Armageddon is stripped of some of its mystery when we know how the servants of Josiah carried their dead lord from the fatal field of Megiddo. 2 Ki. xxiii. 29.

Our aim being to give simple directions for intellectually understanding this inspired book, we do not here advert to the absolute need of the Holy Ghost to a right spiritual and saving knowledge of it—a point not overlooked in other portions of this volume. Let it be the comfort of every reader to know that when the need of this illumination is owned before God he is more willing to give it than parents to give good gifts unto their children. Matt. vii. 11.

LESSON VIII.

HELPS TO INTERPRETATION.

THE Bible being an ancient book, given in another land and in a condition of society which, though singularly unchanging, is yet materially different from ours, it is obvious that we may expect in it allusions that are now obscure, and modes of speech different from our present forms of expression. The present chapter is introduced to point out available helps to overcoming their difficulties, and to encourage readers to their use.

The Old Testament was given to the Hebrews in a language they could understand, for it was conveyed through Hebrews. Those forms of expression which are distinctive of the language (every language has such) are known in books as "Hebraisms." The language of the Old Testa-

ment was exceedingly familiar to the writers of the New; and just as our sermons and prayers are greatly moulded in expression by the Scriptures, so the New Testament writers are influenced in a high degree by the phraseology of the Old Testament. Hence we find phrases in the New Testament modeled, it is easy to see, on the language of the Old. To understand this fact will often save from misconception or ignorance. "Sons of Belial" (1 Sam. ii. 12), and in the New Testament "son of perdition" (John xvii. 12), are illustrations. The word "Belial" in the Old Testament is not a personal name, as one might imagine from our English translation, which here followed the Vulgate, but means *worthlessness* or *wickedness*. A son of Belial, therefore, is a worthless, wicked person, like Nabal (1 Sam. xxv. 17), just as in the New Testament a "son of peace" means a peaceable, candid person (Luke x. 6), and a "child of wrath" means one worthy of wrath, and "children of disobedience" are to be taken as disobedient persons.

So double nouns, like "spirit of promise," do duty for adjectives and participles, and the name of Deity is employed to describe the highest degree of excellence where the doubling of the word is not employed. "Goodly cedars" (Ps. lxxx. 10) are literally "cedars of God," as in the New Testament "weight of glory" means great glory. Roundabout phrases, such as "being called," "being found," are employed where we use parts of the verb "to be." Enoch was "not found" in Heb. xi. 5, and "was not" in Gen. v. 24. See Phil. ii. 8 and 1 John iii. 1. Gradations of feeling are not expressed in a language so simple as the Hebrew, and hence stronger expressions are used than we should employ to describe simple preference, as, when our Lord requires his followers to hate their parents (Luke xiv. 26), he plainly means that they should be loved less than himself, even as, in Mal. i. 2, 3, Esau is "hated" (Rom. ix. 13)—that is, loved less than Jacob.

Positive language is also used in Hebrew where only permissive action is intended, as in the apparent commission to the lying spirit in 1 Kings xxii. 22. The withholding of grace is all that is meant in making "the heart fat" (Isa. vi. 10) and in hardening Pharaoh's heart.

It is to be borne in mind that in all lands in which more than one language is employed, or in records stretching over long periods which cover changes of language, various forms of the same name will appear, and persons will be described by different names. So Joshua of the Hebrew becomes Jesus in Greek (Heb. iv. 8), both meaning Saviour. Hence the confusion as to Moses' father-in-law is in part removed, and hence we see in the New Testament Matthew and Levi applied to the first evangelist. The Sea of Galilee is also the Lake of Gennesareth; Edom and Idumea are the same, as Horeb and Sinai were names given to a whole mountain of which each was a peak. Where double names were not employed, as with us, the recurrence of the same names must be frequent, especially when the official titles, as in so many instances, absorbed the personal name, as in the Pharaohs, Abimelechs, Agags, which corresponded to the "Cæsars" of later Rome.

As in our land the same name is often repeated to describe places (as Washington, Springfield), so it is with Antioch, Cæsarea, Bethlehem, Mizpah and other places.

Plainly, a careful consideration of peculiarities of this nature is a help to the understanding of the word, which was natural in its style to those who wrote and received it.

Some idea of their land is a help to understanding their Scriptures. Jerusalem has a crown of hills called mountains round about its own plateau, well representing the care of the Lord round about his people. In a hot climate the "shadow of a great rock" is easily understood. Where water is less abundant than with us, the digging of wells is a matter of great moment and their possession a cause of

war. In such a land the dew is so needful to vegetation that it may well stand for God's blessing: "I will be as the dew upon Israel." When Lebanon with its cedars was so striking a natural object to the people, we need not wonder at allusions to it. Thunder and rain in wheat harvest are only wonderful to us (1 Sam. xii. 16, 17) when we know the kind of weather that prevailed at that time, just as a knowledge of rainless Egypt enables us to understand the startling effect of a grievous hail over all the land except Goshen. So in another department the eagle, the lion, the hind, the dove, the sheep, and in yet another the fig, the palm, the cedar, furnish illustrations. Some acquaintance, therefore, with the natural history of Palestine, such as numerous excellent books now furnish, is a help to understanding the word.

The names applied to other lands and nations by the Hebrews ought to be understood, if we would not be involved in perplexity. The regions to be reached by water the Hebrews called "isles," and the continent of Europe and much of Asia were to them the "isles of the Gentiles." Yet while there was apparent inconsistency in their language, its peculiarities had a historical basis. Alexander the Great having overrun the East and made Greek power felt from his time onward, civilized peoples, not Jews, are called "Greeks," and "Greek and Jew" included the civilized world as distinguished from barbarian and Scythian. So Hebrews, who lived outside Palestine and spoke other than the Hebrew, are called Grecians. Asia is used in a narrow sense in the life of Paul, and this may easily confuse one who forgets it, but it will not seem strange to any one who remembers the freaks of language. One is often asked, for example, in California, when he came from "the States," as though California were not one of them. An old name lingers after it has lost its distinctive meaning. Occasionally a simple fact in the matter of place throws great light

on an allusion or an incident. For example, the allusion to a "building fitly framed together" in Eph. ii. 21 is singularly apposite in all the letter to those whose eyes must have often rested on the architectural grandeur of the Temple of Diana at Ephesus. Sodom and Gomorrah are described to us in their crimes and ruin with great minuteness, not only because of Abraham and Lot having to do with them, but because they stood in the very midst of Canaan. With the monument of this signal judgment before them, Canaanites and Israelites forgot God and turned to idols.

Geography and chronology have been called the two eyes of history, and nowhere is a little knowledge of dates more valuable than in understanding the Bible. It is quite common to proceed on the assumption that the books are ranged in the order of time, whereas some of the Psalms are concurrent with Samuel, and Ezra and Nehemiah, for example, come long after many of the prophets, such as Isaiah. The history of the nations of the earth is receiving fresh illustrations every year from the explorations of travelers and the researches of scholars, and the results are being presented in forms so attractive as to leave us without excuse if we are ill informed on this general subject. That shepherds should be an abomination to the Egyptians, that Nineveh should be described as a city of three days' journey, that Tyre, Babylon and Idumea should be represented as so wealthy, that Egypt should furnish horses, that Athens should be described as wholly given to idolatry, that such details of the siege of Jerusalem as the trench cast about the city should find a place in our Lord's prophetic word,—these and many like circumstances in the word are no surprise to any who has considerable knowledge of the history of nations contemporary with the Hebrews.

Of the value, to an interpreter of the word, of knowing the customs of the ancient races, one has not need to speak. The Scripture is full of life-like pictures. We see the men

on the housetop; we find the Saviour sitting by the well's mouth, or we follow him to the new tomb hewn out of the rock; we picture to ourselves his seamless robe; we seem to see the phylacteries of the Pharisees and the sandals of the disciples; the "women grinding at the mill" make a picture to the mind's eye as vivid and distinct as the "ox treading out the corn."

Now, it may be said, "Why should a knowledge of all this be needed to a full understanding of the word?" Let it be remembered that knowledge of such subjects is eagerly pursued and highly valued for its own sake. We ought to be thankful for the stimulus to the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge supplied to men by inquiries of this kind. But be it remembered that these things, to understand which we must take some pains, are among the evidences of the divine origin of the Scriptures. The water-mark in a forged letter has been unnoticed by the forger, and become the means of his detection. To how many circumstances does the Bible commit itself, if it were a forgery, every one of them being a means of detection and exposure, in geography, in history, in genealogy, in manners and customs!

But why should we complain of the need of these helps? Take a schoolboy's Virgil or Sallust and examine it. What an apparatus of notes explanatory of construction, history, mythology, current beliefs, and contemporary events, it needs! and before he can begin to use it, he must have mastered the elements of his Latin grammar, and must, besides, use his lexicon. But we have this volume "in our own tongue wherein we were born," with its blessed and glorious revelations of life in Christ now and life eternal beyond the grave. Let us be grateful for it, and gladly avail ourselves of all the facilities afforded us for obtaining a knowledge of its meaning, that we may be wise unto salvation.

LESSON IX.

TYPES AND SYMBOLS.

It is obvious to any reader of the Bible that much of it departs from the common and matter-of-fact style, and that to reach the meaning of such parts we must look beneath the surface. In ordinary animated writings we are not surprised by the use of figures. We expect them because they add strength and beauty to expression. When, in 1814, Daniel Webster said, "Unclench the iron grasp of your embargo," his meaning was plain enough, and a few words express it figuratively with far more force than if he had uttered it in ordinary terms. He employed more than one comparison. Embargo was like a hand—an iron hand—an iron hand clenched. We have a great profusion of such eloquent figures in the Scriptures. Can anything be finer than "the Lord rideth upon the swift cloud" (Isa. xix. 1), "his chariots shall be as a whirlwind" (Jer. iv. 13), "the name of the Lord is a strong tower" (Prov. xviii. 10), or more expressive than likening the brief noisy mirth of fools to the crackling of thorns under a pot? Eccles. vii. 6.

But there is a mode of expression throughout Scripture essentially different from the merely figurative, and in which the whole object presented, no matter in what kind of language, is intended to carry the mind beyond the ideas presented in the first instance. The image may be real, like the paschal lamb or the brazen serpent, or it may be ideal, like the living creatures of Revelation (iv. 8) with six wings, but in both cases the reader looks beyond the image to something of which it is the shadow. The general terms for these portions of the divine word are types and symbols, between which, for practical purposes, there is no distinction.

Why should these be employed in a revelation from God?

Because, in the first place, the human mind has a certain poetic element in it to which such a mode of representation appeals. Strong feeling, especially when it is sympathetic, flows naturally into the poetic form. Battle songs and patriotic songs are illustrations. It is easy to see for how much, for example, such a symbol as the "Star-spangled Banner" stands, and how natural is the language of poetry in connection with it. The Eastern mind carries out the comparison to great lengths in a way not common among less imaginative nations, though not without parallel, as in the allegory of the "Pilgrim's Progress" or the story of "Mansoul."

In the second place, it is the object of that portion of Scripture in which types and symbols are especially found to present truths in outline more or less dim, as the distant objects before a traveler's eye only acquire clearness and distinctness as they are immediately approached. There is perspective in the pictures of the Bible, as in the objects of nature to the eye, and in all true imitative representations. All the true objects of prophecy are served on this plan, and evils inevitable to explicit delineation of the future are avoided. A traveler descending the Italian side of the Alps sees the smoke and general outline of the town where he is to rest, not the gates or the name of the street, or the place at which he is to stop. But he sees these when he comes to the place and as soon as the knowledge is practical. So it is, so far, with the purposes of prophecy. That a deliverer should come, for example, was clear from the beginning. The details of his work are made to stand out clearly as men drew near the time.

In the third place, the mode of giving divine revelation—namely, by visions—rendered the use of object-teaching—that is, of types and symbols—inevitable. Before the mind's eye the embodied truths to be declared passed in review, the prophet's function being to describe what he saw in vision.

As a help to the interpretation of types and symbols we shall mention some of their characteristics. 1. They are suggested by something in the circumstances in which they are employed. Hence they have a naturalness in their original connection, and on this very account a certain fitness which we fail to see until we have placed ourselves in some degree in the circumstances. The first type of Scripture is an example. In the form of a serpent Satan tempted Eve. The word of God, "it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. iii. 15), has obvious fitness and propriety when uttered to the tempter in the serpent form and in the presence of the wife of Adam. So the wants of Israel made manna needful, and the serpents that bit the people suggest the serpent of brass to which they are to look for healing. Out of both grow symbols, the full meaning and significance of which we have in the New Testament. The same is true of the smitten rock. It is conceivable that the Lord could have provided supplies for the people in other ways, but these are chosen, no doubt, that they might be in Israel and among all men to the end of time, object-lessons for God's children. Why should this seem to us like cumbrous preparation for the future? Future is a relative term to us. There is no future to Him who fills all time. Men count it a proof of divine forethought that coal should be prepared and laid up in the earth for a race far in the distance. But the material is mainly for the sake of the moral and spiritual; and we should not wonder that the divine Teacher shapes the experiences of the Church in her infancy so as to render them profitable studies and memories for all her life.

2. Our authority for finding types in persons or in acts must be the Scripture itself. An ingenious fancy may easily discover remarkable resemblances between remote events, as in the history of Joseph and that of Jesus Christ; but we can only build upon any such correspondence as

typical when it is so declared in Scripture. The resemblance we discover may be eminently suggestive and useful as an illustration of truth; but when we call anything a scriptural type, we assume its being so intended by Him who gave the holy oracles, and we can only know his intentions by his declarations.

Nor must we strain a typical element in a man, an object, or an event beyond the use made of it in Scripture. The first Adam, for example, stands over against Jesus in that the one is the head of the natural, and the other of the spiritual, family (1 Cor. xv. 22); but it would be obviously violent and unauthorized to draw the parallel between them as to moral character, or even nature.

Melchizedek, the object of so much speculation, had a natural fitness for typifying the royal priest, Jesus Christ. Ps. cx. 4. We should not have been warranted in inferring from Abraham's paying tithes to him the superiority of Christ's priesthood to Aaron's, if the apostle Paul, writing to a race who could appreciate such considerations (Heb. vii. 2), had not given authority. When the apostle to the Galatians (iv. 22) says that the early notices of Abraham's two sons are "an allegory," it is not meant that they are imagined or figured, as in a parable, for the sake of a moral truth, but that they have a sacred and deeper meaning, "which things are allegorized." When one considers the number and variety of the typical objects in the Old Testament, and remembers that they find their antitypes in the New, and that they who bore a share in the preparing of them, acting of their own motive, were ignorant of what was to come after, we have a singular demonstration of the unity and of the divine origin of the Scriptures, of exactly the same nature as is presented by prophecy and its fulfillment. It would be much easier to believe that corn was made or that the coal which serves so many and varied purposes was stored away without any regard to man than

to believe that the whole Jewish system was formed without regard to Jesus and his kingdom.

3. Where the prophets are directed to speak by types and symbols and similitudes (Hos. xii. 10), we may usually look for some correspondence between them and the circumstances of the messengers whom God employs, or of those to whom the message is delivered. To David, who had been a shepherd, and by no means a rich one (1 Sam. xvii. 28), Nathan's parable of the one ewe lamb had a point which we can easily appreciate. What is true of parables, and in an eminent degree of our Lord's, is applicable to the sustained symbols of the prophets. Ezekiel is a priest (i. 3) and in captivity. How many patriotic memories and dreams he must have had regarding the temple at Jerusalem! He reports the glorious future of the truth by the prolonged symbolism of a reconstructed yet ideal temple with healing waters flowing from its threshold. See Ezek. xl.-xlvii., and xlvii. 9. On the other hand, Daniel was of royal family (i. 3), and all his life in courts, and his predictions are thrown into the form of successive monarchies. So Haggai, intent on the rebuilding of the temple, makes the enterprise of Zerubbabel to foreshadow the triumphs of Messiah, even as Zechariah sees in Joshua and Zerubbabel the "priest upon his throne" and the covenant of peace out of which comes salvation to the true Israel.

4. A certain unity runs through the types of the Bible which, once perceived, puts away the unsatisfactory look of vagueness and arbitrariness which, it is to be feared, they wear to many, and which is extremely discouraging to an inquirer. The best way in which to get rid of this look of vagueness and arbitrariness is to study them. You enter a watchmaker's while he is pursuing his work. On his board you see a confused little heap, in apparent disorder, of springs, brass wheels, circular boxes, and perforated plates. To your eye they are chaotic. His sees the place and use

and fitness of every one of them. It is so with these types to the trained student of God's word.

Take as an example the serpent of the temptation, in Genesis iii. 1. In Isaiah the prosperous times of Messiah's reign are predicted, and the serpent has no power to hurt: "The child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child on the cockatrice' den." Isa. i. 8, 9. Dust was to be the loathsome diet of the serpent in Gen. iii. 14; and in Isa. lxxv. 25, when the lion eats straw like the bullock, "dust shall be the serpent's meat." Is it possible to forget in the allusion of the second text the threat of the first? Now look to the close of the New Testament, and in Rev. xx. 2, 3, we have the "old serpent cast out," his power brought to an end, his head bruised.

Take another case from the symbol of fire. When Abraham was taken into covenant with God (Gen. xv. 17), a "smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between the pieces." When Moses received his commission (Ex. iii. 2) from a present God, behold, the bush to which he may not come too near "burned with fire." The Lord descended upon Mount Sinai "in fire." Ex. xix. 18. In the pillar of cloud and fire the Lord led the people. It stood over the tabernacle. Num. ix. 16. Fire from the Lord consumed Nadab and Abihu. Lev. x. 2. This great fire the Hebrews feared to look on. Deut. xviii. 16. Fire rose out of the rock and consumed Manoah's sacrifice (Jud. vi. 21), as it did Elijah's. 1 Kings xviii. 38. "A fire enfolding itself" appeared to Ezekiel. i. 4. The Messiah baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Matt. iii. 11. On the disciples at Pentecost rest "cloven tongues as of fire" (Acts ii. 3); and in Heb. xii. 19 "our God is a consuming fire." How is it possible to miss the continuity of this symbol of the searching, purifying, enlightening and, when need is, consuming presence and power of the Almighty?

It would not be difficult to add to these examples did our

space permit. One can see how much authority there is, if not for constructing a dictionary of types, at least for approximately estimating their meaning.

“As an example of the way in which an alphabet of the apocalypse might be made out, we may instance a few of its more important symbols. Earth symbolizes society in a settled state; sea, society in a state of convulsion; rivers, nations; a flood, nations in motion; mountains and islands, great and small kingdoms; air, the political atmosphere; heaven, the civil or ecclesiastical firmament; lord, the monarch; slaves, inferior rulers; hail and thunder, wars; earthquake, revolution; head, form of government; horse, king or kingdom; bow, war; crown, victory; altar, martyrdom; coals, severe judgment; vine, a church; wilderness, a state of affliction; rainbow, a covenant; key, ecclesiastical authority; angel, a minister of God’s purposes. Having determined the import of the individual symbols, it becomes easy to interpret them when found in combination.” We do not present the foregoing as certainly determined, but as showing the general principle on which types and symbols can be classified and defined.

LESSON X.

DIFFICULTIES IN SCRIPTURE, AND HOW TO DEAL WITH THEM.

SUPPOSE a mechanic to be required to construct a cylinder printing-press, or an optician a microscope which should serve the highest purposes of such complicated and delicate instruments, and at the same time be perfectly obvious and without difficulties to a child. Suppose a political economist directed to prepare a book which should deal with all the intricacies of trade, commerce and currency, which

should suit all the purposes of this nation, and yet be level to the capacity of all the school-children in the United States. Suppose Sir Isaac Newton had been required to put his "Principia" into such a form that while all future students in astronomical science should find it an invaluable help, yet the lowest intellect could at once see through its demonstrations. Surely the engineer, optician, economist and mathematician might, with good reason, reply, You require what is impossible in the nature of the case. Our work, if it is to be of any use to the more advanced, cannot but present some difficulties which the less advanced must labor to overcome.

All candid persons would feel the force of such replies when the communication is between man and man. Now, there ought to be equal candor in judging when it is between God and man. The infinite Father of lights is to give man a book-revelation that is to suit all lands, all times, all orders of intellect. It would be unreasonable to insist that it should be so constituted as to make no demand on the study, care and candor of its readers, especially when it is itself a part of a moral discipline by which moral agents are being trained for immortal life and perfect virtue.

To offer some suggestions regarding the difficulties of Scripture rather than to make any formal and detailed statement of them is the design of this chapter. They arise mainly (*a*) from the nature and subjects of revelation itself, (*b*) from the manner in which the revelation is given in a book, and (*c*) from the contingencies to which it has pleased God the book should be exposed. To require that there should be no difficulties in the substance of a revelation to man is to require some essential alteration of the relations of God and man, and would be as unreasonable as to demand that the conduct and commands of a parent should always be without difficulties to his infant

child. To require that there should be no difficulties in a divine book is as unreasonable as to require that there should be no study needed to master the laws of chemistry, mineralogy, language or any divine work. And to demand that, the book being in the world, the Lord should keep it from the ordinary accidents to which copying, translating and printing expose any book, is to demand a constant series of miracles that would relieve man of a responsibility which it is best for him to realize. No one, therefore, has any right to feel that the very existence of difficulties is a presumption against the Revelation. The presumption is all the other way. It would be hard to show that a work every part of which was on the level of the lowest human intellect without effort on its part had a superhuman origin.

I. There are difficulties in doctrine where it is conceded that the meaning of the language is understood, but the ideas conveyed are supposed incredible. That there are three persons in the Godhead; that man is depraved; that man is not saved by any works of his own, yet that he is to abound in good works; that he must be born again; that the ruin of the lost is eternal; that the Lord has often worked miracles; and other doctrines are of this class. They are commonly dealt with in books on doctrine and in systems of theology. Two things have to be borne in mind in connection with them:

(a) Facts may be stated and believed *where the manner of the facts is hidden*. We see in the baptism of the Lord Jesus the fact of three divine persons in the mystery of Godhead, the Father speaking, the Spirit descending on the beloved Son. But how the three co-exist in one God we do not pretend to know. Nor is our ignorance of the mode a barrier to our belief of the fact any more than our ignorance of the mode in which our human spirits and our human bodies co-exist prevents us believing the fact. How disembodied spirits live, how a divine spirit acts on matter,

how God is everlasting, how resurrection is to be effected, we know not, and have no hope of knowing, at least here, but in the facts we do not hesitate to believe. A child cannot explain an eclipse of the sun, but he can believe it, for he sees it.

(*b*) A statement or an alleged fact may be above reason, and yet not contrary to it, just as truly as the pigeons and sparrows can fly down the avenue without collision with the carriages or the passengers moving upward.

That Jesus should call Lazarus' spirit back to his body after death is above any reason. To say it is contrary to it is to say that my reason has gone into that region either by observation or experience, and knows all the facts. It has not done so; it knows nothing about it but as it is instructed. We have observed how certain created powers, even, for example, how death commonly works. To see death conquered and the dead live again, therefore, surprises us. Hence miracles are "wonders." But we have not seen how infinite power works in the unseen world, and therefore have no settled knowledge on the subject.

II. The book being in our hands, difficulties may occur to us from many causes, of which the reason lies in the nature of the book. Of these a few may be mentioned as illustrations.

(*a*) The same series of facts being the subject of several writers with distinct objects, one may give what another leaves out, and the omission may seem to be contradiction, but it is so only in appearance. The design of the writer determines the selection of his facts, as in the books of Samuel and Chronicles and in the Gospels. This class of difficulties has been fully dealt with in various works commonly known as "Harmonies." While, as in all similar works, there are diverse solutions, that *any* solution can be given is a sufficient defence of a treatise otherwise bearing marks of veracity, as in the genealogies of our Lord, where

one evangelist traces the line through the real mother, another through the legal father, the one writing for Jews and the other for Gentiles.

The same principle applies to the seeming discrepancy between Paul and James regarding justification. Paul is dealing with the tendency of the natural heart to make every man his own Saviour; James is dealing with the abusers of grace, who "said I am saved by faith and may live as I please." They have been compared to two friends attacked before and behind, and who for defence turn "back to back," one to parry the blows of self-righteousness, the other of licentiousness. This surely is a very different thing from contention between themselves or striking at one another. You are to be saved, says Paul, by faith alone; but, adds James, the faith which is alone and without good works is not faith of the living, saving kind. An almost parallel case is found in the apparently opposite directions for answering a fool in Prov. xxvi. 4 and 5. Two kinds of "fools" are contemplated.

(b) Difficulties arise from inaccurate construction of the words, as in Judg. i. 19, where Voltaire found matter for scoffing in the supposed inability of the Lord to drive out the inhabitants of the valley because they had chariots of iron. He did not see that Judah, and not the Lord, is the antecedent to "he," and that the real trouble lay in the defective faith of Judah, not in the defensive power of the Almighty. So obvious is this now that later commentators never notice the original objection, but lay out their strength on the terrible scythe-chariots, adapted to valley warfare, and which appear too formidable to the Hebrews to admit of assault.

(c) Difficulties may arise from ignorance of usages of languages, as when, in Acts i. 18, Judas is said to have bought a field which Matt. xxvii. 7 says the chief priests bought. It was with the ill-earned money of Judas the

purchase was made. Men are said to do that of which they are the cause, as Jesus baptized by his disciples, or the occasion, or which they claim to do, as the magicians are said to have made blood (Ex. vii. 22) with their enchantments --that is, they claimed and appeared to do it.

III. Difficulties are produced by undoubted errors in transcription in a way that is easily understood. Many of these errors are now rectified by collation of manuscripts and of kindred passages; and the number of ambiguous portions is now not only small relatively to the whole volume, but there is not one of them involving any article of faith, so that it would be put in doubt by the discrediting of the passage. The chief of these supposed errors are in the matter of numbers. The very earliest Hebrews, it is alleged, employed sign-letters, as we do figures and Roman letters, for numbers; and where letters were nearly alike in form or their significance was varied by points, it is easy to see how errors could occur in course of transcription. These errors are mostly in the earlier books of the Bible; and as a general rule, the numbers are exaggerated. The slain at Beth-shemesh, for example (in 1 Sam. vi. 19), are made to be fifty thousand and seventy. In the Arabic and Syriac the number is five thousand and seventy. Several manuscripts support Josephus in reading this seventy and omitting the thousands; and considering that this was a country village, it is the more likely number. Sometimes a sacred writer speaks in round numbers, while another is exact in the reckoning, as in the case of the wandering and enslavement of the Israelites for four hundred or four hundred and thirty years. Sometimes numbers are given inclusively, as we do, and sometimes exclusively. An event may be on the eighth day from this inclusively; but excluding this day and the day on which it occurs, it will be only six days from this day. We find a variation in the Gospels of this nature. In Matt. xvii. 1 we find "after six days." So it


is in Mark ix. 2, but Luke (ix. 28) reads "about an eight days after." Such seeming discrepancies as these are usually explained in ordinary books, and in such a way as to leave no discomfort in candid minds.


There is little use in recommending books on the subject of these difficulties. Those which one finds discussed in older text-books, like "Horne's Introduction," are rarely urged now. He devotes a section to alleged Bible contradictions to morality. Most infidel writers now admit and magnify the morality, but deny the miraculous element, of the Scripture. The difficulties that lie outside the classes we have enumerated are usually only difficulties to ignorance, and the power to deal with them is acquired by devout study of the word as a whole.

CEREMONIAL INSTITUTES.


- I. SACRED PLACES.
 - II. SACRED PERSONS.
 - III. SACRED RITES.
 - IV. SACRED TIMES.
-

BY THE
REV. EDWARD P. HUMPHREY, D.D., LL.D.





The Tabernacle, with its Coverings mostly removed.



CEREMONIAL INSTITUTES.

LESSON I.

THE CEREMONIAL INSTITUTES DISTRIBUTED.

THEY naturally divide themselves into four particulars:
I. Sacred Places. II. Sacred Persons. III. Sacred Rites.
IV. Sacred Times.

THEIR HISTORICAL ORIGIN.—The altar was the basis of the sacred places, the priesthood was the basis of the sacred persons, the burnt-offering was the basis of the sacred rites, and the Sabbath was the basis of the sacred times. Here we discover the links that connect the ceremonial laws given by Moses with the primeval ordinances of religion.

In the altar set up in the family of Adam we have the genesis of the tabernacle and temple. At the beginning the minister of sacrifice was the patriarch of the existing family, and his sacred office passed over to the Mosaic priesthood. In the offering of blood by Abel and the offering by fire of Noah we discover the germs of the Jewish ritual. The Sabbath ordained in paradise became the central institute in the sacred times appointed by Moses. These facts show—(1.) That the religious institutes of the Hebrews had their roots in the ordinances which God gave to the human race in the primeval age; (2.) The organic unity of the Pentateuch considered as a history; (3.) The position of the book of Genesis as an introduction to the laws given from Sinai; (4.) The gradual development of the Church and its ordinances of worship from the begin-

ning; (5.) The ceremonial law was not wholly a new thing to the children of Israel. They learned from the book of Genesis that God was proposing no principles regulating divine worship which were not laid in the early history of redemption; (6.) Atonement for sin by the shedding of blood, which was taught at the altars of both Cain and Abel, was the predominant idea in every section of the ceremonial law.

SACRED PLACES.


DESIGNATIONS.—The place of worship was—(1.) The Tabernacle, from the giving of the law until about the tenth year of Solomon's reign—five hundred years; (2.) Solomon's temple, until the Babylonish captivity—about four hundred and seventeen years; (3.) Zerubbabel's temple, built after the return from the captivity (about B. C. 520). This stood till it was removed or rebuilt by Herod (B. C. 8), or about five hundred and twelve years. (4.) Herod's Temple, from about 8 B. C., or till the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, A. D. 70, or seventy-eight years.

SECTION I.

THE TABERNACLE.

1. THE PLAN AND SPECIFICATIONS, down to the minutest particular, even the hooks and pins and shovels and snuffers, were prescribed by God himself, and are preserved in chapters xxxvi. to xxxix. of Exodus. Next, God gave to Moses in the mount a pattern of the house and its furniture. Ex. xxv. 9; xxvi. 30; Heb. viii. 5. This was probably an ideal pattern only, such as an architect forms in his own mind of a building to be erected. When the house was finished, Moses examined it thoroughly to see if it was exactly conformed to God's command. Ex. xxxix. 33-43.

2. THE ARCHITECTS were appointed and taught to execute the divine plan and specifications. God called by



Ground Plan of the Court of the Tabernacle.

name to this service Bezaleel and Aholiab, and endowed them with supernatural gifts in architecture and the ornamental and curious arts. Ex. xxxi. 1-11; xxxv. 30-35; xxxvi. 1, 2. The gift of God's Spirit qualified these men simply for the work of rearing and furnishing the tabernacle. It was not an inspiration for any other purpose, nor did it necessarily convey to them personal holiness.

The lessons taught here are—(1.) The extraordinary care which God took to secure a suitable place of worship, free from incongruities and wholly unlike the idol temples of Egypt; (2.) The supreme skill which appeared in the ornamental work about the tabernacle and its furniture and the sacred vestments of the priests is to be referred to the supernatural endowments of the artists. The rough, coarse work of Egypt in brick and mortar had disqualified the people for the curious arts of jewelry and embroidery and carving, which were now called into requisition.

The materials were derived from—(1.) The atonement money of half a shekel levied on all the males that left Egypt (Ex. xxx. 12-15); (2.) The voluntary contributions of the people. Ex. xxxv. 4, seq. These riches became so embarrassing to Moses that he issued an order "restraining the people from bringing." Ex. xxxvi. 6. The house when finished was loaded down with gold and silver and precious stones; *it was not loaded down with debt.* (3.) When the people left Egypt, they took spoils from their task-masters, "jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment." Ex. xii. 35. The value of the house and furniture has been estimated at \$1,500,000.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE TABERNACLE.

The relation of the tabernacle proper to the "court of the tabernacle," by which it was surrounded, will be understood by a reference to the engraving of the ground plan of the tabernacle and its courts. For a description of the fence

of curtains which formed the enclosure, with its supports, see Exodus xxvii. 9-18.

THE TABERNACLE, in its structure, is illustrated by the engraving given at a preceding page, in which the coverings are represented as almost entirely removed. The description is given in Exodus. 1. Base course of silver sockets. Ex. xxvi. 19. 2. Boards of shittim-wood standing upright. xxvi. 15-19. 3. Rings inserted in the boards and rods or bars running through the rings. xxvi. 26-29. Five pillars stood at the entrance. xxvi. 37. The under curtain was of fine linen (xxvi. 1-6), the next of goats' hair (v. 7 and 9), the next of rams' skin (v. 14), and the outer covering was of badgers' skin. v. 14.

FURNITURE OF THE TABERNACLE.

1. In the fore court. The brazen altar for burnt-offering. Ex. xxvii. 1-8. The laver of brass. Ex. xxx. 18.


2. In the holy place. Golden altar of incense. Ex. xxx. 1-10. Table of show-bread. Ex. xxv. 23, *sq.* Golden candlestick. Ex. xxv. 31, *sq.*

3. In the most holy place. Ark of the covenant, its golden lid the mercy-seat; above that the cherubim (Ex. xxv. 10, *sq.*; Ex. xxxvii. 1-9); between the cherubim the *Shekinah* or dwelling-place of Jehovah. Ex. xxv. 18-22; xxxvii. 6-9. Within the ark of the covenant were deposited the two tables of the law, a pot of manna, Aaron's rod that budded and the book of the law. Ex. xvi. 33-34; xxv. 16; Num. xvii. 10; Deut. xxxi. 26; Heb. ix. 4.

THE TABERNACLE AS A WHOLE.

1. It was a *tent* in the midst of the tents of Israel while they dwelt in the wilderness. That was the fundamental idea of the structure, and controlled in part its size, shape and position in the encampments and marches.


2. It was *portable*. The curtains could be easily removed




The Brazen Altar. For Burnt Offerings.



The Golden Candlestick.



The Altar of Incense and a Roman Altar.



The Table of Shew Bread.

FURNITURE OF THE TABERNACLE.

and folded up, the planks taken down; and the articles of furniture were supplied with rings and staves by which they could be borne along in the marches. In the first four chapters of Numbers we have the distribution of the twelve tribes about the tabernacle when in camp; the mode of taking it down and setting it up; the method in which the various parts of the building, the curtain and furniture were carried by the Levites; and the order in which the tribes moved in the journeys.

3. It was a *small, narrow* building, about forty-five feet long and thirteen and a half feet wide. It was hardly large enough to give standing-room for a hundred men, yet it was the only place of public worship for the twelve tribes of Israel, numbering not less than three millions. This smallness is explained by the fact—

4. That it was intended for worship by *representation*. Sacrifice was offered, not *by* the people in a mass, but *for* the people by the ministry of a few men representing all Israel.

5. The edifice and its appointments were exceedingly *beautiful*. The material glory of the house shined forth from the profusion of gold and embroidery and cunning work. It was a tent and a sanctuary or habitation fit for God.

IMMEDIATE USES OF THE HOUSE.

1. It was a *tent* for Jehovah. Just as a commander-in-chief of an army in the field has a tent for his headquarters, so Jehovah, who was the “leader and commander of the people,” ordered a tent to be prepared for himself. His throne-room was the most holy place, and the exact situation of the throne was the mercy-seat. “O Thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth.” Ps. lxxx. 1.

2. The place of the *oracles*. God spake first to Moses on Mount Sinai. When the tabernacle was finished and dedicated, the pillar of cloud and of fire came down from

the mount and stood over the most holy place. Ex. xl. 34. God spake to Moses out of "the tabernacle of the congregation" and delivered to him the Levitical law. Lev. i. 1. See also Num. xii. 4; Ex. xxv. 22.


3. *A meeting-place.* Jehovah met with his servants in the sanctuary. The phrase "tabernacle of the congregation" means simply the tent of meeting—*i. e.*, the tent where God meets with his people. Ex. xxix. 42, 43.

4. The house took the *name* "tabernacle of witness" or testimony (Num. xvii. 7; Acts vii. 44) from the fact that the ark of the covenant, standing in the most holy place, contained at first the two tables of the law, and in due time the book of the law or the Levitical institutes. Deut. xxxi. 26. It was a witness of the holiness of God and of the sinfulness of the people, establishing the necessity of the atonement and purification set out in the ritual.


SYMBOLICAL MEANING OF THE TABERNACLE.

1. The main truth symbolized by the sanctuary was the inhabitation of God in the midst of the race. It was a perpetual testimony that God does not dwell afar off; that he is not too great to concern himself with human affairs; that he is near at hand to punish the wicked and reward the righteous. Jehovah's tent in the centre of the camp, the cloud of his glory standing above the dwelling, his glory between the cherubim, his voice heard therein, were expounded by God himself: "And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them." Ex. xxv. 8; xxix. 45.

2. Approach can be made to God only by atonement and purification. Between the curtain of the fore court and the door of the tabernacle stood first the altar of burnt-offering, then the laver of washing. Both must be passed on the way to the sanctuary, showing the necessity of forgiveness and the washing of regeneration.



The Tabernacle and Laver.



The Ark of the Covenant.

3. The mercy-seat *covering* the tables of the law showed that "mercy rejoiceth over judgment." Kapporeth, the *covering*.

4. The altar of incense symbolized prayer. Ps. cxli. 2; Rev. v. 8. The candlestick was the symbol of truth diffused (Rev. i. 20), and the table of show-bread, a loaf for each tribe, suggested communion with God at his table. The priests by whom the bread was eaten represented the people in the act of communion.

TYPICAL MEANING.

See the Epistle to the Hebrews.

AFTER-HISTORY OF THE TABERNACLE.

After the children of Israel entered Canaan, the tabernacle of Moses was the sanctuary for about five hundred years, until the reign of Solomon, when the temple was built. When the Israelites crossed the Jordan, the tabernacle was set up first in Gilgal, then in Shiloh, twenty-three miles north of Jerusalem, in Ephraim. Shiloh retained the tabernacle between three and four hundred years. In the reign of Saul it was removed to Nob, about six miles north of Jerusalem, and was afterward conveyed to Gibeon. In the time of Eli the ark of the covenant was taken from the tabernacle, and was never returned to its place.

SOLOMON'S TEMPLE.

The tabernacle bore a distinct relation to the temple in its plan and furniture. It was a tent for Jehovah while Israel dwelt in tents; it was movable until Mount Moriah was purchased by David (2 Sam. xxiv. 18, *sq.*), when it gave place to a permanent and magnificent sanctuary.

Solomon's temple was double the size of the tabernacle. The materials were square stones instead of acacia wood; the walls and ceiling were lined with cedar curiously carved in flowers and palm trees and cherubim. The altar of burnt-offering was twenty cubits square and ten in

height; instead of the laver, a molten sea, measuring from fifteen to seventeen thousand gallons, standing on twelve brazen oxen with their heads turned outward; instead of one golden candlestick and one table of show-bread there were ten; in the most holy place the cherubim were of olive wood, ten cubits high; and at the door of the temple two pillars of brass. For descriptions see 1 Kings, chapters vi. and vii.; 2 Chronicles, chapters iii. and iv.

For the temple of Zerubbabel and the temple of Herod reference is made to the Bible dictionaries.

LESSON II.

SACRED PERSONS.

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

1. THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE PRIMITIVE AND PATRIARCHAL AGES.—At the beginning each worshiper offered sacrifice for himself, as Adam (Gen. iii. 21), Cain and Abel. Gen. iv. After the flood the office was in the patriarch of the family. Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob among the chosen seed, Melchizedek, and perhaps the priest of Midian (Ex. ii. 16), among the heathen, ministered at the altar.

2. INDICATIONS OF FUTURE CHANGES IN THE ORDINANCE.—(1.) In Jacob's prophecy respecting the future of the twelve tribes, he declared that the tribe of Levi should have no separate inheritance in Canaan, but should be "scattered and divided." Gen. xlix. 5-7.

(2.) At the slaying of the first-born in Egypt, God reserved to himself, for the service of the altar, the first-born son in every family of all Israel and the first-born of beasts. Ex. xiii. 2; Num. viii. 17. At the great covenant sacrifice at Sinai, burnt-offerings and peace-offerings were

offered by these first-born sons. Ex. xxiv. 5. But their priesthood was temporary and provisional.

(3.) Meanwhile, the leading position assigned to Aaron in the negotiation with Pharaoh and in the giving of the law intimated not obscurely that he was foreordained to some high calling.

3. THE SACRED PERSONS DESIGNATED.—(1.) Very early in the proceedings at Sinai, God commanded Moses to set Aaron and his sons apart to the priesthood. Ex. xxviii. 1. At this stage in the history Aaron and his sons were the priests, and the first-born sons of all Israel were their assistants.

(2.) As a reward of the fidelity and zeal of the Levites at Sinai (Ex. xxxii. 25–29) they were consecrated to the service of Jehovah. Deut. xxxiii. 10. In due time he ordered all the first-born males of all Israel, twenty-two thousand in number, to be exchanged for a like number of males in the tribe of Levi. The remainder, two hundred and seventy-three first-born males in all Israel, were released from the service of the altar by the payment of five shekels each redemption money. By this arrangement Aaron and his male descendants became the priests, and the males of the tribe of Levi became his assistants, instead of the first-born of all the tribes. Num. iii. 5–13, 40–51; viii. 16–19. That was the final and permanent arrangement.

DIVINE VOCATION OF THE SACRED PERSONS.


1. THE CALLING.—We have already seen that Aaron and his sons were set apart to the priesthood by the divine command, wherein they were named one by one. Ex. xxviii. 1. To this purpose Paul says, “No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that was called of God as was Aaron.” Heb. v. 4. The tribe of Levi, as we have seen, was also appointed to the service of the tabernacle by the Almighty.

2. **THIS VOCATION WAS SOVEREIGN.**—No reason is given why God chose Aaron to be high priest rather than any other Israelite. Even when Korah and his company contested Aaron's right to the office, God did not condescend to give reasons for the choice which he had made. Aaron was no doubt eminently a man of God. But the narrative is careful to show that Aaron was by no means free from sin. Even after he was called to his holy office (Ex. xxviii. 1), he encouraged the people in the worship of the golden calf. Ex. xxxii. Not long afterward he joined Miriam in murmuring against the divine appointment by which Moses, being assigned to the prophetic office, was preferred before them. For this sin Miriam was smitten with leprosy. Aaron escaped that punishment only because the leprosy would have disqualified him for the priestly office. Num. xii. And, finally, thirty-eight years afterward, he became a partaker in the sin of Moses, and was sentenced to die in the wilderness. Num. xx. It is certain that Aaron was chosen to the holy priesthood out of God's good pleasure, "without any foresight of faith and good works, or perseverance in either of them, as conditions or causes moving him thereto." The same is to be said with much emphasis of the choice which God made of two of Aaron's sons, Nadab and Abihu. After their consecration they offered strange fire before the Lord, and were devoured by fire going out from the Lord. Lev. x. 1-3. They were not chosen for their piety.

3. **VINDICATION OF AARON'S VOCATION.**—Within one or two years after Aaron's call and consecration, Korah, who was a Levite, with Dathan and Abiram of the tribe of Reuben, instigated a revolt in the camp against the leadership of Moses and the priesthood in the hands of Aaron. Two hundred and fifty princes, men famous in the congregation and of great renown, entered into the conspiracy. Its object was to oust both Moses and Aaron



The High Priest.



The Breastplate.

from their offices. The conspirators were put to the test before the Lord. Korah and his company were destroyed, and the two hundred and fifty princes who presumed to offer incense were consumed by fire from the Lord. Num. xvi. 35. The censers which the insurgents used were, by God's command, made into broad plates for a covering for the altar, to be a memorial unto the children of Israel that "no stranger which is not of the seed of Aaron come near to offer incense before the Lord." Num. xvi. 40.

AARON'S VOCATION AUTHENTICATED.—The chiefs of Israel, one out of each tribe, were directed by Jehovah to take, each of them, a rod, and write his name upon it. Aaron did the same. The twelve rods were laid up in the tabernacle. On the morrow it was found that the rod of Aaron had blossomed and yielded almonds. This rod was laid up in the most holy place as a memorial that Aaron, to whom that rod belonged, and his sons were the only true and lawful priests. It was, in some sense, a commission, deposited in the ark of the covenant, authenticating the divine and exclusive priesthood of Aaron and his sons. Num. xvii.

THE OFFICE, HOW PERPETUATED.—The priesthood was conferred upon Aaron and his sons, descending from him through the ages. We must recognize here an extraordinary providential intervention in the usual course of nature. It is rare that any family is perpetuated in the male line beyond six or eight generations. But God made himself responsible for the continuance of heirs male to Aaron through about forty-five generations down to the coming of Christ. Through this entire period of fifteen hundred years there was no failure in the succession. For the line of descent, see 1 Chron. vi. 3-14 and Neh. xii. 10, *sq.*

DRESS OF THE HIGH PRIEST.

See Ex. xxviii., and illustrations.

CEREMONIAL HOLINESS.

The most important qualification of the priesthood was the ceremonial purity. God laid upon the conscience of the priest the command to be pure in heart; yet one might be a lawful priest, though a wicked man. No standard of mental training was proposed, for the reason that the functions of his office required in him little more than the decent and orderly performance of outward ceremonies. He taught the people mainly by the dumb-show of the ritual, using not oral but pictorial instruction. But he must be ceremonially clean, scrupulously so—

1. In his dress. On the forefront of his mitre was written, Holiness unto the Lord. Ex. xxviii. 36.

2. In his consecration. Aaron and his sons were washed with water at the door of the tabernacle. Ex. xxix. 4. A solemn atonement was made for them. Ex. xxix. 10, 15, 19.

3. He must be free from bodily defects. If he was deformed, he might be supported from the treasury of the sanctuary, but might not officiate as priest. Lev. xxi. 17-23.

4. Cleanliness. See Lev. xxii. 1-9. The law touching leprosy in Lev. xxii. 4 explains the fact that Aaron was not smitten with leprosy as well as Miriam. Num. xii. 9. The priest might not touch a dead body, nor enter a house where the dead lay, even if the dead were his father or mother. Lev. xxi. 11. Nor might he give any sign of mourning, for that was unclean ceremonially. Lev. xxi. 10-12. For this among other reasons, at the death of Nadab and Abihu, God commanded Aaron and his surviving sons not to exhibit any signs of grief, or even to leave the tabernacle.

FUNCTIONS OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

1. The priest taken from among men was ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he might offer gifts and sacrifices for sin. Heb. v. 1.

2. He stood as the representative of a wide constituency. (1.) Israel was appointed by God to be "a kingdom of priests, a holy nation." Ex. xix. 6. That was the point of Korah's plea against the exclusive prerogative claimed by Aaron: "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are *holy*, every one of them." Num. xvi. 3. See also Isaiah lxi. 6. (2.) The tribe of Levi represented the whole kingdom of priests—*i. e.*, all Israel; the family of Aaron represented the tribe of Levi; and Aaron represented his family in the office of high priest. Aaron, who stood at the head of the whole hierarchy, represented his family before the Lord's altar; and through his family his tribe; and through his tribe all Israel; and through them the whole body of God's elect. This circumstance gives us a deep insight into the typical relation between the Aaronic priesthood and that of Christ, to wit: Christ's representative relation to his people.

3. Aaron's representative position is indicated—(1.) In his official dress. On his shoulders were twelve onyx stones, bearing the names of the twelve tribes. His breastplate contained twelve jewels on which the same names were graven. Ex. xxviii. 9, 15. (2.) His special duty was to offer sacrifices not only for his own sins but for the sins of the people. Lev. xvi.; Heb. ix. 7. (3.) He was the sole offerer of sacrifices. If any other man, even any other Levite, should come nigh the altar, he was put to death. Num. iii. 10; xvi. 40; xviii. 3. (4.) He was the mediator between God and the people, representing both. By the words "Holiness to the Lord," engraved on his mitre, he appeared for God; by the names of the twelve tribes in the onyx stones and in the breastplate, he appeared for the people.

4. He was the bearer of the holy oracles. The Urim and Thummim were in the breastplate, and by the use of these, when he stood before the inner veil of the tabernacle,

he asked counsel of God and received the answer spoken out of the holy of holies. Num. xxvii. 21.

SYMBOLICAL MEANING OF THE SACERDOTAL OFFICE.

1. Man needs a divinely appointed mediator between himself and God. No other could come before God and live.

2. The mediator must be a representative of both God and man.

3. He must come before God with the blood of an atoning sacrifice.

TYPICAL LESSON.

See on this vital doctrine the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is an inspired and luminous commentary on the book of Leviticus. Some of the points are—

1. The divine vocation of Christ. Compare Ex. xxviii. 1 with Heb. v. 4.

2. Personal holiness. The holiness of the Levitical priest was ceremonial, a type only of the essential holiness of Christ.

3. His representative position. Christ has entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Heb. ix. 24.

4. Christ is our mediator. Compare Lev. xvi. 15 with Heb. ix. 15 and 1 Tim. ii. 5.

5. He made a true atonement for sin. Compare Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35, with Heb. ix. 11, 12.

6. He is our intercessor. Compare Lev. xvi. 15 with Heb. ix. 24; vii. 25.

CHRIST AS PRIEST SUPERIOR TO AARON.

(1.) Christ made priest with an oath. (2.) Holy, harmless, undefiled. (3.) A royal priest—priest and king after the order of Melchizedek. (4.) Offering a sacrifice once for all. (5.) Holding an unchangeable and eternal priest-

hood. (6.) Christ a priest, not under but above the Mosaic law; not after the order of Levi, but an order greater than that of Melchizedek himself. Heb. vii. and viii.

LESSON III.

SACRED RITES.

THE ritual was the central part of the ceremonial institutes. The sanctuary and its utensils were adapted to worship by sacrifice only. The priesthood was appointed to offer sacrifices. The sacred times were set apart for these solemnities.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SACRED RITES.

1. Into offerings and purifications. These two classes correspond to the furniture of the fore court, the altar being symbolical of atonement, and the laver of regeneration. The offerings also refer to the guilt (*culpa*), and the purification to the stain (*macula*), of sin.

2. The offerings were—(1.) Animal, or bloody and expiatory; (2.) Vegetable, or bloodless and thankful. They rested on the truth that the worship of sinners must contain the two elements of expiation for sin and gratitude for the blessings of God. The first element was represented by the bloody, the last by the unbloody, oblation.

3. The animal oblations were—(1.) The whole burnt-offering, Hebrew *Olah*, wherein the whole body of the victim was slowly burned on the altar. (2.) The burnt-offering, in which only a part of the victim—*e. g.*, the fat—was burned. See Ps. li. 19.

4. Burnt-offerings were—(1.) Sin; (2.) Trespass; (3.) Peace-offerings. In all these a portion of the victim was burned; the fat only, or a part of the flesh with the fat.

5. Peace-offerings were bloody and were for—(1.) Vows; (2.) Thanksgiving; (3.) Free-will.
6. Vegetable offerings were—(1.) Meat; (2.) Drink; (3.) First fruits; (4.) Fruits dedicated in vows.

SECTION I.

OFFERINGS.

CHARACTERISTICS OF ANIMAL OFFERING.

1. The animals were invariably such as were used for food; the ox-kind, the sheep, the goat, and in condescension to the poor the turtle dove and pigeon. The reasons why animals used for food were chosen are—(1.) They represented the wealth of the people, and the lesson was that man's possessions all belonged to God. (2.) This rule brought religious worship and daily family life close together. (3.) Eating the flesh of the victim was a part of certain ceremonies at the altar.

2. The place of the sacrifice was always at the sanctuary. The one sole altar and the one single high priesthood intimated not obscurely the unity of God; the unity of the race as created, fallen and redeemed; the unity of the Church, and the oneness of the mediator. The law was imperative. See Deut. xii. 13; compare Josh. xxii. 9-34.

3. The minister of the sacrifice was the priest alone. Num. iii. 10; xvi. 40; xviii. 3-7. Compare the crime and punishment of Korah and his company in Num. xvi.

THE WHOLE BURNT-OFFERING.

1. It was so called because the whole body of the victim (the skin only excepted, which was the priest's perquisite, Lev. vii. 8) was burned. Lev. i. 6-9. It was also styled *Olah*, ascension, because it went up to God in the smoke thereof. In the Greek text of Heb. x. 8 it is called *holocaust*—*i. e.*, burnt whole.

2. This was the most ancient form of sacrifice. It was

offered by Noah eight hundred years before the giving of the law. When introduced into the Hebrew ritual, the people well knew that it was no new act of worship, that it taught no new theology. It was one of their oldest and most sacred traditions.

3. The basis of the entire ritual was laid in this oblation. The burning entered as an integral element into all the forms of the bloody offerings; into the sin-, the trespass- and the peace-offerings. Blood and fire were invariably seen in every one of the expiatory rites.

4. It was renewed twice daily from day to day, and was therefore a "continual burnt-offering." The fire never went out, the smoke never ceased to ascend day or night. Ex. xxix. 42; Num. xxviii. 3-6.

5. This was the general comprehensive offering for sin as sin and for the sin of the race as a whole. Offerings for particular sins, whether of individuals or of all Israel, took the specific form of the sin- or the trespass- or the peace-offering. The olah was in the nature of a general act of worship and expiation for sin, without special reference to the guilt of the individual, or even of the Hebrews as the chosen people. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the *sin of the world.*"

THE SIN-OFFERING.

See Leviticus iv. to v. 14.

1. Like the *olah*, it was expiatory. Blood was shed and sprinkled on the furniture of the sanctuary, and was poured in floods over the altar of burnt-offering in the fore-court.

2. Unlike the *olah*, it was expiatory of particular sins and the sins of individuals.

3. Unlike the *olah*, the fat only was burnt, and the kidneys, because these organs were imbedded in large deposits of fat. The flesh was otherwise disposed of. Lev. iv. 8, 10-15.

4. The greater sin-offering was presented—(1.) For the high priest when he was guilty of crime (Lev. iv. 3–12); (2.) For a sin of the whole people (Lev. iv. 13–21); (3.) On the great day of atonement. Lev. xvi. 26.

5. The lesser sin-offering was presented—(1.) By the ruler (Lev. iv. 22–26); (2.) By the private person (vs. 27–35); and (3.) In various purifications. xii. 6; xiv. 19.

THE TRESPASS-OFFERING.

The full distinction between the sin- and the trespass-offering has not, perhaps, been ascertained. But the following are points in which they differ: 1. The trespass-offering was never presented for the guilt of the whole people. That was a peculiarity of the sin-offering.

2. The trespass-offering was presented when the idea of restitution for injuries done was introduced into the service. Lev. vi. 1–7. This offering belonged, in a special sense, to trespasses against human rights. Lev. vi. 1–6; vii. 1–7; Num. v. 6–8.

3. It was an inferior form of the sin-offering. This appears—(1) from the occasion on which it was offered; and (2) the blood was not taken into the sanctuary, nor put on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering; but was simply sprinkled round about on the altar. Lev. v. 9; vii. 2.

4. Christ is said, in 2 Cor. v. 21, to be made a sin-offering for us; but nowhere is he called a trespass-offering, for the reason that the notion of our making restitution for our sins as against God is excluded.

PEACE-OFFERING.

See Lev. vii. 11–21. (1.) It was generally presented by way of thanksgiving for mercies received. 2 Sam. xv. 8; Ps. lxxvi. 13–15. See also Jephthah's vow in Judges xi. 30, 31.

2. Expiation for sin was an essential element in the

ceremony, showing that thanksgiving to God could not be separated from confession for sin. This was one of the fatal defects in Cain's offering.

3. The *votive* and *freewill*- and *thank-offerings* were the three forms of the peace-offering. The *wave*- and *heave*-offering took their name from the ceremony of waving or heaving a portion of the victim, say the shoulder, toward the altar in the holy of holies. Hence the "wave breast" or "heave shoulder." Lev. vii. 32-34.

BLOODLESS OFFERINGS.

1. These were also called the meat- and drink-offerings. Lev. ii.

2. The matter was corn, oil, wine, the first-fruits, etc. They were, like the bloody offerings, chosen from the wealth of the people, and were articles of food, for the same reasons.

3. These were solely thank-offerings. But the idea of expiation by fire and blood was never absent from even the thank-offering. Without the shedding of blood there could be no acceptable service of thanks.

SACRIFICIAL RITES.

1. The rites performed by those who presented the victims were—(1.) The act of the individual (Lev. i. 3), or of the elders for the congregation (iv. 14), bringing the victim to the door of the sanctuary. Rom. xii. 1. (2.) The imposition of hands upon the head of the victim, denoting substitution, the imputation of sin, and devoting the victim to God. These are the great outstanding elements of the ceremony. They go deeply into the very efficacy of the ritual and into the doctrine of salvation by Christ. Lev. xvi. 21, 22; Num. viii. 9-11; Lev. xxiv. 14. (3.) The slaying of the victim. This was at first done by the worshiper. Lev. i. 5. Afterward this was done by the Levites, because they were more expert.

2. It was the office of the priest to dispose of the blood. He poured the blood upon the brazen altar or at its foot. Lev. i. 5. Or he sprinkled the blood on the altar of incense or the mercy-seat. Lev. iv. 4-7, 17, 18; xvi. 14. Hence the term, "blood of sprinkling." The priest also burned the flesh or the fat with the use of salt, etc. Lev. i. 7, 8; ii. 13.

THE BLOOD.

The capital controlling idea of the offering stood in the use made of the blood. (1.) With the blood began the office of the priest. (2.) God declared that the life of the flesh was the blood, and the "blood maketh an atonement for the soul." Lev. xvii. 11. (3.) A perpetual statute forbade the eating of blood or fat, the first being poured on the altar and the last being offered by fire. Lev. iii. 17; vii. 22-27. Here the lesson was indicated that by the shedding of blood was the remission of sins.

THE OFFERINGS OF THE POOR.

If one was too poor to bring a lamb, he might present two turtle doves and two pigeons. Or in case of extreme poverty he might bring a little flour, without even frankincense or salt; that, said God, shall be a "sin-offering," an atonement for him that hath sinned. Lev. v. 7-11. This is remarkable not only because it shows God's compassion for the poor, but because it is an allowed departure, in behalf of the poor, from the law of sacrifice. This explains the offering of Mary, the mother of our Lord. Luke ii. 24.

SECTION II.

RITUAL OF PURIFICATIONS.

EXPLANATION.

1. THE OCCASION OF CEREMONIAL UNCLEANNESS.—(1.) Women in child-bed. Lev. xii. (2.) Issue from the flesh xv. (3.) Leprosy. xiii. (4.) Contact with dead bodies.

2. RESTRAINTS LAID ON THE UNCLEAN.—They were shut out of the sanctuary on penalty of death. Lev. xiv. 1-7; xv. 3; Num. xix. 13. In leprosy they dwelt in a separate house.

3. PROCESS OF CLEANSING.—(1.) Washing in water. Lev. xiv. 8; xv. 13. (2.) Cleansing by the use of ashes. See the ordinance of the red heifer in Num. xix.; compare Heb. ix. 13. (3.) Hyssop and cedar were used to sweeten the unclean. Num. xix. 6; Lev. xiv. 4. (4.) A sacrifice, usually by the sin-offering. Lev. xiv. 10-32. This fact is most important, showing that purification had direct reference to sin.

SIGNIFICANCE OF PURIFICATION.

The skeptical writers teach that they were simply *sanitary* regulations founded solely in—(1) a regard for personal cleanliness; (2) in a purpose to prevent the spread of disease; (3) and in a natural repugnance to certain habits of the body.

These explanations are insufficient. (1.) The occasions of uncleanness are too few for mere sanitary purposes. There are many things more defiling to the body than touching a dead body or entering a tent where the dead are laid out. (2.) The sacrifice of one lamb for a burnt- and another for a sin-offering, or of a turtle dove and pigeon, can have no relevancy to sanitary precautions, or to mere cleanliness and natural aversion to filth.

This part of the ritual was intended to set out the stain (*macula*) of sin, just as the ritual of offering corresponded to guilt (*culpa*). The occasions show this. *Child-birth* was ceremonially unclean to point out the fact of birth-sin. Ps. li. 5. *Leprosy* was a lively image of the loathsomeness of sin. *Death* is the wages of sin. The *stain* of sin being thus indicated, *purification* from sin was symbolized by the sin-offering, by the washings and the cleansings and the sweetening by hyssop and cedar. The use of the ashes of a red

heifer shows that these were not sanitary but religious ordinances.

SYMBOLICAL MEANING OF THE RITUAL AS A WHOLE.

1. The imputation of sin, and its transfer from the offender to the victim. Lev. iv. 3, 15, 24.

2. Atonement by the shedding of blood. Lev. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 22.

3. The work of salvation is twofold. It is an atonement and a purification. These two distinct yet related truths were plainly taught by the two distinct yet related systems of offering and purification, both making one undivided ritual. Atonement for sin by the shedding of blood, purification from sin by washings and cleansings, were the outstanding and inseparable ideas of the system.

TYPICAL MEANING.

1. The lamb was typical of Christ. John i. 29.

2. The death of Christ atoning for sin and the work of the Spirit purging away sin. See Epistle to the Hebrews.

3. The ritual as a whole was typical of the gospel as a whole; it was a shadow of good things to come. Heb. ix.

LESSON IV.

SACRED TIMES.

1. DISTRIBUTION —I. The Sabbath. II. The feast of trumpets. III. Three great feasts of convocation. IV. Great day of atonement.

2. THE BASIS OF THE CALENDAR was the Sabbath, after the manner in which the altar was the basis of the tabernacle, the patriarchal priest the basis of the priesthood, and the *olah* that of the ritual.

3. Out of the Sabbath were evolved the three other seasons which followed the rule of sevens, thus—(1.) *The feast of trumpets*. (2.) *The Sabbatical year* was the seventh year, during which the soil rested from tillage, and its spontaneous products were given to the poor. Ex. xxiii. 10, 11; Lev. xxv. 1–7; Deut. xv. 1, 2. (3.) *The year of jubilee* was the Sabbath of the sabbatical years—the forty-ninth year, 7×7 . Servants were liberated, and property sold was returned to its former owner. Lev. xxv.

HISTORICAL RELATIONS OF THE SABBATH.

1. TO THE HUMAN RACE.—It was given to man at the creation for a day of rest. Gen. ii. 2; Mark ii. 27.

2. TO THE JEWS.—It was made a sign of the covenant between God and Israel. Ex. xxxi. 13. The violation of it was a capital crime. Ex. xxxi. 14; xxxv. 2, 3. This law grew out of the constitution of the Hebrew state as a theocracy, and out of God's peculiar position in the government as its supreme temporal King and Ruler. Sabbath-breaking was *leze-majesty*—a crime against the sovereign power in the land. The worship of the Sabbath is prescribed in Num. xxviii. 9. The show-bread was renewed on this day. Lev. xxiv. 5, 9; compare Matt. xii. 5.

THE FEAST OF TRUMPETS.

1. On the first day of the new moon the beginning of the month was announced to the people by the blowing of silver trumpets and the offering of a burnt-offering. Num. x. 10; xxviii. 11.

2. The ecclesiastical year began with the first new moon after the vernal equinox, generally in April. The civil year began six months later, in *October*, and was introduced by the feast of trumpets. Special sacrifices were offered on this new year's anniversary. Lev. xxiii. 25; Num. xxix. 1–6. The effect of this was a double date in

the Jewish reckoning, analogous to the usage in certain public documents issued in the United States, wherein two dates appear, January 1 and July 4. For scriptural expositions of the feast, see Ps. lxxxii. 3; Isa. i. 13, 14; Col. ii. 16.

FEASTS OF CONVOCATION.

1. These were the passover, pentecost and the feast of tabernacles. In Deut. xvi. 16 they are denominated the feasts of unleavened bread, of weeks and of tabernacles.

2. They are commonly called feasts of convocation because all the males of Israel were required on these occasions to assemble at the door of the sanctuary while they were in the wilderness, and ever after, through the ages, while they dwelt in the land of Canaan. Ex. xxiii. 17. Among the advantages of this remarkable ordinance were: (1.) It gave opportunity for the religious instruction of the whole people. (2.) It strengthened the bonds of national unity, counteracting some of the divisive tendencies of tribal separation and jealousy. (3.) It brought to the minds of the people the truths and promises of which these feasts were symbolical.

3. The passover took place at the opening of the ecclesiastical year; the feast of the tabernacles occurred at the beginning of the civil year. The pentecost divided the interval unequally. The three feasts all fell into the six months from April to October.

4. Each of these feasts had a threefold association with the usages of the people. One was historical, commemorating an event in the history of the people. A second was national, marking the season of the year. The third was religious, connected with spiritual blessings enjoyed or expected.

PASSOVER.

1. It commemorated the departure from Egypt. Ex. xii. 1-28.

2. It marked the beginning of the early harvest. Lev. xxiii. 10-14. "Green ears" in April.

3. The lamb slain was a type of Christ: "Christ our passover." 1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

PENTECOST.

This feast was held seven weeks after the passover; hence called feast of weeks. Lev. xxiii. 15, 16.

1. Jewish traditions suggest that it commemorated the giving of the law from Sinai, fifty days after the Exodus.

2. It marked the latter harvest; hence called the "feast of harvest" in Ex. xxiii. 16. Compare Num. xxviii. 26; Lev. xxiii. 17.

3. It prefigured perhaps the descent of the Holy Spirit, "when the day of pentecost was fully come." Acts ii. 1.

FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

It was so called because during the feast the people dwelt in booths or tents. Lev. xxiii. 40.

1. Historically it was associated with the journey in the wilderness.

2. It marked the beginning of the vintage and ingathering of the fruits. Ex. xxiii. 16.

3. The state of the Church in the everlasting rest was represented by this feast. Compare Lev. xxiii. 40 with Rev. vii. 9.

THE GREAT DAY OF ATONEMENT.

This was by far the most solemn and imposing of all the ceremonial observances. It is described at length in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus. The references below are to that chapter, unless otherwise indicated.

1. It was a day of fasting and sorrow and humiliation for sin. Lev. xxiii. 27-29; xvi. 29-31.

2. The day occurred very near the close of the civil year

in October. Lev. xvi. 29. The sins of the people had been typically atoned for by the daily sacrifice and the continual burnt-offering. But now the sins of the whole year were recapitulated, and a broad atonement was made for the accumulated mass of transgressions.

3. The atonement was most thorough. The high priest made an atonement for himself and his family; for the people; for the holy place; for the most holy place; for the altar of sacrifice itself. vs. 6-20. See the summing up in v. 33. It was a most vivid picture of the moral pollution of man. The high priest was held to be himself a sinner; he was held to be polluted by the sins of the people as their representative. The altar of their daily worship, all the sacred furniture of the sanctuary, the holy place, the most holy place, and even the mercy-seat, were treated as things polluted, and now to be purified by the shedding and sprinkling of blood. Like a subtle infection, sin had poisoned all, even the most holy, and was required to be removed on the great day of national fasting and humiliation.

4. The services of the day summed up and recapitulated the entire ritual. (1.) All the animals used in daily sacrifices were now slain. vs. 3-5. (2.) The three great forms of sacrifice were used, the olah (v. 24); the sin-offering (v. 25); and the burning without the camp. v. 27. (3.) All parts of the sanctuary and all its furniture were brought into use: the fore-court (v. 24); the holy place (v. 20); and the holy of holies. v. 14. The whole ritual system was reproduced. It was all there. The sanctuary in all its apartments was entered. The priesthood was there in its highest representative. The ritual was there in the blood of bullock, ram and goat—this blood sprinkled everywhere; the burnt-offering on the altar, the sin-offering, the burning without the camp were seen there. The day itself was a Sabbath of rest and affliction. Lev. xxiii. 32. The ceremonies made up an atonement for sin, for all sin—of all the people, an

atonement for the altar and the sanctuary and the mercy-seat, unclean by the transgression of Israel.

5. Ceremonies peculiar to this day. (1.) One of these was the entrance into the most holy place by the high priest. On this one day in the year only might the high priest go behind the veil. He went in during the day once with incense and with blood for his own sins, and once with blood for the sins of the people. Lev. xvi.; Heb. ix. 7, 25.

(2.) Another was the ceremony of the slain and the scape-goats. Lev. xvi. 7-10; xvi. 21-26. The symbolical meaning of this rite is plain. The atonement for sin includes two ideas, substitution for sin and its removal from the offender. Substitution was set forth by the goat slain at the door of the tabernacle. Its removal was represented by the acts of the high priest confessing over the other goat the iniquities of the people, putting them on its head, and sending him into the wilderness to return no more. Substitution for the sinner and the removal of his sin made up expiation. The slain goat was a symbol of the sin-sacrifice; the scapegoat of the sin-bearer. This plain explanation of the rite shows how useless are the puzzles which have been invented whereby the subject is confused. These are some of the unreasonable suggestions that have been offered—that the two goats represented the human and the divine nature of Christ; or his humiliation and exaltation; or his personal sufferings and the contempt of men; or Christ and Barabbas.

(3.) The burning of the victim without the camp. Heb. xiii. 11.

TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CALENDAR.

See Epistle to the Hebrews.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

I. THE EFFICACY OF THE MOSAIC RITUAL.

(1.) These atonements did not purchase the pardon of sin. Heb. x. 4. The place to this effect in Isa. xl. 16 is

thus paraphrased by Umbreit: "Lebanon the altar; nature the temple; its lordly woods the pile; and its countless beasts the sacrifice;" but all could not put away sin.

(2.) The Levitical purification did not purify the soul, but the flesh only. Heb. ix. 13, 14.

(3.) These ordinances restored the offenders and the unclean to church privileges.

(4.) They expiated certain civil offences. Lev. iv. 2, *seq.* But high crime could not be expiated even by these bloody rites.

(5.) Sin as against God was only *typically* atoned for by these rites. They pointed forward to a true atonement by the blood of Christ and a vital regeneration by the work of the Holy Ghost. The analogy is found in the Christian sacraments. They do not save by any virtue in them—they are the signs and seals of what does save; viz.: the work of Christ and of the Spirit. The efficacy of the ritual may be stated thus: *Ceremonial sin actually, moral sin typically, atoned for.*

II. ALLOWED DEPARTURES FROM THE CEREMONIAL INSTITUTES.

1. For the strict law of the sanctuary, see Lev. xvii. 8–9; Deut. xii. 1–11. For allowed departures, see 1 Sam. xvi. 5; 1 Kings xviii. 33; 2 Sam. xxiv. 25.

2. For the law of the priesthood, see Num. xvi. 40; 2 Chron. xxvi. 19. For the allowed departures, see offerings made by David, Elijah, Samuel, Saul, and notably by Solomon in 2 Chron. i. 6. None of these men were Levitical priests.

3. For the law of the ritual, compare the law requiring blood with the offering of the poor, a little "fine flour" in Lev. v. 11.

4. For the law of the calendar, compare the regular time of the passover with the appointment out of time by Heze-

kiah in 2 Chron. xxx. 18. On the subject generally, see Lev. xxiv. 8; 1 Sam. xxi. 6; Num. ix. 6; Matt. xii. 10, *seq.*; John xviii. 28.

These departures from the provisions of the law show— (1.) That the law ascribes to its rites no inherent power to save. Salvation was not tied to any of them. (2.) The rites were typical. Their significance as such was not marred by occasional departures from any one or all of them. (3.) The law contained within itself signs of its incomplete and provisional character. The law made nothing perfect. Heb. vii. 19. (4.) Its chief value was in its relation to the blood of Christ, to which salvation is tied—a salvation which is complete and final, and from the methods of which there is neither departure nor exception.

BIBLE HISTORY.

GEOGRAPHY OF THE BIBLE.

ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE BIBLE.

BY THE

REV. WM. HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.

BIBLE HISTORY.

LESSON I.

FROM THE CREATION TO THE EXODUS.

BIBLE history divides itself into two principal parts, viz. : the history of the Old Testament, embracing that which precedes and is preparatory to the coming of Christ, and the history of the New Testament, which records that coming itself, and that which results from it and follows after it.

The history of the preparation for Christ's coming begins with the expulsion of our first parents from Eden and the promise then given (Gen. iii. 15) that the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent. What precedes is preliminary, and was needed to explain the scene in which, and the circumstances under which, this progressive victory or this process of redemption and recovery was to be accomplished. The narrative of the creation of the world (Gen. i. 1–ii. 3) provides the scene; man's being placed in paradise (ii. 4–25) and his fall (ch. iii.) supply the circumstances. The original promise advances to its accomplishment, first, from Adam to Abraham under a general covenant embracing all mankind (Gen. i.–xi.), and, secondly, from Abraham to Christ under a special covenant temporarily restricted to a single family or nation for the ultimate benefit of all the families of the earth. Gen. xii. 1–3. The history before Abraham is divided into the antediluvian period (Gen. i.–viii.), before the destruction of the world by the Deluge; and the postdiluvian period, from that time onward to the call of

Abraham. Gen. ix.—xi. The history after Abraham is divided into the patriarchal or pre-mosaic period, preceding the exodus of Israel out of Egypt, during which the chosen seed expanded from a family to a nation (Gen. xii.—l.), and the history subsequent to the exodus or the history of Israel as the people of God. The history of the chosen people is again divisible into three principal periods, viz.: First, from the exodus to the death of David, or from the organization of Israel as the people of God to the complete establishment of the kingdom. Second, from the death of David to the Babylonish exile, which continues the history of the kingdom until its downfall. Third, from the Babylonish exile to the advent of Christ, during which Israel was subject to foreign domination.

During the three periods from Adam to Moses, God's revelation was given to man only in an oral form, and each period was distinguished by a divine covenant peculiar to itself and by a specific promise of its own of increasing definiteness. To the antediluvian period belong God's covenant with Adam and the promise respecting the seed of the woman; to the postdiluvian period belong God's covenant with Noah and the promise to Shem; to the patriarchal period belong God's covenant with Abraham and its promises, which were successively renewed with Isaac and with Jacob, and the signal promise to Judah. Gen. xlix. 8, ff.

During the three periods from Moses to Christ, God's revelation was given not only in an oral, but also in a written, form. At the beginning of the first period the five books of Moses, commonly called the Pentateuch, were written. The rest of the history of this period, from the death of Moses to the death of David, is contained in what might be called a second Pentateuch, or the five books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1st and 2d Samuel. To the close of the first and the beginning of the second period—that is to say, to the reigns of David and Solomon—belongs the greater

part of what may be called the third Pentateuch, or the five books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon. The book of Lamentations, though poetical, belongs to a later time, and may be regarded as a supplement or appendix to the prophecies of Jeremiah. The remainder of the inspired history of the former dispensation, extending from the death of David to the end of the Old Testament, is recorded in what may be called a fourth Pentateuch, viz. : 1st and 2d Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther; the two books of Chronicles, which cover the same period as Samuel and Kings, being supernumerary and not counted in the estimate here made. The further history, to the time of Christ, is contained in uninspired though authentic writings. Near the close of the second period after Moses, and in the earlier portion of the third—that is to say, as the kingdoms were approaching their downfall as well as in and after the Babylonish exile—we find what may be called a fifth Pentateuch, completing the inspired writings of the Old Testament, viz. : the four books of the major prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, together with the collection of the minor prophets, which, on account of the smallness of the individual books, may be reckoned one, as was usual, in fact, in all the early catalogues or lists of books of Scripture.

The history of the New Testament may be divided into two principal portions or periods, in which we find a like repetition as before of the two successive methods of divine revelation. First, the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, during which the word of God was made known orally and by his own manifestation of himself in the person of his only-begotten Son. Secondly, the history of the apostles and of the Church which they founded, from the time of our Lord's ascension, when divine revelation was continued by means of inspired writings. The New Testament completes itself in what may be called two Pentateuchs; the first

group covers the history and embraces the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles; the second group includes the didactic or prophetic writings of five apostles, viz.: Paul, James, Peter, John and Jude.

FROM THE CREATION TO THE FLOOD.

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth in six days. The work of the first day was light; of the second, the firmament; of the third, the dry land with its products; of the fourth, the sun, moon and stars; of the fifth, fishes and birds; of the sixth, land animals and man, who was created in the image of God. All was made very good; and on the seventh day God rested from his work and instituted the Sabbath in commemoration of this fact.

Man was placed in the garden of Eden and forbidden to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil upon pain of death. The woman, formed to be his helper, was deceived by the serpent and ate of the forbidden fruit; she gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. They were in consequence sentenced to return to the ground from which they were taken, and were driven forth from the garden lest they should eat of the tree of life and live for ever. And a curse was pronounced upon the tempter which involved a promise to the fallen race of man: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. iii. 15. This predicted struggle began in the family of Adam when Cain, his first-born, "who was of that wicked one" (John iii. 12), slew his brother Abel, because Abel's offering of the firstlings of his flock was accepted and Cain's offering of the first fruits of the ground was not. It came to its climax when Christ, the seed of the woman, by way of eminence, conquered Satan by his death. It shall be ended when Satan shall have been bruised under the feet of all of Christ's people. Rom. xvi. 20.

Cain was driven forth from the presence of the Lord a fugitive for his crime. Among his descendants we find criminal excesses and worldly culture—the first city, representative of secular power (Gen. iv. 17), the polygamy of Lamech (ver. 19), and his bloodthirsty threats of vengeance (vs. 23, 24), tents and cattle, musical instruments and working brass and iron. vs. 20–22. Seth, who was appointed instead of Abel, was the head of a pious race. In the days of his son Enos men began to call upon the name of the Lord. Enoch, the seventh from Adam, walked with God, and was not, for God took him. Lamech piously looked for a blessing in his son Noah. v. 29. Noah, the tenth from Adam, was a just man, perfect in his generations, and he walked with God. vi. 9.

But the sons of God, or the pious race, intermarried with the daughters of men, the ungodly descendants of Cain; and wickedness so increased that God at length, in the 600th year of Noah, and according to the common computation 1656 years after the creation of man, destroyed the world by a flood. Only Noah and his family were saved in an ark which he had been directed to build, and into which he took some of all kinds of beasts and fowl and creeping things. The waters prevailed for five months, at the end of which time the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat. At the end of one year and ten days the waters had disappeared and the ground was dried.

FROM THE FLOOD TO THE CALL OF ABRAHAM.

After this violent interruption the history again proceeds with Noah, the second head of the human race, in whose line a fresh experiment is instituted, with many points of resemblance to the preceding. As there had been a covenant with Adam, so there is one with Noah pledging that all flesh should never again be destroyed by a flood. ix. 11. The blessing is renewed, Be fruitful and multiply, and re

plenish the earth, and dominion is again granted over the creatures. ix. 12. Mention is made as before of the offering of sacrifice; and that of Noah as he came out of the ark is accepted, as Abel's had been. viii. 20. The prohibition of murder plainly looks back to the crime of Cain. ix. 6. Noah transgressed also (ix. 21), as Adam had done, and his son Ham is guilty of an offence which severs him from the promise and leads to a fresh limitation of it to the line of Shem, whose God the Lord would be and in whose tents he would dwell. ix. 26, 27. The progress of mankind in this period, as in the preceding, was once more away from God. As that had ended with the segregation of Noah and his three sons, so this with the call of Abraham, one of Terah's three sons and the tenth in descent from Shem, to found a new race which might be guarded from surrounding contamination, and amongst whom the way might be prepared for the advent of the great Redeemer. The rest of mankind were not in this instance destroyed, as by the flood, but temporarily passed by, with a view, however, to their future reception into the kingdom of God. Hence the origin of the various nations of the world is here recorded (ch. x.) as springing from the three sons of Noah, Shem, Ham and Japheth, of whom the whole earth was overspread. ix. 19. This was done with a double design: first, that of gradually eliminating the divergent branches, in order afterward to pursue uninterruptedly the line of the promise (xi. 10-26); and, secondly, that of declaring their affiliation with the chosen seed, to whom by no right of their own, but by God's special favor, the covenant of his grace was temporarily, and yet only temporarily, restricted. Mention is also made of the rise of the great empires of Babylon and Assyria (x. 10, 11), which, aspiring to universal dominion, were doomed to fall with all their successors before that empire which alone shall ever be truly universal. Dan. ii. 44. The confusion of tongues at Babel in the

days of Peleg (x. 25), the fifth from Shem (xi. 16), is a part of the process of dispersion and separation which belongs to the temporary rejection of the Gentiles. The removal of this restriction was symbolized at the beginning of the new dispensation by the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost, when men from many lands were brought together to hear the gospel and the variety of their languages offered no obstruction.

This period, according to the common computation, covers 292 years.

FROM THE CALL OF ABRAHAM TO THE EXODUS.

Abram, afterward named Abraham (Gen. xvii. 5), chosen to be the progenitor of the peculiar people of God, was severed from the idolatry of his father's house (Josh. xxiv. 2) and his faith subjected to the severest tests. He was bidden to leave his country and his kindred and go into a land that God would show him (Gen. xii. 1), which he did in the seventy-fifth year of his age, accompanied by Sarai, afterward named Sarah, his wife, and Lot, his brother's son. The promise was given him, and several times repeated, of the possession of Canaan, of a numerous seed, and that all nations should be blessed in him. But the land was then occupied by Canaanites; and though Abraham sojourned unmolested and erected altars at various points, as Shechem (xii. 6, 7), Bethel (ver. 8) and Hebron (xiii. 18); and digged wells, as at Beersheba (xxi. 30, 31); and chastised the invaders who had carried off Lot (xiv. 13); and received a blessing, as well as the gift of bread and wine, from Melchizedek, king of Salem and priest of the most high God, whose sacred character he recognized by paying him tithes of his booty (vs. 19, 20); and Lot, who had chosen the valley of Jordan as his own (xiii. 10, 11), abandoned it after the destruction of Sodom (xix. 30); yet he never owned a foot of land (Acts vii. 5) except^t the burying-place which

he purchased from the sons of Heth for himself and Sarah. xxiii. 13, ff.

Though he had the promise of posterity, he was long kept waiting for its accomplishment. He was twice in danger of losing his wife (xii. 11, ff. ; xx. 2, ff.) ; the steward of his house was looked upon as his future heir (xv. 2, 3) ; Ishmael was born to him of Hagar, but this was not the promised seed (xvii. 18, 19) ; at length, after Isaac had been born, in his one hundredth year (xxi. 5), he was directed to offer him up in sacrifice (ch. xxii.), but at the critical moment the Lord interfered, and substituted a ram for Isaac, approved Abraham's faith and spared him further trials.

Rebekah was obtained from the land of his kindred as a wife for Isaac. Her elder son, Esau, was excluded from the line of the covenant and the promise restricted to Jacob, who fled from his brother's displeasure to Padan-aram, where he served Laban twenty years and married his daughters Leah and Rachel, by whom he had twelve sons. After Jacob's return to Canaan his favorite son Joseph was sold into Egypt, and subsequently raised to be chief in authority, next to Pharaoh. This prepared the way for the removal of Jacob, also called Israel (xxxii. 28), with his family, seventy in all (xlvi. 27), into Egypt, 215 years after Abraham had entered Canaan. Here they were located in the fertile district of Goshen, that they might be converted from a nomadic life into one of settled habitation and developed into a numerous people under the shelter of the most famous empire then existing in the world, and in which the science of government, the useful arts and all that pertains to refinement and civilization had been carried to the highest measure of perfection then attained.

As the predicted time of their return out of Egypt drew nigh (xv. 13-16) providential measures were taken to effect it. The multiplication of Israel exciting jealous apprehen-

sions (Ex. i. 10), they were subjected to hard bondage and an ordinance passed that their male children should be put to death as soon as born. In these straits a deliverer was born in the person of Moses, who was hid by his parents for three months and then exposed on the brink of the river, where he was taken charge of by Pharaoh's daughter, who had him trained in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. Acts vii. 22. When forty years old, he was obliged to flee into Midian, and there familiarized with the desert for forty years. God then appeared to him in the burning bush, and sent him, with his brother Aaron, to demand of Pharaoh that he should let the Lord's people go. Upon his refusal ten successive plagues were sent—water changed to blood, frogs, lice, swarms of flies, murrain, boils, hail, locusts, darkness, the slaying of the first-born. The passover was instituted, and Israel led forth 600,000 men, besides children and a mixed multitude (Ex. xii. 37, 38), precisely 430 years after the entry into Egypt. xii. 40, 41. Pharaoh pursued them with his army, but a passage was miraculously opened for Israel through the Red Sea, and their pursuers were drowned.

LESSON II.

FROM THE EXODUS TO THE DEATH OF DAVID.

THE chosen seed were now sufficiently multiplied; they were next to be organized as the people of God and established in Canaan. This was accomplished in four successive steps: 1. By the covenant at Sinai and the legislation of Moses they were constituted the people of God and placed under his laws. 2. They were put in possession of the promised land by Joshua. 3. They were made to feel their lack of unity and of a vigorous government in the time of the Judges. 4. Their civil organization was com-

pleted and the conquest of the land perfected under Samuel, Saul and David.

The people, brought safely through the Red Sea and fed on manna, were first led to Sinai, where the ten commandments were proclaimed by God himself amidst awful pomp (Ex. xx.), and the covenant was formally ratified between him and the people through their representatives, Moses, Aaron and his sons and seventy elders of Israel. xxiv. 1-11. Moses then went into the mount for forty days and nights to receive the law of God. The people, impatient at his long delay, made the golden calf and worshiped it, whereupon the Lord would have destroyed them but for Moses' urgent intercession. ch. xxxii. They remained at Sinai one year (Num. x. 11, 12), during which the tabernacle was built, the ritual was instituted and Aaron and his sons were ordained to the priesthood. Removing thence, they were led by a pillar of cloud and fire. Transgression was severely punished in repeated instances, as the fire at Taberah (xi. 1), the plague following the sending of the quails (xi. 33) and Miriam's leprosy for contending with Moses. xii. 10. On their arrival at Kadesh, in the wilderness of Paran, they sent twelve spies to view the land, at whose report the people refused to proceed, threatening to stone Moses and to go back again to Egypt. They were in consequence condemned to wander forty years in the desert, till that entire generation had perished, with the sole exception of Joshua and Caleb (xiv. 30), who had brought a good report of the land.

During this term of their banishment they were guilty of gross transgression (Ezek. xx. 13) and open idolatry. Amos v. 25, 26; Acts vii. 42, 43. Korah and a company of 250 of the tribe of Levi rebelled against the exclusive priesthood of Aaron, claiming an equal right to minister at the altar, and were supported in their rebellion by Dathan, Abiram and others of the tribe of Reuben; but the earth opened and swallowed up the latter, with all that ap-

pertained to them, while a fire blazed forth from the Lord which burned up the former with their censers in their hands, and a plague broke out among the people, destroying upward of fourteen thousand Num. xvi. The divine choice of Aaron was shown when twelve rods were laid up before the Lord, one to represent each tribe, and Aaron's rod budded and brought forth almonds. ch. xvii.

In the first month of the fortieth year the whole congregation were again gathered at Kadesh. xx. 1. Here Miriam died, and Moses and Aaron, failing to honor God before the rebellious people in bringing water out of the rock, were prohibited from entering the promised land. ver. 12. The king of Edom refusing to suffer Israel to pass through his land, a circuit was made around it, requiring them to retrace their steps from the southern border of Canaan to the shores of the eastern arm of the Red Sea. vs. 14, ff.

Aaron died at Mount Hor. xx. 28; xxxiii. 38. The murmurs of the people, who were discouraged because of the way, were punished by fiery serpents, and a brazen serpent erected upon a pole that they who looked upon it might be healed. xxi. 19. Sihon, king of the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan, were subdued (xxi. 21, ff.), and their territory, which lay east of the Jordan, was assigned to Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh (xxxii. 33) on condition of their assisting their brethren in the conquest of the remainder of the land. Balak, king of Moab, hired Balaam the soothsayer to come from Pethor in Mesopotamia and curse Israel, but his curse was changed to a blessing; and though the Moabites and Midianites through his counsel enticed the people into idolatry and crime at Baal-peor, it was severely avenged by a battle in which Balaam and five kings of Midian were slain. xxxi. 8. Israel now encamped in the plains of Moab. Here Moses rehearsed to them the whole law in the last month of the fortieth year (Deut. i. 13), including the promise (Deut. xviii. 18), "The

Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me." Comp. Acts iii. 22. He then gave a charge to Joshua as his successor (xxxii. 23), delivered the book of the law to the Levites to be kept in the side of the ark of the covenant (vs. 24, ff.), pronounced a blessing upon the several tribes (ch. xxxiii.), and went up the mountain of Nebo to the top of Pisgah, where the Lord showed him all the promised land, and he died there, one hundred and twenty years old.

2. To Joshua was committed the task of conducting Israel into Canaan, subduing the land, and apportioning it among the several tribes. He first sent two spies to view Jericho, where they were protected by the harlot Rahab. The people were then led through the Jordan on dry land, and twelve stones taken from its bed were laid up at Gilgal, their first encampment in Canaan, in commemoration of the miracle. Here the covenant with God was renewed by circumcision, which had been neglected in the wilderness (Josh. v. 5), and by the celebration of the passover, the manna thenceforth ceasing, as no longer needed. The walls of Jericho were miraculously thrown down, and the place pronounced accursed; its silver and gold and vessels of brass and iron were devoted unto the treasury of the Lord, and all that were in the city were devoted to destruction, except Rahab and those who were in her house. At Ai the people were repulsed in consequence of Achan's trespass in the accursed thing. He had coveted and taken from the spoils of Jericho, but his crime was detected and punished, whereupon Ai was again assaulted and taken. An altar was then erected in Mount Ebal, and the blessings and curses of the law formally pronounced in the presence of all the people. The inhabitants of Gibeah, by a successful stratagem, made peace with Joshua. A combination formed of five kings in the southern portion of the country, headed by the king of Jerusalem, was defeated, Joshua

bidding the sun stand still and prolong the day that he might complete the victory. A similar combination in the north was likewise utterly routed at the waters of Merom. In about six years the conquest of the entire land was effected. Josh. xi. 18; comp. xiv. 7-10.

The territory west of the Jordan was then divided by lot among nine tribes and a half, and the two tribes and a half which had a portion assigned them by Moses east of the Jordan returned to their inheritance. Joshua died one hundred and ten years old, and, according to Josephus, twenty-five years after the crossing of the Jordan, having first assembled the tribes at Shechem and solemnly bound them to the service of the Lord.

3. The people were now organized under the laws given them by Moses, and put in possession of the land conquered by Joshua. But their civil organization had not yet attained its complete and final form, and the conquest of the land was not thoroughly perfected. Much was left to be done by each of the tribes in its own domain, in the further subjugation or extermination of their foes; and this in their divided state it was difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish, particularly as in their repeated relapses from God they were deprived of his aid and given over to the power of their enemies. In their times of distress, however, they repented, and God raised up special leaders or judges for their deliverance.

They were thus oppressed eight years by Chushan-rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia, and rescued by Othniel; then eighteen years by Eglon, king of Moab, who was slain, and Israel delivered by Ehud; again, twenty years by Jabin, king of Hazor, the captain of whose host, Sisera, was defeated by Deborah and Barak, and slain by Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite; again, seven years by Midian, whose immense host was discomfited by Gideon with three hundred men. Gideon's son, Abimelech, slew his brothers and

had himself made king of Shechem, but was himself slain in the disturbances that arose at the end of his brief reign of three years. The children of Israel east of the Jordan were oppressed by the Ammonites eighteen years (Judg. x. 8), but were delivered by Jephthah the Gileadite, who vowed that if the Lord would give him the victory, whatsoever came forth from the doors of his house to meet him on his return should surely be the Lord's, and he would offer it up for a burnt-offering. As he came back victorious, his daughter, who was his only child, met him with timbrels and dances, and he did with her according to his vow. The Philistines in the west oppressed Israel forty years. A champion was raised up from the tribe of Dan in the person of Samson to begin the work of deliverance. His birth was foretold by the angel of the Lord, who directed that he should be a perpetual Nazarite, and that no razor should ever come upon his head. Num. vi. 5. As long as he was faithful to the sacred obligation thus enjoined God endowed him with superhuman strength, which he employed in molesting or destroying the Philistines. He judged Israel twenty years. Other judges whose names are mentioned, but of whom little is known, are Tola (x. 1), Jair (x. 3), Ibzan (xii. 10), Elon (xii. 11) and Abdon (xii. 13), making, with Eli (1 Sam. iv. 18), the entire number of judges to be twelve.

The terms of these twelve judges, together with the periods of oppression and rest mentioned in the book of Judges, amount to 450 years, as stated Acts xiii. 20. But as the entire interval from the exodus to the building of Solomon's temple was but 480 years, all of these periods cannot have been successive. Different judges may have ruled or different oppressors may have held sway in different parts of the land at the same time. The opposite phases of this period are pictured in the turbulent lawlessness of the Danite band (ch. xviii.) and of the men of Gibeah (xix. 22), on

the one hand, and the charming piety and peaceful domestic life of Naomi, Ruth and Boaz, the ancestors of David, on the other.

4. The times of the judges had been marked by three great evils, viz., declension in religion, want of unity among the tribes and weakness before their foes. There was pressing need of a religious reformation, a strong central government and victory over their enemies. To accomplish these ends three remarkable men were raised up, Samuel, Saul and David. Samuel, the son of Hannah and Elkanah, was the child of prayer (1 Sam. i. 27, 28), and was consecrated from his childhood to minister before Eli, the priest of the sanctuary, in Shiloh (ii. 11), where God early revealed himself to him. ch. iii. The Philistines gained a great victory over Israel, slew the degenerate sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, and captured the ark of God. But their idol Dagon fell and was broken before it, and plagues were sent upon their cities, so that at the end of seven months they were forced to send it back to the land of Israel, where it remained in obscurity at Kirjath-jearim until the reign of David. Samuel now induced the people to put away their strange gods; and gathering them to Mizpeh for penitent humiliation before the Lord and return to his service, he there discomfited the Philistines, breaking their power completely for a time. vii. 13. Samuel was not only himself a distinguished prophet of the Lord, but the founder of a company of prophets (x. 5; xix. 20) or community of inspired men, associated under his superintendence to oppose the prevailing corruption; and though occasional messages had been sent by men of God before (1 Sam. ii. 27; iii. 1), he may be said to have been the first of that continuous line of prophets which, varying greatly in numbers from time to time, never entirely ceased until the close of the Old Testament (Acts iii. 24), and in which we see the preliminary fulfillment of the promise made through

Moses. Deut. xviii. 15. As the special messenger of God he also assumed the right both to supersede the degenerate priesthood for the time, offering sacrifices himself, though not one of the family of Aaron, and to exercise the highest civil authority by acting as judge.

His sons not walking in his ways, the elders of Israel solicited the appointment of a king. 1 Sam. viii. 5. Samuel rightly saw in this request that they might be "like all the nations" a want of confidence in the Lord who was their King. x. 19; xii. 12. Although it was the divine intention that Israel should have a kingly government, and express provision had been made for it in the law of Moses (Deut. xvii. 14), nevertheless, in the form in which the request was made and in the disposition of those making it, it was a virtual rejection of the Lord from reigning over them. 1 Sam. viii. 7. The Lord accedes to their request, but suffers them in the first instance to experience in Saul what it is to have a king without him, before he bestows upon them in David a king after his own heart. Saul was first anointed privately by Samuel (x. 1) and then chosen by lot at Mizpeh. x. 21. His assumption of royalty was signalized by a victory over the Ammonites, which at once gained him the hearts of the people. In his second year Saul renewed the war against the Philistines, who assembled an immense host. The men of Israel were scattering from Saul, some hiding, some fleeing, and the few that followed him were trembling. As Samuel failed to reach Gilgal at the appointed time, Saul offered the sacrifice himself, and for his presumption in so doing was rebuked by Samuel and threatened with the forfeiture of his kingdom. Saul's men were now reduced to six hundred. His son, Jonathau, and his armor-bearer, adventuring upon the garrison of the Philistines alone, created a panic, which finally grew into an utter rout. Saul was likewise victorious over Moab, Ammon, Edom and other foes, and was sent against the Amalekites with the

charge that he should utterly destroy them. But he spared their king and the chief of the spoil, for which fresh act of disobedience Samuel plainly told him that the kingdom should be rent from him and given to another.

Samuel accordingly anointed David, the youngest son of Jesse the Bethlehemite, and the Spirit of the Lord came upon David and departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him. David, being a skillful player on the harp, was sent for to relieve his gloom, but his slaying Goliath and the popular rejoicing over that event awakened Saul's jealousy, so that he sought his life. He threw his javelin at him to kill him; he gave him a position in the army, hoping that he might fall in battle, but this only gave David an opportunity to distinguish himself still more. Saul married his daughter to him that he might more easily ensnare him; he sent assassins to his house to kill him; he massacred the priests because one of their number had furnished him supplies; he pursued him with an armed force into the wilderness and mountain fastnesses, where David was repeatedly in imminent danger of being captured, but escaped by providential interposition. Twice he had Saul in his power and magnanimously spared his life, but the softening effect upon the king was only temporary. At length David was obliged to flee to the Philistines and put himself under the protection of Achish, king of Gath, where he was when Saul perished with his three sons in the disastrous battle with the Philistines at Mount Gilboa.

David was now made king over Judah in Hebron, where he reigned seven years and six months. The remaining tribes attached themselves to Ishbosbeth, the son of Saul, who was king in Mahanaim, and reigned there two years. After his murder all the tribes submitted to David, who captured Jerusalem from the Jebusites and established his capital there, and had the ark of the Lord brought thither from Kirjath-jearim with great pomp. It was his purpose

to have built a temple, but this was reserved for his son, Solomon. He, however, gathered abundant materials and resources for the work in his numerous wars, in which he was everywhere successful against foreign foes. He also prepared its plan (1 Chron. xxviii. 11, 12) and designated its site (1 Chron. xxii. 1), which he purchased from Araunah the Jebusite, and where he offered an accepted sacrifice in time of pestilence. His care for the sanctuary was further shown by his division of the priests into regular courses (1 Chron. xxiv. 3, ff.), by his arrangements for musical performance (1 Chron. xxv.), and by his composition of those Psalms which earned him the name of the "sweet Psalmist of Israel." 2 Sam. xxiii. 1.

The great stain upon David's life is the affair of Bathsheba, whom he took for his own wife, having procured the death of her husband, Uriah, in battle. 2 Sam. xi. 14, 15. From this time he was visited by the most serious domestic calamities—the death of his infant child (xii. 16, ff.), the disgrace of his daughter Tamar (xiii. 19), the murder of his son Amnon by Absalom (xiii. 28, 29), and the rebellion of Absalom (xv. 10), during which he was forced to flee from Jerusalem and seek refuge beyond Jordan. In the battle that ensued Absalom was slain; but a quarrel arising between Judah and the other tribes respecting the restoration of the king to his capital, a fresh revolt followed under Sheba, son of Bichri, which was speedily quelled and Sheba slain. In his later years his son Adonijah sought to seize upon the kingdom (1 Kings i. 5, ff.), but by David's direction Solomon was anointed king and established upon his throne.

David died in the fortieth year of his reign (1 Kings ii. 11), leaving the kingdom at the summit of its prosperity and power.

LESSON III.

FROM THE DEATH OF DAVID TO THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

THE reign of Solomon was one of peaceful splendor, and contrasts strongly with the numerous wars of his father. It presents a type of the kingdom of Christ in its extensive sway and prosperous abundance (Ps. lxxii.), as the reign of David does of its victories and of its triumphing over all opposition. Ps. ii. When offered by the Lord his choice of blessings, at the beginning of his reign, Solomon chose an understanding heart; and the Lord gave him the wisdom for which he asked, and added to it riches and honor. His most noted enterprise was the building of the temple, which was begun in his fourth year, and finished in seven years. At its dedication, which was celebrated with much pomp, the cloud of the divine glory filled the house so that the priests could not stand to minister because of it. He also built a palace for himself, which he was thirteen years in erecting, and numerous other structures, upon a scale of lavish magnificence. 1 Kings vii. 2, ff.; ix. 17, ff. This vast expenditure was provided for in part by the treasures accumulated by his father and by his lucrative foreign trade (ix. 26; x. 21-27), but it likewise imposed oppressive burdens upon the people. He also contracted numerous marriages with foreign princesses (xi. 1), who led him into idolatry in his later years.

After a reign of forty years, Solomon was succeeded by his son Rehoboam, whose insane refusal to lighten the exactions imposed by his father led to the permanent division of the kingdom. Ten tribes rebelled against the house of David and chose Jeroboam king, so that from this time forward there were the two rival, and commonly hostile, kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

The kingdom of Israel, or of the ten tribes, continued

two hundred and fifty-four years from the schism of Jeroboam, B. C. 975, to its overthrow by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, B. C. 721. Twenty persons in all sat upon the throne, or were aspirants to it.

1. Jeroboam I., the son of Nebat, who reigned twenty-two years; 2. his son, Nadab, two years; 3. conspired against by Baasha, twenty-four years; 4. his son, Elah, two years; 5. conspired against by Zimri, seven days; rival aspirants, 6. Tibni, who was defeated, and 7. Omri, the choice of the army, who was successful, twelve years; 8. his son, Ahab, twenty-two years; 9. his sons, Ahaziah, two years, and 10. Jehoram, twelve years; 11. Jehu, anointed by divine command, twenty years; 12. his son, Jehoahaz, seventeen years; 13. his son, Joash, sixteen years; 14. his son, Jeroboam II., forty-one years; 15. his son, Zachariah, six months; 16. conspired against by Shallum, one month; 17. conspired against by Menahem, ten years; 18. his son, Pekahiah, two years; 19. conspired against by Pekah, twenty years; 20. conspired against by Hoshea, nine years. There seems also to have been an interregnum or period of anarchy after Jeroboam II., and another after Pekah. Eight kings reached the throne by successful conspiracy and slaying their predecessors. The crown was in but two instances transmitted from father to son beyond a single generation, viz., by Omri to the second generation, and by Jehu to the fourth, as had been particularly predicted. 2 Kings x. 30. All these kings were wicked, following as they did in the track of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin by establishing the worship of the golden calves at Bethel and at Dan to prevent the people from going up to Jerusalem to worship and so coming again under the dominion of the house of David. This was not an open renunciation of the worship of Jehovah, but the calves were set up professedly as symbols of the God who had brought them out of the land of Egypt. 1 Kings xii. 28.

The allusions in the prophets show that the annual feasts, new moons, Sabbaths, legal sacrifices and other Mosaic regulations (Hos. ii. 11) remained in full force; only the time of the feast of tabernacles was changed from the seventh to the eighth month, and priests were ordained, not from the tribe of Levi, but from the lowest of the people. vs. 31, 32.

The worst of all the kings was Ahab, the son of Omri, the builder of Samaria, who with his wife Jezebel, the daughter of the king of the Zidonians, introduced the open and avowed worship of heathen divinities, Baal and Ashtaroath, put to death the prophets of the Lord and perpetrated other deeds of violence and oppression, as the murder of Naboth in order that they might seize upon his vineyard, though even in this time of the grossest apostasy there was a pious Obadiah in the very palace (1 Kings xviii. 3), and there were seven thousand who had not bowed the knee unto Baal. xix. 18. Elijah was sent repeatedly to confront Ahab, and by the predicted drought, and the miracle at Carmel of fire from heaven consuming the sacrifice, began a reaction. Ahab was slain in battle at Ramoth-gilead. His son Jehoram (2 Kings iii. 2) removed the image of Baal; and Baal-worship was entirely extirpated by Jehu (x. 18, ff.), though the worship of the calves remained. Elisha succeeded Elijah after his translation with a like ministry of power. Communities of sons or pupils of the prophets were established at such seats of idolatry as Bethel, Jericho and Gilgal. The prophets Hosea, Amos and Jonah were raised up in the reign of Jeroboam II., under whom the ten tribes reached their highest prosperity and power, but they were unable to turn back the tide of corruption or to effect a genuine reformation, and the kingdom hastened to its downfall.

Israel had been repeatedly and sorely pressed by the Syrians, particularly in the reigns of Ahab (1 Kings, ch. xx.), Jehoram (2 Kings vi. 24, ff.) and Jehcahaz. 2 Kings

xiii. 3. In the reign of Menahem we first read of the advance of the Assyrians under Pul (2 Kings xv. 19); in the reign of Pekah, Tiglath-pileser carried captive the northern portion of the kingdom and all that lay east of the Jordan. 2 Kings xv. 29; 1 Chron. v. 26. Shalmaneser, after besieging Samaria three years, put an end to the kingdom entirely in the ninth year of Hoshea, and the people were carried into Assyria; and the finishing stroke was put to its desolation by the subsequent introduction of heathen colonists (2 Kings xvii. 24), from whom the Samaritans of a later period were descended.

The kingdom of Judah lasted three hundred and eighty-seven years from the schism to its overthrow by Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 588. The number of monarchs in this as in the other kingdom was twenty, viz.: 1. Rehoboam, who reigned seventeen years; 2. Abijah, three years; 3. Asa, forty-one years; 4. Jehoshaphat, twenty-five years; 5. Jehoram, eight years; 6. Ahaziah, one year; 7. Athaliah, six years; 8. Joash, forty years; 9. Amaziah, twenty-nine years; 10. Azariah, also called Uzziah, fifty-two years; 11. Jotham, sixteen years; 12. Ahaz, sixteen years; 13. Hezekiah, twenty-nine years; 14. Manasseh, fifty-five years; 15. Amon, two years; 16. Josiah, thirty-one years; 17. Jehoahaz, three months; 18. Jehoiakim, eleven years; 19. Jehoiachin, three months and ten days; 20. Zedekiah, eleven years.

The crown descended regularly throughout the whole line from father to son with the exception, first, of the usurpation of Queen Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab, who seized the throne upon the death of her son Ahaziah and sought to destroy all the blood royal. Joash was saved from the massacre, however, and after being concealed for six years in the house of the Lord by the high priest Jehoiada was made king, and Athaliah slain. The other exception is that of the last four kings; three—viz., Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah—were brothers, the sons of Josiah. Of the

kings of Judah, three fell victims to conspiracies among their own subjects, viz., Joash, Amaziah and Amon; three died in captivity, Jehoahaz in Egypt, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah in Babylon. Ahaziah was slain by Jehu, king of Israel, and Josiah fell in the battle of Megiddo, fighting against Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt.

In point of character the kings of Judah are divided into three classes; first, four who are commended as having done that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, as did David their father, viz., Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah; secondly, four who did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, yet not like David their father, viz., Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah and Jotham; thirdly, all the rest did evil in the sight of the Lord, practicing idolatry and the abominations of the heathen. Remarkable instances of change for the better and the worse are afforded by the case of Manasseh, who, after practicing the grossest idolatry and the most revolting cruelty, repented in captivity and at his restoration began to act the part of a reformer; and by that of Joash, who did that which was right in the sight of the Lord while Jehoiada, the high priest, lived, but afterward fell into the practice of idolatry. In point of political wisdom and prosperity, the best reigns were not uniformly those of the best kings. This double honor belongs, it is true, to Asa and his son Jehoshaphat, but the reign of the pious Hezekiah was marred by great defects and errors of a worldly nature, and in this respect was greatly inferior to those of his grandfather Jotham and his great-grandfather Uzziah, who were morally far below him. The reign of Ahaz was at once the weakest and the worst, if we except the four with which the history concludes, and during which the power was really exercised by foreign states.

Apostasy was inherent in the very existence of the kingdom of Israel, but it was not so in Judah. Though idolatry

was encouraged in all the ungodly reigns, and Ahaz (2 Kings xvi. 10, ff.) and Manasseh (2 Kings xxi. 4, ff.) especially profaned the temple of God itself by setting up heathen altars or objects of worship within its sacred precincts, yet upon every return of pious princes to the throne a reformation was wrought more or less thorough and effective, and the temple was cleansed, repaired and restored to its legitimate use. Thus by Asa (2 Chron. xiv. 8, 16), Joash (2 Chron. xxiii. 17; xxiv. 4), Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix. 3) and Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 3, 8), under the last of whom mention is made of finding in the temple, after long neglect, "the book of the law" (verse 15), probably the identical copy in the handwriting of Moses which had been delivered by him to the Levites for safekeeping, and had from that time forward been preserved in the sanctuary. And though the servility of the priesthood to wicked rulers is shown in the case of Urijah (2 Kings xiv. 16), and the transgressions of the priests (2 Chron. xxxvi. 14) contributed to the downfall of the kingdom, there are noble instances in which their power for good was shown, as in Jehoiada during the usurpation of Athaliah and the former part of the reign of Joash (2 Chron. xxiii. 16; xxiv. 2), and in Azariah and his associates, who withstood Uzziah in his profane intrusion into the temple to burn incense. 2 Chron xxvi. 16, ff.

There was a continuous line of prophets, also, not so remarkably endowed as Elijah and Elisha with miraculous power, for which there was not so imperative a call, yet ever appearing at important crises and exerting a constant influence for good, as Shemaiah under Rehoboam (2 Chron xii. 5); Azariah under Asa (xiv. 1); Jehu (xix. 2), Jahaziel (xx. 14) and Eliezer (verse 37) under Jehoshaphat; Isaiah (Isa. i. 1) under Uzziah and his successors. Yet their messages were frequently neglected (2 Chron. xxiv. 9), and the prophets themselves were sometimes subjected to personal ill-treatment, as Hanani was imprisoned by Asa (2 Chron. xvi.

10); Zechariah was stoned in the court of the temple (xxiv. 20); Urijah was put to death by order of Jehoiakim (Jer. xxvi. 20-24), and Jeremiah was beaten and put in the stocks (Jer. xx. 2), thrust into a filthy dungeon (Jer. xxxviii. 6), his life repeatedly threatened (Jer. xxvi. 8; xxxvi. 26), and he was in prison at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Jer. xxxix. 14.

Shishak, king of Egypt, invaded Judah in the reign of Rehoboam, and plundered the temple as well as the palace of the king. 1 Kings xiv. 25. Under Asa, Zerah the Ethiopian, with his immense host, was defeated (2 Chron. xiv. 9, ff.), as was the formidable combination of Moab, Ammon and others, under Jehoshaphat. 2 Chron. xx. Up to the time of Jehoshaphat there had been constant war between Judah and Israel. 1 Kings xxii. 44. His ill-judged and disastrous alliance with Ahab resulted in the marriage of his son Jehoram with Ahab's daughter (2 Chron. xxi. 6) and all the consequences of that vicious association. Under Amaziah we again find a state of hostility existing and Judah worsted before Israel. 2 Kings xiv. 12. Asa had hired Benhadad, king of Syria, to attack Israel in the interest of Judah (2 Chron. xvi. 2), and Joash had purchased peace from Hazael of Syria at great cost. 2 Kings xii. 17, 18. But in the reign of Ahaz, Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Israel united their forces against Judah, and created such alarm (2 Kings xvi. 5; Isa. vii. 2) that, in spite of the remonstrances of Isaiah, the weak-minded monarch besought the aid of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria. That ambitious power, having accomplished the overthrow of the kingdom of Israel, directed its designs against Judah, and Sennacherib came up with an immense host against Hezekiah, but was miraculously overthrown. 2 Kings xix. 35. Hezekiah, being congratulated by the king of Babylon on his recovery from sickness, was guilty of the vanity and imprudence of exhibiting all his treasures, whereupon he was warned by

the prophet Isaiah that they should all be carried captive to Babylon. 2 Kings xx. 12, ff. Palestine, lying, as it did, between Babylon and Egypt, was alternately the prey of each of these great powers, who were contesting the empire of the world. Josiah was slain in a battle with Pharaoh-necho. 2 Kings xxiii. 29. His son Jehoahaz was carried captive into Egypt. In the third year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, marched against Jerusalem, taking it in his fourth year, and carrying away many captives, Daniel among the rest. Dan. i. 1. It is from this first deportation, B. C. 606, that the seventy years of captivity predicted by Jeremiah (Jer. xxv. 1, 11) are to be computed. The second deportation put an end to the reign of King Jehoiachin, who was carried into captivity, together with many of the better portion of the people. 2 Kings xxiv. 12. Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, and the mass of its inhabitants were led away into exile. The wretched remnant that stayed behind in the land of Judah were placed under the government of Gedaliah, and after his murder they removed into Egypt.

Cyrus, king of Persia, the conqueror of Babylon, issued an edict in the first year of his reign, B. C. 536, permitting the Jewish exiles to return to their own land. Accordingly, 42,000 of them returned under Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David, and Joshua, the high priest. After many hindrances, they completed the building of the temple in the sixth year of Darius, B. C. 516. Jerusalem still lay in ruins, however, and its walls were not rebuilt until Ezra, and after him Nehemiah, came up with fresh colonists in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. The incidents recorded in the book of Esther took place in the reign of Ahasuerus (Esth. i. 1), otherwise known as Xerxes, the son of Darius.

The Persian monarchy was overthrown by Alexander the Great, who was personally favorable to the Jews. On the

partition of his empire Palestine fell under the control of the Ptolemies of Egypt, who granted the Jews many privileges and protected them in the exercise of their religion. After many fluctuations, it was finally subjected to the king of Syria, who treated the Jews with great severity. Antiochus Epiphanes, in particular, plundered and polluted the temple, and endeavored by the most cruel atrocities to compel the Jews to adopt heathen customs and to engage in heathen rites. Mattathias raised the standard of revolt, and under his leadership and that of his noble sons Judas Maccabeus, Jonathan and Simon, the Jews contended successfully against the armies of Antiochus.

After cleansing the sanctuary and building a new altar, the first sacrifice was offered on the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month, Chisleu, B. C. 165, just three years after its profanation. In memory of that event the feast of dedication (John x. 22) was observed upon the anniversary of this day and the seven following days.

Simon was succeeded by his son John Hyrcanus, and he by his son Aristobulus, B. C. 106. Dissensions arising among his descendants relative to the succession, the Romans, under Pompey, entered Jerusalem, B. C. 63, and established Hyrcanus II., the grandson of Aristobulus, in supreme authority. Under his weak government the Idumean Antipater rose to power, and was by Julius Cæsar advanced to the dignity of procurator of Judea, B. C. 47. His son Herod the Great was made king of Judea by the order of the Roman senate, B. C. 40. Under his reign Christ was born.

LESSON IV.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

THE prophet Isaiah announces (xl. 3), a voice crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord. And Malachi (iii. 1; iv. 5) predicts the mission of Elijah the prophet as a messenger to prepare the way before the Lord at his coming. This forerunner was the son of a priest named Zacharias, who lived in the days of Herod the king, and whose wife's name was Elizabeth. As he was burning incense in the temple an angel appeared to him and said, "Thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, and many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God, and he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias (or Elijah) to make ready a people prepared for the Lord."

Six months later the angel Gabriel was sent to Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel said unto her "Fear not, Mary; for thou hast found favor with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

A decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed required Joseph to go with Mary to Bethlehem, his ancestral city. There Jesus was born, and was laid in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn. His birth was announced by an angel to the shepherds, when suddenly a multitude of the heavenly host were heard praising God and saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will to ward men." When

presented in the temple in his infancy, he was recognized as the Lord's Christ by the aged Simeon and the prophetess Anna. Wise men from the east also came seeking him who was born King of the Jews. Herod, startled by their inquiry, sent them to Bethlehem, the predicted place of the Saviour's birth (Mic. v. 2), charging them to return when they had found the infant king, and tell him, that he might come and worship him also. But being warned of God in a dream, they departed into their own country another way. Joseph was likewise warned to take the young child and his mother and flee into Egypt. Herod, finding that he was mocked of the wise men, sent forth and slew all the children in Bethlehem from two years old and under. After the death of Herod the parents of Jesus brought him to Nazareth. When he was twelve years old, he was taken to Jerusalem, to the passover; and lingering behind when his parents returned, he was found in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers.

In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, the successor of Augustus, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, Herod Antipas, son of Herod the Great, being tetrarch of Galilee, and Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness of Judea, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Great multitudes from all quarters flocked to hear him, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. Jesus also, being now thirty years of age, came from Nazareth, and was baptized, whereupon the heavens opened and the Spirit of God descended upon him like a dove, and there came a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

He was then led up by the Spirit into the wilderness, where he fasted forty days and forty nights, and was tempted

of the devil. Soon after, his first disciples attached themselves to him, John the Baptist pointing him out as the Lamb of God to two of his own disciples, one of whom was Andrew and the other probably the apostle John ; they both followed Jesus. Andrew brought his brother Simon Peter to Jesus, and the next day Philip and Nathanael were added. On the day following he wrought his first miracle at a marriage in Cana of Galilee, changing water into wine. As the passover was at hand, he went up to Jerusalem, and with a scourge of small cords drove out of the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money. And many believed in his name when they saw the miracles that he did. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, came to him by night, convinced that he was a teacher sent from God. As he taught in Judea, and his disciples baptized, such crowds resorted to him as to awaken the jealousy of John's disciples. But John replied, I am not the Christ, but one sent before him ; he must increase, but I must decrease.

John the Baptist being seized by Herod and cast into prison, Jesus departed into Galilee, passing through Samaria on the way. Here he conversed with the Samaritan woman as he sat wearied by the well of Jacob, convincing both her and many who lived in Sychar that he was indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world. Arriving at Cana of Galilee, he healed the son of a nobleman who lay sick at Capernaum. In the synagogue at Nazareth he announced himself as the Saviour predicted by Isaiah, but was so violently treated that he fixed his residence at Capernaum. He now formally called Simon Peter and Andrew, James and John, who were engaged in their occupation as fishermen, to permanent discipleship, promising them that they should be fishers of men, and by a miraculous draught of fishes assuring them of the abundant success which would be divinely granted to them in their new vocation. Matthew was

also called from the receipt of custom. He now proceeded to exhibit himself as the healer of all human disorders and the conqueror of Satan in Capernaum and throughout all Galilee, over which he made a complete tour, teaching and preaching, curing the sick and casting out devils. This first year of his ministry was one of unbounded popularity, great multitudes even from remote parts attending him wherever he went, so that on one occasion those who sought his healing could only reach him by uncovering the roof where he was and letting down the sick man in his bed. At length, to escape the crowds, he was forced to remain outside the city in desert places, but even then they came to him from every quarter. There were, however, some who cherished thoughts which they did not venture to express, as though he were guilty of blasphemy in claiming the power to forgive sins. *Matt. ix. 3.*

At the next passover Jesus was again in Jerusalem, and healed the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, bidding him take up his bed and walk, though it was the Sabbath. This profanation, as it was regarded, of this sacred day, occurring in the very centre of pharisaic influence and authority, gave occasion for an outburst of hostility against a teacher whose extraordinary popularity excited their jealousy, and whose spiritual instructions were at variance with their most cherished ideas. Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus and sought to slay him. The opposition which had taken such a malignant form at the capital did not fail to show itself likewise in Galilee, and opportunities were soon afforded by his disciples plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath, and his healing a man with a withered hand in one of the synagogues, by his withering exposures of their hypocrisy and wickedness (*Luke xi. 39*), by his suffering a sinner to wash and kiss his feet and anoint them (*Luke vii. 38*), and even sitting at meat with publicans and sinners in *Matthew's house* (*Matt ix. 11*), so that the Pharisees took

counsel with the Herodians how they might destroy him. Mark iii. 6. They applied opprobrious epithets to him (Matt. xi. 19); they attributed his miracles to satanic influence (Matt. xii. 24); they tempted him by demanding signs from heaven (Matt. xii. 38); they pressed him with ensnaring questions. Luke xi. 53, 54. He was not, however, deterred from continuing his ministry. He organized his disciples by selecting the twelve apostles, and in the sermon on the mount made explicit announcement of the laws of his kingdom. He went twice with his apostles through all the towns and villages of Galilee (Luke viii. 1; Matt. ix. 35), and then clothed the apostles with miraculous powers, and sent them forth to preach that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. Matt. x. 5; xi. 1. His miracles were now more striking than before. He cured a man who had had an infirmity thirty and eight years (John v. 5), and a woman sick for twelve years, whom the physicians could not heal (Mark v. 25, 26), and fierce demoniacs whom no man could tame (Mark v. 2, ff.), and the blind and the dumb (Matt. ix. 27, ff.), and raised from the dead the daughter of Jairus (Mark v. 42) and the son of the widow at Nain (Luke vii. 15), and stilled the storm (Luke viii. 24), and walked on the sea (Matt. xiv. 25), and fed five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes. Matt. xiv. 20.

Our Lord's instructions bear, to some extent, the impress of the opposition that he now encounters. In healing the centurion's servant at Capernaum, he contrasts the faith of this Gentile with the want of it in Israel, and intimates the calling of the Gentiles and the rejection of the Jews. That generation refused both John the Baptist's instructions and his own. Matt. xi. 16, ff. He upbraids Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum because they repented not. He warns his hearers that Nineveh and the queen of the South shall condemn them in the judgment, and that the blood of all the prophets shall be required of that generation.

He tells his disciples of the persecutions they must expect, but bids them not to fear them who can only kill the body. The parables of the barren fig tree (Luke xiii. 6), the sower (Matt. xiii. 3, ff.), the tares (v. 24, ff.) and the net (v. 47) show the different reception of the gospel by different classes of hearers, while those of the mustard seed (v. 31) and the leaven (v. 33) declare the certainty of its progress and ultimate triumph. That his popularity with the masses had not abated, appears from the frequent references to the crowds that still gathered to hear him (Matt. v. 1; xiii. 2; xiv. 13; Luke xii. 1), and the disposition of the people to make him a king (John vi. 15), even though the inhabitants of Nazareth were offended at his humble origin. Matt. xiii. 57. His true followers believed, and were sure that he was Christ, the Son of the living God, though many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him. John vi. 66, ff. The murderous disposition of the Jews at Jerusalem was such, however, that he did not go up to the next passover. John vi. 4; vii. 1.

The next year, which is the last of our Lord's ministry, extending to the passover at which he suffered, is divided by the feast of tabernacles, when he again visited Jerusalem. The six months preceding this feast were spent in Galilee, which he then leaves, and does not again revisit. During this time he gives further offence to the Pharisees by exposing the variance between their traditions and the law of God (Matt. xv. 3), but continues his teaching and miracles, healing great numbers (Matt. xv. 30), feeding the four thousand (v. 38), and especially suggesting again the extension of the gospel beyond the limits of the chosen people by curing the daughter of the Syrophenician woman in the coasts of Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xv. 21, ff.), and the ten lepers, of whom the only one who returned to give thanks to God was a Samaritan. Luke xvii. 18. The disciples, through Peter, having again solemnly professed their faith

in him as the Christ (Matt. xvi. 16), he began from that time forth to show unto them how that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Matt. xvi. 21. He had made enigmatical allusions to this before, at the very beginning of his ministry, speaking to the Jews at his first passover in Jerusalem of the temple of his body, which they would destroy and he would raise up in three days (John ii. 19), and to Nicodemus of the Son of man being lifted up like the serpent in the wilderness (John iii. 14), and in the synagogue at Capernaum two years later of his giving his flesh for the life of the world. John vi. 51. But he now speaks of this subject plainly and more than once (Matt. xvii. 22, 23), and tells his disciples that they too must take up their cross and follow after him, expectant of the reward which they shall have when the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father. Matt. xvi. 24, 27. He further confirms them by the vision of his transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1, ff.), and of Moses and Elias speaking of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem (Luke ix. 31,) teaching them their need of stronger faith by healing a demoniac whom they could not cure (Matt. xvii. 19), and of the humility of a little child (Matt. xviii. 3), and of tender (v. 14) and forgiving love (v. 22), and rebuking the zeal which would forbid others casting out devils in his name (Luke ix. 50), or would call down fire from heaven upon those who refused to receive him. v. 55. Then sending forth seventy before his face to heal and preach in every place whither he himself would come, he left Galilee finally, and went up to Jerusalem to the feast of tabernacles. John vii. 2-10.

He remained at the capital or in its vicinity for two months, until the feast of dedication, teaching publicly in the temple and elsewhere, and performing at least one signal miracle—that of healing a man born blind. John ix.

His foes sought on various occasions to take him, but no man laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come. John vii. 30; viii. 20; x. 39. Officers were sent expressly to apprehend him, but returned without him, saying, Never man spake like this man. John vii. 47. They brought cases to him as of the woman taken in adultery, tempting him that they might have to accuse him. viii. 6. They charged him with being a Samaritan, having a devil (vii. 20; viii. 48) and being mad. x. 20. They agreed that if any man did confess that he was Christ he should be put out of the synagogue. ix. 22. And they twice actually took up stones to cast at him. viii. 59; x. 31.

There was, however, a division among them about him, for some said, This is the Christ (vii. 41); others, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? ix. 16; x. 19. But none of the rulers or Pharisees believed on him (vii. 48); the only friendly voice among them was that of Nicodemus, who claimed that he should not be condemned unheard. v. 51.

After the feast of dedication Jesus retired before the increasing hostility of his enemies beyond the Jordan (John x. 40), only returning as far as Bethany to raise Lazarus from his grave, ch. xi. This new evidence of his Messiahship so exasperated the chief priests and Pharisees that the Sanhedrim was called together, and a formal resolution taken that he must be put to death. xi. 53. He continued to teach beyond the Jordan, reciting among others the parables of the great supper (Luke xiv. 16, ff.), the prodigal son (xv. 11, ff.) and the rich man and Lazarus. xvi. 19, ff. When the Pharisees represented to him that his life was in peril from Herod, he replied that he could not perish out of Jerusalem. Luke xiii. 31. As he went to the city he told his disciples once more of what should befall him there. xviii. 31, ff. Nevertheless, the impression that he was now on the point of setting up his kingdom led James and John to ask for conspicuous positions (Mark x. 35, ff.),

and gave occasion to the parable of the ten pounds (Luke xix. 11, ff.), and after he had reached Bethany, six days before the passover (John xii. 1), incited the multitude to come forth to meet him and escort him into the city in jubilant procession. xii. 13. As he came near the city he wept over it in its impenitence and coming doom (Luke xix. 41), which were also represented in the miracle wrought upon the barren fig tree on the following day and the parables of the wicked husbandmen (Luke xx. 9, ff.), the marriage of the king's son (Matt. xxii. 1, ff.), the ten virgins (Matt. xxv. 1, ff.) and the five talents (v. 14, ff.), his casting out them that sold and bought in the temple (Luke xix. 45), and his prediction of the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem. Two days before the passover he was at a supper at Bethany, where Mary anointed him with costly ointment, which he said was for his burial. Matt. xxvi. 8, ff. Judas Iscariot bargained with the chief priests to betray him for thirty pieces of silver. Then followed the passover, the institution of the Lord's Supper, the last address of Jesus to his disciples (John xiv. and xvi.) and his prayer (xvii.), his agony in Gethsemane and his seizure in the night by the band of soldiers led by the traitor Judas. He was taken to the high priest's house, where Peter thrice denied him. Early in the morning the Sanhedrim was summoned, who pronounced him guilty of death. He was then carried to the judgment-hall of Pilate, who finally gave sentence that he should be crucified. His body was laid in a new tomb belonging to Joseph of Arimathea, and a watch set to guard the sepulchre. On the morning of the third day he rose from the dead; and when Mary Magdalene and the other Mary visited the sepulchre, they found not the body of Jesus, but saw two angels, who told them that he was alive; and as they went to tell the disciples, Jesus himself met them. He further appeared to Mary Magdalene at the sepulchre (John xx. 14), to Peter (1 Cor. xv. 5), to two

disciples on their way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 15, ff.), to the apostles when Thomas was absent and again when he was present (John xx 19, ff.), to seven apostles at the Sea of Tiberias (John xxi 1, ff.), and to above five hundred brethren at once. 1 Cor xv. 6. Finally, after being seen of his disciples forty days (Acts i. 3), he ascended in their sight to heaven.

LESSON V.

THE LABORS OF THE APOSTLES.

OUR Lord, having satisfied the apostles of the reality of his resurrection by many infallible proofs, commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem till the Holy Spirit, promised by the Father, should come upon them. They would thus be fitted and empowered to be witnesses unto him in Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria and unto the uttermost part of the earth. Having given them this charge, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight. The eleven, accordingly, returned from the Mount of Olives, the scene of the ascension, and with the rest of the disciples, amounting in all to about a hundred and twenty, continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, awaiting the fulfillment of the promise. Meanwhile, they filled up the number of the apostles, which had been reduced by the apostasy and suicide of Judas Iscariot. Two were named, who had been with the Lord Jesus from the very beginning of his ministry until the day of his ascension to heaven, and who therefore were competent witnesses to his resurrection; of these Matthias was chosen by lot, which was cast under divine direction.

The time for the organization of the Church of the new dispensation had now arrived. It was the day of Pentecost,

the annual commemoration of the organization of Israel as the people of God under the former dispensation, when God came down with solemn pomp on Sinai and proclaimed his law. The Spirit of God now came down from heaven with the sound of a rushing mighty wind, which filled the house where the disciples were assembled. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. Representatives of various lands then present in Jerusalem in attendance upon the feast flocked in, and were amazed that, though the speakers were Galileans, every man heard them speak in his own language. Thus the gospel of the crucified and risen Saviour was at the very outset proclaimed to those who had been gathered from distant parts of the world, symbolic of its being ultimately preached in all the world and to every creature. And the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And all that believed were together and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods and parted them to all men as every man had need; and the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.

The infant Church, thus divinely established, was now subjected to successive trials from without and from within, which, however, instead of destroying, or even weakening it, were overruled for its enlargement and purification and more complete equipment. Peter and John healed a lame man at the temple and again preached Jesus and the resurrection to the wondering crowds, five thousand of whom believed. For thus speaking to the people they were arrested and brought before the Sanhedrim, where, unabashed, they repeated their testimony, that "by the name of Jesus of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, doth this man stand here before you whole." To the command of the council that they should not speak at all,

nor teach in the name of Jesus, they firmly and decidedly refused compliance. So, when they had further threatened them, they let them go, finding nothing how they might punish them, because of the people; for all men glorified God for that which was done. But in this popularity and rapid increase and enthusiasm of the early converts there lay a fresh danger to the Church, arising within its own bosom; unworthy adherents might be attracted to it and gain admission, whose hypocrisy might cast suspicion on the body and endanger its purity. Ananias and Sapphira sought a reputation for piety by a false pretence, but their sudden and startling fate created a widespread and salutary awe which deterred others from following their pernicious example.

Miracles of healing continued to be wrought in great numbers. The sick were placed on beds and couches in the streets that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them, and the diseased were brought from surrounding cities into Jerusalem to be cured, and believers were added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. Alarmed at the rapidity with which the new faith was spreading, the high priest and his associates undertook to stop it by still more summary measures than before. They seized the whole body of the apostles and put them in the common prison. When the Sanhedrim assembled in the morning to deliberate upon the case, to their dismay the prisoners had disappeared. They had been miraculously released, and had returned to the temple to teach the people. Learning this, they had them brought before them; and exasperated by their intrepid boldness, they took counsel to slay them. Dissuaded from this extreme measure by the judicious advice of Gamaliel, they beat the apostles and commanded them not to speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go. And they departed rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name; and daily in the temple and in every

house they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus Christ. A fresh trouble arose within the Church consequent upon its rapid enlargement. It is not now corruption, threatening to mar the purity of the Church, but strife between parties, impairing its unity. The Grecian Jews murmured against the Hebrews because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. The dissension was allayed, and the inadequate distribution of the benefactions of the Church to the needy poor was corrected by creating the office of deacon with reference to this special work. Seven deacons were appointed. Among them was Stephen, whose great fidelity and ability proved the occasion of a renewed outbreak of hostility more virulent than before. Stephen himself was its first victim. He was carried before the Sanhedrim, and false witnesses brought forward who charged him with blasphemous words against the temple and the law. He stated and defended his real position by reciting briefly the history of the chosen people and showing that the unfaithfulness of which they had been guilty in every age had now culminated in the murder of Him who was predicted by the prophets, and that the temple could not be God's true and permanent abode. These unwelcome truths filled them with rage, and they stoned him to death. It is in connection with this first Christian martyrdom that the earliest mention is made of one who is afterward to appear in a very different character and play a very prominent part in the apostolic Church. The witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet whose name was Saul, and Saul was consenting unto his death.

This martyrdom was the signal for the first act in a great and bloody persecution, which, however, instead of crushing the Church, served but to open the way for a new stage in its development and growth. Hitherto it had been confined to Jerusalem, which was its appointed place of beginning. The time had now come for its diffusion, and the

violence of this persecution was the providential means of bringing this about. The disciples were scattered abroad, and went everywhere preaching the word. Philip, one of the seven deacons, went northward to Samaria, which may be said to have occupied a position intermediate between Jews and Gentiles, and preached the gospel with such success that he was followed by the apostles Peter and John, who labored both there and in other cities of the Samaritans. Philip was then directed to the opposite quarter, southward from Jerusalem, where he met an Ethiopian eunuch of great authority under Queen Candace, and preached to him Jesus; he believed, was baptized, and went on his way rejoicing. But it was not only by dispersed disciples that the gospel was thus carried into various parts. An instrument of God's grace was preparing in one of the persecutors themselves. Saul, who started to Damascus breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, was converted on the way, and began himself to preach Jesus, first at Damascus, then at Jerusalem, whence also he found it prudent to retire to his native city of Tarsus. But the Church did not itself understand that the restrictions of the old dispensation were no longer operative, and that the barriers of the ceremonial law, which had proved so serviceable in guarding God's ancient people from contamination, were not now to be permitted to obstruct the free diffusion of the gospel. Peter had preached on the day of Pentecost that the promise was to all that are afar off (Acts ii. 39), and that all the kindreds of the earth were to be blessed in the seed of Abraham. iii. 25. But that this involved the abolition of Mosaic institutions he had not suspected. The first lesson on this subject was now given to the apostle of the circumcision. Gal. ii. 8. Peter had been providentially led to Lydda and then to Joppa, to which latter place Cornelius, a devout Roman centurion of Cæsarea, had been directed to send to him for

further instruction. A special vision, teaching him not to call that unclean which God had cleansed, prepared him for the coming of the messengers, with whom the Spirit bid him go. As he was preaching to Cornelius and his assembled friends the Holy Ghost fell on them with his miraculous influences, and he could not refuse to baptize them. On his return to Jerusalem he was charged with having broken the law by eating with men uncircumcised; but on his rehearsing the whole matter, the confession was made, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." A further step was taken in the same direction when those scattered by the persecution came to Antioch and preached to Greeks with remarkable success. This was followed up by Barnabas and Saul, who labored there for a whole year; and the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch. It was thus recognized for the first time that they were not a mere section of the Jews, but formed a distinct body. The new name implied the admission that the Church had attained to a separate and independent existence. Antioch was preparing to be a new centre of Christian radiation, but meanwhile recognized its dependence on the mother-church at Jerusalem by sending supplies to the needy brethren in Judea by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. A fresh persecution under Herod Agrippa showed how impossible it was thus to check the gospel. James, the brother of John, was killed. But Peter, though imprisoned, was miraculously released; the persecutor died a miserable death, and the word of God grew and multiplied.

The time had now come for an entirely new movement in the work of spreading the gospel. Hitherto apostolic and Christian labor had been confined almost exclusively to the territory of Palestine. Now, by the express direction of the Holy Spirit, Barnabas and Saul, or Paul, were set apart, and sent forth by the church at Antioch upon a mission in foreign lands. They passed through Seleucia, Salamis and

Paphos in Cyprus, Perga in Pamphylia, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, and then returned by the same route to Perga, and thence to Attalia and Antioch, planting and organizing churches everywhere. The chief opposition that they encountered was from the Jews, and their principal converts were from the Gentiles. But were these Gentile converts to be required to observe the law of Moses? This was affirmed by some who came down from Judea, and denied by Paul and Barnabas. The question was referred to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem for decision, and they enjoined no ceremonial observances whatever, but simply required them, from prudential considerations, to abstain from meats offered to idols, and from things strangled, and from blood, as well as to keep aloof from that licentiousness which prevailed to such a shocking extent among the heathen. Paul and Barnabas now separated, each going in a different direction. Barnabas, with Mark, sailed unto his native island of Cyprus. Paul, with Silas and Timothy, took a much more extensive tour than before. After passing through Galatia and other parts of Asia Minor, he was led by express divine direction into Europe. Entering Macedonia, he visited Philippi and Thessalonica, founding the churches to which he subsequently addressed three of his Epistles. Driven onward by Jewish opposition, he went to Berea, Athens and Corinth, where he remained a year and six months, and the results of his labors are apparent in his two Epistles to the church in that city. Having thus gained a permanent lodgment for the gospel in Greece, he hastened back to Jerusalem and Antioch by way of Ephesus, promising shortly to return to this important city. Accordingly, after a brief delay, he directed his third missionary journey mainly to Ephesus, where he remained for three years, preaching in the synagogues, disputing in the schools, teaching from house to house, and working miracles with such effect that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word

of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks. Great numbers believed, and many abandoned the practice of magic arts, and the makers of silver shrines for Diana began to fear that they should lose their occupation, so mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed. Having occupied this populous and influential metropolis of Western Asia, Paul next turned his thoughts to Rome, the capital and heart of the civilized world (Acts xix. 21), where, however, he was to be taken in a very different way from that he then imagined. A short time was spent in revisiting the churches in Greece and Macedonia, after which he returned to Miletus, where he took a last affecting farewell of the elders of the Ephesian church, and then persistently, in the face of entreaties and prophetic warning, went bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem.

Thus far the gospel had been spread by the active efforts of the apostles and disciples, either impelled by their own voluntary purpose or driven by the persecution of foes. The preacher of the gospel is now to be carried to the capital of the Roman empire by the authorities of the empire itself. Paul had scarcely been a week in Jerusalem when he was seized in the temple by a Jewish mob, who would have put him to death if he had not been rescued by the chief captain of the Roman garrison, by whose permission he made his defence to the populace from the stairs of the castle. On the following day he made another defence before the assembled Jewish council. As a plot had been formed against his life, he was sent under guard to Cæsarea, the residence of the governor Felix, before whom he defended himself again, and then once more before his successor, Festus. As the latter proposed to send him back to Jerusalem, he was obliged to appeal unto Cæsar. Accordingly, after a fifth defence, in the presence of King Agrippa, he was embarked as a prisoner for Rome. The vessel in which he sailed was wrecked upon the island of Malta; but

all escaping with their lives, he was forwarded to the imperial city. Here, being suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him, he first, as had been his invariable custom, endeavored to win the Jews to the acceptance of the gospel. So, calling their chief men together in three days after his arrival, a day was named for a conference, at which he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets, from morning till evening. And some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not. And when they agreed not among themselves they departed, after Paul had faithfully set before them the consequences of this obstinate blindness: Be it known, therefore, unto you that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it. And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no man forbidding him.

The Church, thus gradually freed from the trammels of Judaism, and planted in the chief seats of population and influence, and attended by the mighty power of God, was fairly equipped for its great struggle for the mastery of the world.



GEOGRAPHY OF THE BIBLE.

LESSON I.

PALESTINE.

THE land which was the residence of the chosen people, where our blessed Saviour dwelt and where the principal events recorded in the Bible took place, is known by various names. On account of its sacred associations it is called the Holy Land (Zech. ii. 12), the pleasant land (Dan. viii. 9), the glorious land (Dan. xi. 16), the LORD'S land (Hos. ix. 3), the land which the LORD swore to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob (Gen. i. 24), and the land of promise. Heb. xi. 9. From its inhabitants at different periods it is called the land of Canaan (Gen. xi. 31), the land of the Hebrews (Gen. xl. 15), the land of Israel (1 Sam. xiii. 19), and Palestine, which is now familiarly applied to the whole country; though when used in the Old Testament (Ex. xv. 14; Isa. xiv. 29; Joel iii. 4), it has its original and narrower sense of Philistia (Ps. lx. 8), or the territory of the Philistines along the south-western coast.

This land was admirably adapted by its location for the purpose for which God in his providence designed it. It was shut in by great natural barriers, the Mediterranean on the west, the mountain range of Lebanon on the north and the desert on the south and east, and the people were thus secluded from the heathen states around them. Its proximity to the seats of early civilization and to the great empires of the old world both gave them the advantage of the highest existing forms of worldly culture and provided

instruments for their chastisement when they transgressed. And its central position in relation to the three great continents of the eastern hemisphere, lying as it did upon or adjacent to the main routes of trade and travel from west to east, eminently fitted it to be the centre of diffusion for the true religion when the time had come for the gospel to be preached to every creature.

As defined in the promise to Abraham (Gen. xv. 18) and to Moses (Ex. xxiii. 31), the land extended to the Euphrates on the east and to the Red Sea on the south. These limits were reached in the prosperous reigns of David and Solomon (1 Kings iv. 21 ; ix. 26), but were only maintained for a brief period. The territory actually assigned by Moses to the tribes east of the Jordan is minutely described Num. xxxii. 33-42, and the boundaries of the territory west of the Jordan are given in Num. xxxiv. 2-12. This cannot now be traced with perfect accuracy, since several of the places named in the description can no longer be identified. It may be stated in the general that it lay between $33\frac{3}{4}^{\circ}$ and $35\frac{3}{4}^{\circ}$ east longitude, as reckoned from Greenwich, and between $30\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ and $33\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ north latitude, being thus about midway between the equator and the arctic circle. Kitto estimates its extreme length from north to south at about 180 miles, and its extreme breadth from west to east at about 100 miles, its average breadth being perhaps 65 miles and its area about 11,000 square miles. This would make it about the size of the State of Maryland, or equal to one-fourth of Pennsylvania, or one-fifth of England and Wales, or two-thirds of Switzerland. But as in the case of Greece, its influence upon the world has been immense, notwithstanding its small extent.

In studying the geography of Palestine, we shall first consider its physical features and then proceed to its civil divisions and its cities. As the most important of the physical features of a country are its elevations, we shall in the

first instance examine the mountains and highlands. These condition the existence and determine the amount of its depressions, viz., the valleys and plains, which will next claim attention. And these again fix its water system in location, extent and the direction of its flow, which brings before us its seas and lakes, rivers, streams and fountains.

MOUNTAINS.

In general, Palestine may be described as a mountain land, or, as it is called by Moses (Deut. xi. 11), "a land of hills and valleys." It is an elevated, undulating region, stretching from the mountains of Lebanon on the north to the Arabian desert and the mountains of Sin, an extension of the Sinaitic range, on the south. This lofty plateau is divided through all its extent from north to south by the deep and precipitous valley of the Jordan, called by the modern inhabitants El Ghor, and which, under the name El Arabah, is continued all the way to the Dead Sea. Parallel to this is a broader depression along the Mediterranean coast, which also reaches, with but a single interruption, from the northern to the southern limit of the country. There are thus two elevated plateaus extending north and south, one on the east and the other on the west of the Jordan, and two resulting depressions, viz., the valley of the river Jordan and the plain upon the sea-coast.

Reviewing the mountains more in detail, Lebanon demands the first place, as most remarkable in itself and most frequently referred to in Scripture. Moses calls it (Deut. iii. 26) "that goodly mountain." The name Lebanon means strictly the "white" mountain, and is given to it either on account of the chalky whiteness of the limestone rock of which it is chiefly composed, or because of the snow which rests upon some of its summits during the greater part of the year. The southern extremity of Lebanon constitutes

the northern boundary of Palestine. It consists of two parallel ranges of mountains, commonly called Libanus and anti-Libanus, though this distinction is never made in the Bible, both being there included under the common name of Lebanon. They run through about one degree of latitude, from south-west to north-east, parallel to the sea-coast and enclosing the rich and fertile valley of Cœle-Syria, or, as it called (Josh. xi. 17; xii. 7), "the valley of Lebanon." The mountains attain an elevation of about 9000 feet; their sides are terraced and extremely productive. The sacred writers celebrate its perennial streams (Sol. Song iv. 15); the perfume of its plants (Sol. Song iv. 11; Hos. xiv. 6); its wine (Hos. xiv. 7); and especially its cedars, which the Tyrians used for masts of vessels and boxes of merchandise (Ezek. xxv. 5, 24), David for his palace on Mount Zion (2 Sam. v. 11), Solomon in the erection of the temple, floating them by sea to Joppa (2 Chron. ii. 8, 16), and the Jews after the captivity in building the second temple. Ezra iii. 7.

The southern portion of the anti-Libanus range was known as Mount Hermon, which, according to Deut. iii. 9, the Sidonians called "Sirion" and the Amorites "Shenir," and also bore the name of "Sion" (Deut. iv. 45), a different word in Hebrew from "Zion," the mountain in Jerusalem, though this is also spelled "Sion" in the New Testament. Hermon is the highest point in the range, rising to an altitude of perhaps 10,000 feet, and covered with perpetual snow. The hoary whiteness of its summit has given rise to its modern name of *Jebel-es-Sheikh*, *old man mountain*, or *Jebel-el-telj*, *snow mountain*.

Passing southward upon the west of the Jordan, we first meet Mount Naphtali, mentioned once (Josh. xx. 7) as the site of Kedesh, one of the cities of refuge. It is a spur running south-west from Hermon, and is named from the tribe within whose territory it lay. This falls off into the

high table-land of Zebulun, or of Galilee, which slopes gradually into the plain on the seacoast, but with a steeper descent into the valley of Jezreel on the south, and more abruptly still toward the Lake of Gennesaret and the valley of the Jordan. From this elevated base arises the so-called Mount of Beatitudes, nearly due west from the middle of the lake, and Mount Tabor farther south, almost on a line with the extremity of the same lake. The former, which derives its name from the doubtful tradition that the Sermon on the Mount was delivered on its summit, is a low ridge thirty or forty feet high and scarcely half a mile long. Mount Tabor is in appearance a truncated cone, rising to a considerable elevation and having a level plot of more than a mile in circumference upon its summit, which commands a view of rare extent and beauty. It is spoken of (Josh. xix. 22) as one point in the boundary of the tribe of Issachar; at this mountain Barak assembled his army before his victory over Sisera (Judg. iv. 6), here Gideon's brethren were slain by the Midianites (Judg. viii. 18), and tradition has fixed upon it as the scene of our Lord's transfiguration.

South of the table-land of Nazareth runs the broad and fertile valley of Jezreel, separating it from the high land beyond, which extends southward to the limits of Palestine. This, though forming an uninterrupted hill country, is distinguished (Josh. xx. 7) into the mountain of Ephraim and the mountain of Judah, the former embracing the northern and the latter the southern portion of it, the names being derived from the tribes in whose territories it lay. At the north-eastern extremity of this mountain land of Ephraim we find Mount Gilboa, overlooking the valley of Jezreel and the plain of the Jordan; here Saul and his sons were slain in battle with the Philistines. 1 Sam. xxxi. North of this mountain, and separated from it by a branch of the valley of Jezreel, lies a high ridge to which tradition has improperly given the name of Hermon, and which is in con-

sequence often called Little Hermon, in distinction from the true Hermon already spoken of.

At its north-western extremity the mountain of Ephraim sends out a long spur reaching to the sea, the extremity of which is known as the promontory of Mount Carmel. This name, which signifies "a garden," was bestowed upon it on account of its fertility. Hence, Isaiah, describing the glorious changes of the future under the emblem of the desert being made to bloom, says (xxxv. 2), "The glory of Lebanon and the excellency of Carmel shall be given unto it." This marked the southern boundary of the tribe of Asher (Josh. xix. 26); here Elijah encountered the prophets of Baal and his sacrifice was consumed by fire from heaven (1 Kings xviii. 19, ff.); from its summit his servant saw the little cloud arising out of the sea (ver. 44); and here we subsequently find Elisha. 2 Kings iv. 25. Its modern name is *Jebel mar Elias*, or the mountain of St. Elijah. The order of Carmelite monks takes its name from this mountain, on which convents have been erected at different periods. The snowy peak of Hermon is visible from its summit, though perhaps fifty miles distant. The immense number of caves and grottoes, natural or artificial, which here exist and afford remarkable facilities for concealment, is perhaps alluded to in Amos ix. 3: "Though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel."

To the mountains of Ephraim further belong Ebal and Gerizim, which rise in steep, rocky precipices from opposite sides of the narrow valley of Shechem. The children of Israel were directed (Deut. xxvii.), on their entrance into Canaan, to erect an altar on Ebal, and six tribes were to stand on Ebal to pronounce the curses of the law, and six on Gerizim to pronounce blessings. The Samaritans built a temple on Gerizim in the time of Alexander the Great, and substituted "Gerizim" for "Ebal" in their copies of the law in the passage above referred to. To this temple

the woman of Samaria alluded when she said (John iv. 20), "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain," and to this day the Samaritans turn their faces toward Mount Gerizim when they pray. It was from the top of Gerizim that Jotham propounded his parable to the men of Shechem. Judg. ix. 7.

To the mountain land of Ephraim also belong the hill of Samaria (1 Kings xvi. 24), on which the city of that name was built; Mount Zalmon, which must have been somewhere in the vicinity of Shechem; the hill Gaash, where Joshua was buried (Josh. xx. 30); and Mount Zemaraim, the scene of a victory by King Abijah over Jeroboam (2 Chron. xiii. 3), whose localities cannot now be identified.

The southern part of this elevated region, or the mountain of Judah, includes the mountains of Jerusalem, viz: Zion, which David selected for his own residence (2 Sam. v. 7), and on which he erected a temporary tabernacle for the ark (2 Sam. vi. 12, ff.); Mount Moriah, on which Solomon built the temple (2 Chron. iii. 1), and where Abraham had been directed to offer Isaac (Gen. xxii. 2); and the Mount of Olives on the east side of the city. On the eastern border of this mountain district of Judah, near Jericho, is Mount Quarantania, so called as the reputed scene of our Lord's temptation and fasting for forty days. At the foot of this mountain is a spring, said to be the one which Elisha healed by casting into it a cruse of salt. 2 Kings ii. 21.

The south-eastern portion of this high table-land was the wilderness of Judah (Judg. i. 16), different portions of which went by different names derived from places in the vicinity, as the wilderness of Tekoah (2 Chron. xx. 20), and the following, which occur in the history of David: the wilderness of Engedi (1 Sam. xxiv. 1), of Maon (1 Sam. xxiii. 25), of Ziph. 1 Sam. xxiii. 14. Carmel, also, where Nabal resided (1 Sam. xxv.), is in this region, and must not be confounded with the promontory of Mount Carmel, be-

fore described. The southern extremity of the mountain of Judah, where it abuts upon the wilderness, is called the mountain of the Amorites. Deut. i. 7. The children of Israel presumptuously undertook to enter the land by this route after they had been condemned to retrace their steps in the wilderness, and were in consequence smitten before the Amorites. Deut. i. 43, 44.

The elevated district east of the Jordan was called in its northern portion the hill of Bashan (Ps. lxxviii. 15), celebrated for its oaks (Isa. ii. 13) and for its cattle (Deut. xxxii. 14; Ps. xxii. 12), which there found abundant pasturage. Farther south it was known as Mount Gilead (Deut. iii. 12), and opposite the Dead Sea the range took the name of the mountain Abarim (Deut. xxxii. 49), to which belong Mount Nebo, a particular summit, and Mount Pisgah, a portion of the range (Deut. xxxiv. 1) from which Moses saw the promised land, and where he died; also Mount Peor, to which, as well as to Pisgah, Balak brought Balaam when he wished him to curse Israel.

The mountains of Palestine are mostly composed of limestone, in which are numerous caves, such as those in which the Israelites hid from fear of the Midianites (Judg. vi. 2), or of the Philistines. 1 Sam. xiii. 6. Five kings of the Canaanites concealed themselves in the cave at Makkedah (Josh. x. 16); six hundred Benjamites abode in the rock Rimmon four months (Judg. xx. 47); David and his men took refuge from the pursuit of Saul in the cave Adullam (1 Sam. xxii. 1) and in another in the wilderness of Engedi. 1 Sam. xxiv. 3. The cave in Machpelah was purchased by Abraham for a burial-place (Gen. xxiii. 17), and our Lord's body was laid in a tomb hewn out of the rock. Matt. xxvii. 60.

The mountains of Bashan consist of a black basalt, which contains no caves and is too hard to be hollowed out. This explains the circumstance mentioned (Deut. iii. 4, 5) as

peculiar to Bashan, that the cities were fenced with high walls, gates and bars. In the regions traversed by the children of Israel previously the people dwelt largely in habitations excavated from the rock, as in the Edomite city of Petra. Obad., ver. 3. But in Bashan this was impossible. The only way in which they could there provide for mutual defence was by living together in walled cities.

LESSON II.

PLAINS AND VALLEYS.

THE valley of Jezreel has already been spoken of as intersecting the highlands west of the Jordan. It lies between the mountains of Galilee on the north, the mountains of Ephraim on the south, Mount Carmel on the west and Mount Gilboa on the east, and is perhaps twenty miles long by ten broad. It derives its name from the city of Jezreel, and is occasionally called the valley of Megiddo from another town included within its limits. 2 Chron. xxxv. 22. This has been the great battle-ground of Palestine. Here Gideon gained his victory over the Midianites (Judg. vi. 32; vii. 22); here the Israelites encamped prior to Saul's last battle with the Philistines (1 Sam. xxix. 1); here the Syrians were beaten by Ahab when they said the LORD was the God of the hills, but not of the valleys (1 Kings xx. 26); here King Josiah was slain in battle with the king of Egypt. 2 Kings xxiii. 29. It was, according to Josephus, the scene of a battle between the Jews and the Romans under Vespasian, and in modern times the French under Napoleon here gained a victory over the Turks.

The plain along the sea-coast is divided by Mount Carmel. That portion which extends northward to the promontory known as the Ladder of Tyre is not particularly

mentioned in Scripture. The other portion, extending from Mount Carmel to the southern boundary of Palestine, is about one hundred miles in length and from twelve to twenty miles in breadth. From Carmel to Joppa or Jamnia it was called the plain of Sharon, whose fertility and beauty are frequently celebrated in the Bible. South of this it was called the vale (Josh. x. 48); its Hebrew name, Sephela, is retained in 1 Macc. xii. 38. The valley of Sorek (Judg. xvi. 4), where Samson found Delilah, was probably somewhere in this Philistine vale.

The plain of the Jordan (Gen. xiii. 10; called, Matt. iii. 5, the region round about Jordan) is the valley through which the Jordan flows. It is of varying width and mostly bounded on each side by steep ascents. In the vicinity of Jericho it was called the plain of the valley of Jericho (Deut. xxxiv. 3), and on the east of Jordan, opposite Jericho, it was called the plains of Moab. Num. xx. 1. As this depression continues southward from the Dead Sea to the Ælanitic gulf, it was formerly thought that the Jordan flowed by this channel into the Red Sea prior to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. But this opinion has been abandoned since the discovery of the fact that this valley for a considerable distance descends northward toward the Dead Sea, and that the level of the Dead Sea itself is so far below that of neighboring seas. The Valley of Salt, where David smote the Syrians (2 Sam. xiii. 13), and where Amaziah gained a victory over Edom (2 Kings xiv. 7), was south of the Dead Sea in this extension of the valley of the Jordan.

SEAS, LAKES AND RIVERS.

The Mediterranean is called the sea (Num. xxxiv. 5), the great sea (vs. 6, 7), the uttermost sea (Deut. xi. 24)—*i. e.*, the hindmost sea, which is equivalent to the western sea, since the face was turned to the east in naming the points

of the compass; it is also entitled the sea of the Philistines (Ex. xxiii. 31), because the Philistines occupied a portion of its coast. The shores of this sea from the Ladder of Tyre northward are rocky and precipitous. But the greater portion of the coast of Palestine is low and sandy. The only good harbor is that lying north of Carmel, though voyages were made to and from Joppa (Jon. i. 3) and vessels landed at Cæsarea. Acts xviii. 22.

The Jordan forms the eastern boundary of Canaan, properly so called, or the dividing line between Eastern and Western Palestine. This river is formed by the confluence of three or four small streams which descend from the region of Mount Hermon. It flows first into the Lake of Merom, on the banks of which Joshua discomfited Jabin, king of Hazor, and the kings that were with him. Josh. xi. 7. A few miles below this it flows through the Lake of Gennesaret, the Sea of Galilee, or the Sea of Tiberias, as it is variously called in the New Testament, where it is repeatedly mentioned in connection with events in the life of our Lord; its name in the Old Testament is the Sea of Cinneroth (Josh. xii. 3), or, with a slightly different orthography, Chinnereth. Num. xxxiv. 11. This lake is about twelve miles long and five broad, and is encased among beautiful and verdant hills, having on the west the table-land of Galilee and on the east the still steeper and loftier region of Bashan. The waters of the lake are clear and sweet, and at its northern extremity abound in fish.

Leaving this lake, the Jordan continues to flow due south until it reaches the Dead Sea, called also the sea of the plain, the salt sea (Deut. iii. 7) and the east sea (Ezek. xlvi. 18), which occupies the site of Sodom and Gomorrah and the other cities of the plain, which were destroyed by fire from heaven, whence its modern name among the natives of that region is the Sea of Lot. It is about forty miles long and ten broad, and receives its current designa-

tion, "the Dead Sea," from the fact that there is no verdure on its shores and no life in its waters, which are acrid and strongly impregnated with mineral salts.

It is a remarkable fact that the Jordan lies throughout its whole extent below the level of the Mediterranean. The Lake of Gennesaret is 700 feet below the level of the sea, and the Dead Sea 1300 feet below the same level. There is thus a fall of 600 feet between them, while the distance is but sixty miles in a direct line, though trebled by the tortuous course of the river. The depth of the valley of the Jordan, bordered as it is by high mountains, which shelter it from cooling winds and concentrate the rays of the sun, makes its climate almost tropical and its harvest a fortnight earlier than in the highlands to the east of it; and the great heat in the basin of the Dead Sea produces an evaporation which balances the influx of the Jordan.

All the streams of the land west of the Jordan flow either east into this river or west into the Mediterranean, and the watershed, or dividing line between those which run in one direction or in the other, lies near the main route, which traverses the land from south to north, and passes through its principal places, Hebron, Bethlehem, Jerusalem, and so on to Nazareth. The line which separates the eastern from the western declivity accordingly runs not through the centre of the land, but considerably nearer its eastern border, making the western slope twice as long as the eastern, the latter being in the same proportion more precipitous. The streams which fall into the Jordan are consequently smaller than those which empty into the Mediterranean, and partake more of the character of mountain torrents.

The Shihor-libnath (Josh. xix. 26) mentioned in the statement of the boundaries of Asher has been plausibly conjectured to be the Belus of classic writers, emptying

near the town of Accho. Upon its banks, according to Pliny and Tacitus, glass was accidentally discovered by the melting of its sands. According to some eminent authorities, its Hebrew name denotes "the glass river."

The Kishon drains the valley of Jezreel and empties near the foot of Mount Carmel. This is called by Deborah "that ancient river, the river Kishon," and she speaks of its sweeping away the dead bodies of Sisera's host. Judg. v. 21. It was by this stream that Elijah put to death the prophets of Baal. 1 Kings xviii. 40.

The streams south of Carmel are more insignificant and of less note. The river Kanah (Josh. xvi. 8), or "brook of reeds," is only mentioned as the border line of Ephraim. The brook Besor, which runs south of Gaza, was crossed by David (1 Sam. xxx. 9) in his pursuit of the Amalekites who had burned Ziklag. The river of Egypt (Gen. xv. 18) is the last of these streams, and marks the southern border of Palestine. Its modern name is the wady el-Arish.

Of the trifling streams which find their way to the Jordan, the only ones mentioned in Scripture are the brook Cherith (1 Kings xvii. 3, 5), where Elijah was fed by ravens, and which Robinson identifies with the wady Kelt, near Jericho; the waters healed by Elisha (2 Kings ii. 21), also in the vicinity of Jericho; and the Kedron (John xviii. 1), which rises near Jerusalem and empties into the Dead Sea.

On the east of the Jordan we find three principal streams. The Jarmuk or Hieromax is nowhere referred to in the Bible. The Jabbok separated the land of the Amorites from Bashan, and subsequently the territory of Gad from that of the half tribe of Manasseh; it is first mentioned in the account of Jacob's return from Mesopotamia, and it was on its banks that he wrestled with the angel and prevailed. Gen. xxxii. 12. And finally we have the Arnon,

which empties into the Dead Sea and separated Moab on the south from Ammon on the north.

CLIMATE.

The year is divided into two seasons, the winter, or more properly the cold season, extending from October to March, and the summer, or warm season, from April to September. During the latter no rain falls, but the dews are very copious. Hence, "rain in harvest" is spoken of (Prov. xxvi. 1) as something quite out of place, and "thunder and rain in wheat harvest" were sent by miracle at the prayer of Samuel. 1 Sam. xii. 17. The first rain, commonly styled the early rain, fell in October, after which the winter crops, principally wheat and barley, were sown. Rain was thenceforward liable to occur at intervals until March and the beginning of April, which was the end of the rainfall for the year, and was accordingly known as the period of the latter rain. Snow is not infrequent from December to February, though in Jerusalem it rarely lies longer than a single day.

The winds from the west and south-west, coming from the Mediterranean, were charged with moisture, and brought showers and rain (Luke xii. 54); the east wind, in consequence of the desert region over which it passed, was dry and withering in its effect. Hos. xiii. 15. The south wind, proceeding from the warm countries of that quarter, brought heat. Luke xii. 55. The hot simoom of the desert appears to be alluded to (Ps. xi. 6), where "an horrible tempest" is literally "a burning wind." This never blows in Palestine, though it does in the neighboring desert of Arabia.

The extraordinary fertility of Palestine is celebrated not only in the Bible (Deut. viii. 7-9), where it is repeatedly called a land flowing with milk and honey (Ex. iii. 8), but also by the classic writers of antiquity; and this is confirmed by the population which it once supported. In the

lays of David this must have amounted to 400 to the square mile; and according to Josephus, the population was still more dense in his time. Its present condition is in lamentable contrast with its former state. The land has been desolated by the curse of centuries. Property has been rendered so insecure by the wars which have raged there, by the exactions of oppressive rulers and by the incursions of predatory tribes, that large portions are left waste and uncultivated. And by the neglect of ages the soil has been allowed to be washed from the hillsides and other exposed situations, until the fruitful land has actually been converted into barrenness. Ps. cvii. 34.

INHABITANTS AND CIVIL DIVISIONS.

When Israel entered Canaan, it was held by seven nations, the Hittites, Girgashites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites and Jebusites. Deut. vii. 1. In Gen. xv. 19-21 ten nations are spoken of, but the Kenites, Kenizites and Kadmonites may have been subdivisions of one or other of the seven already mentioned. These various tribes, which were descended from Canaan, the youngest son of Ham (Gen. x. 15, ff.), were not, however, the original occupants of the land. We find occasional allusions to an antecedent population, which from their powerful frames and great stature were called Rephaim or giants. Gen. xiv. 5. To these belonged the Anakim (Num. xiii. 33), the Emims (Deut. ii. 10), who are described as "a people great and many, and tall as the Anakims," the Horims (ver. 12), the Zamzummims (ver. 20) and the Avims. ver. 23.

The Philistines, who resided in the south-western portion of the land, belonged to a different stratum of population from either of the preceding. The name properly means "emigrants" or "aliens." They were descended, not from Canaan, but from Mizraim, another son of Ham. Gen. x. 14. According to Amos ix. 7, they came from Caphtor,

(which has been variously identified with Cappadocia, with the island of Crete and with a portion of Egypt), and seized upon the territory previously possessed by the Avims (Deut. ii. 23) in the region of *Azza*—that is, Gaza. The Philistines are spoken of as early as the time of Abraham (Gen. xxi. 34) and Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 1) in the region of Beer-sheba and Gerar; also at the time of the Exodus as holding the direct route from Egypt to Palestine. They were not conquered by Joshua, and he does not even seem to have come into collision with them, as they are not mentioned in any of his battles. They are but once referred to in the book of Joshua (xiii. 2, 3), and that simply as a people to be subdued. In the period of the Judges they for a time gained the ascendancy over Israel, until their power was broken by Samuel (1 Sam. vii. 13), and they were still further humbled by Saul and by David. They were not exterminated, however, and we hear of them in the reigns of the later kings as sometimes tributary and sometimes making incursions and predatory forays. They are once spoken of by Zechariah (ix. 6) after the return from the Babylonish exile, but from that time they vanish out of history.

When Israel took possession of Canaan, two tribes and a half were settled east of the Jordan, viz., Reuben on the south, Gad in the middle and the half tribe of Manasseh on the north. The other nine and a half tribes were located west of the Jordan; Judah, Simeon, Dan and Benjamin were in the south; Ephraim, Issachar and the other half of Manasseh were in the middle or central portion of the land; Zebulun, Asher and Naphtali were in the north. The tribe of Levi had no separate inheritance in the land, but forty-eight cities, with their suburbs, were assigned to them in the territory of the other tribes. Josh. xxi.

This partition among the tribes was, at the time of the schism of Jeroboam, superseded by another, or rather a

fresh division of yet greater political importance was superinduced upon it, viz., that into two rival and often hostile kingdoms. Ten tribes adhered to the northern section, which was called the kingdom of Israel, and sometimes the kingdom of Ephraim, from the preponderance of that powerful tribe. Judah and Benjamin adhered to the southern, which was called the kingdom of Judah.

Under the Romans and in the times of the New Testament the current division was into Judea, Samaria and Galilee on the west of Jordan, and Perea on the east of Jordan. The name Perea does not occur in the New Testament, but it is referred to as the region beyond Jordan. Matt. iv. 25.

LESSON III.

CITIES.

THE cities, towns and villages of Palestine may be conveniently grouped in four lines from north to south, corresponding to the main physical features of the country as already described. Omitting those which are rarely mentioned in the Bible, or which are of little consequence, we shall give a cursory view of the principal places situated—

1. On the plain along the sea-coast;
2. On the central highlands west of the Jordan;
3. In the plain of the Jordan;
4. On the highlands east of the Jordan.

CITIES NEAR THE SEA-COAST.

Proceeding from the north southward, we first come to three cities commonly reckoned as belonging to Phenicia rather than to Palestine, viz.:

Zidon or Sidon, which was assigned to Asher, though never conquered and occupied by that tribe. Judg. i. 31.

Zarephath or Sarepta, the village where Elijah was nourished by the widow. 1 Kings xvii. 9; Luke iv. 26.

Tyre was founded by a colony from Zidon, which in the time of Joshua still maintained its original superiority, and is hence called "great Zidon" (Josh. xi. 8; xix. 29); but by the days of David and Solomon, Tyre had outstripped the mother city, and had become the capital of Phenicia. 1 Kings v. 1, 6. Tyre was famous in antiquity not only for its extensive trade, but for the sieges which it sustained. Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, besieged it for five years without being able to reduce it. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, besieged it for thirteen years. Alexander the Great reduced it after a siege of seven months. The city has long since ceased to exist, and is, as was predicted, a place for the spreading of nets. Ezek. xxvi. 5.

Accho lay across the bay from Mount Carmel. It belonged to the tribe of Asher, though it was not conquered by them. Judg. i. 31. In the New Testament it is called Ptolemais, and is mentioned in the travels of the apostle Paul. Acts xxi. 7. Under its modern name, Acre, it was famous in the history of the Crusaders, and was held by them for some time after the rest of Palestine had been abandoned.

South of the promontory of Carmel we find Cæsarea, so called by Herod in honor of Augustus Cæsar, and commonly known as Cæsarea Palæstina, to distinguish it from Cæsarea Philippi, which lay at the foot of Mount Hermon, near the sources of the Jordan, and was so called from Philip, the tetrarch of that region (Luke iii. 1), who named it Cæsarea in honor of Tiberias Cæsar. Cæsarea Philippi is mentioned in our Lord's history (Matt. xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27), as he was once in its vicinity. Cæsarea of Palestine is spoken of repeatedly in the Acts of the Apostles. The evangelist Philip, one of the seven original deacons, resided there (Acts viii. 40; xxi. 8), so did Cornelius the

centurion (Acts x. 1); here Herod Agrippa came to his miserable end (Acts xii. 13, ff.), and it is several times mentioned in the narrative both of Paul's travels and of his imprisonment, being the residence of the Roman governors of Judea.

Antipatris is the place to which Paul was sent by the chief captain of Jerusalem on his way to Cæsarea after his arrest. Acts xxiii. 31.

Joppa or Japho (Josh. xix. 46) lay in the border of the territory assigned to Dan. The cedars of Lebanon were conveyed by sea to this place for building Solomon's temple (2 Chron. ii. 16), and again after the exile for building the second temple. Ezra iii. 7. Jonah took ship from Joppa when fleeing from the presence of the Lord. Jon. i. 3. Peter here restored Tabitha to life (Acts ix. 36, ff.), and he saw here the vision of the sheet let down from heaven. Acts x.

Lydda or Lod (Neh. xi. 35) lay in the vicinity of Joppa, on the road to Jerusalem; here Peter restored Eneas. Acts ix. 32, ff.

The neighboring Ramleh is by many regarded as the Arimathea of the New Testament (Matt. xxvii. 57) and the Ramathaim-Zophim of 1 Sam. i. 19, also often called Ramah, where the prophet Samuel was born, lived and died, though their identity is disputed.

Then follow the five cities of the Philistines (1 Sam. vi. 17), which may be traced in a circuit in alphabetical order • Ashkelon, Ashdod, Ekron, Gath, Gaza.

CITIES OF THE WESTERN HIGHLAND.

These are mostly situated on the crest which divides the eastern from the western declivity, or the waters flowing east from those flowing west, the summits having been built upon because they were the most impregnable and easily defensible positions. This too is the main traveled route

from south to north. Beginning at the south and proceeding northward, we come first to—

Ziklag, in the southern boundary of Judah, according to the original apportionment (Josh. xv. 31), afterward transferred to Simeon (Josh. xix. 5), presented to David by Achish, king of Gath (1 Sam. xxvii. 6), and sacked by the Amalekites, whom David chastised in consequence. 1 Sam. xxx. David was in Ziklag at the time of Saul's death. 2 Sam. i. 1.

Beersheba received its name from Abraham (Gen. xxi. 31), and is repeatedly mentioned in the sojournings of the patriarchs; from the sacredness thus attached to it, it became one of the chief seats of idolatry, and is so spoken of by the prophet Amos. v. 5; viii. 4. It lay near the southern border of Palestine, as did Dan near the northern; whence the phrase "from Dan to Beersheba" (Judg. xx. 1) denoted the entire land.

Hebron, called by the Canaanites Kirjath-arba or city of Arba (Josh. iv. 15), was for some time the abode of Abraham. Gen. xiii. 18. Here, in the cave of Machpelah, Abraham and Sarah were buried, as well as Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah. Gen. xlix. 31. In the division of the land it was given to Caleb as his possession (Josh. xiv. 14), and was one of the cities of refuge west of the Jordan (Josh. xx. 7), the other two being Shechem, in the centre of the land, and Kedesh, in the north. David reigned here over Judah seven years and six months (2 Sam. ii. 11), and was here anointed king over all Israel (2 Sam. v. 3), after which he transferred his capital to Jerusalem. It was at Hebron that Absalom began his rebellion. 2 Sam. xv. 10.

Bethlehem, also called Ephrath and Bethlehem-judah, to distinguish it from another Bethlehem of little note in the tribe of Zebulun. Near this place Rachel was buried. Gen. xxxv. 19. Here Elimelech and Naomi lived (Ruth i. 1), and hither Naomi returned with Ruth after a temporary sojourn in the land of Moab (Ruth i. 22), and here

David was born. 1 Sam. xvii. 12. But Bethlehem is chiefly distinguished as the birthplace of our Lord Jesus Christ (Matt. ii. 1), agreeably to the prophecy of Micah. v. 2.

Jerusalem, originally called Salem (Gen. xiv. 18), and during the Jebusite occupation Jebus (Judg. xix. 10), was made by David the capital of his kingdom and the religious centre of the nation after the expulsion of the Jebusites. 2 Sam. v. 6-9.

In the neighborhood of Jerusalem, toward the east, lay Bethany, the residence of Lazarus and his sisters (John xi. 18); Nob, where Ahimelech the priest gave David the shew-bread and the sword of Goliath (1 Sam. 21), in consequence of which all the inhabitants of the place were put to death by Saul; and Anathoth, a city of the priests within the limits of Benjamin (Josh. xxi. 18), to which Abiathar was banished by King Solomon (1 Kings ii. 26), and where the prophet Jeremiah was born. Jer. i. 1.

To the west of Jerusalem lay Mizpeh, where the children of Israel assembled themselves before the Lord, when they went up to war against Benjamin (Judg. xx. 1; xxi. 1), where Samuel gained his great victory over the Philistines (1 Sam. vii. 10), and where Saul was chosen king (1 Sam. ii. 17, ff.); Emmaus, whither our Lord walked with two disciples after his resurrection (Luke xxiv. 13), and which should not be confounded with another Emmaus, also called Nicopolis, on the road to Lydda and Joppa, which is nowhere mentioned in the Old or New Testament, though it is in the Apocrypha and by Josephus; and Gibeon, whose inhabitants made peace with Joshua by a stratagem (Josh. ix. 3), and which was subsequently a city of the priests (Josh. xxi. 17), and where the tabernacle of Moses was temporarily located. 2 Chron. i. 3.

Again proceeding northward from Jerusalem by the main route, we come to—

Gibeah, called also Gibeah of Benjamin and Gibeah of Saul, to distinguish it from other places of this name in different parts of the land. Here the crime was committed in the period of the judges which led to the almost total extinction of the tribe of Benjamin. Judg. ch. xix, xx. Here King Saul resided (1 Sam. x. 26), and here seven of Saul's descendants were executed to appease the Gibeonites. 2 Sam. xxi. 6.

Ramah was near Gibeah (Judg. xix. 13), and was fortified by Baasha, king of Israel, as a border city between the two kingdoms. 1 Kings xv. 17. This is not to be confounded with the Ramah where the prophet Samuel lived, which has not been certainly identified, though it may have been the same with the modern Ramleh.

Beerth, in the Canaanitish period subject to Gibeon (Josh. ix. 17); the murderers of Ishbosheth, the son of Saul, were natives of this place. 2 Sam. iv. 2.

Bethel, originally called Luz, where God appeared twice to Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 11, ff.; xxxv. 15), and where the ark was kept temporarily. Judg. xx. 26, 27. ["The house of God" (ver. 26) is properly "Bethel."] It was one of the places where the prophet Samuel judged. 1 Sam. vii. 16. The worship of the golden calves was set up here and at Dan, in the north of the land, by Jeroboam (1 Kings xii. 28, 29); the idolatry of Bethel was finally abolished by Josiah. 2 Kings xxiii. 15.

Shiloh, where the ark and the tabernacle remained from the time of Joshua (Josh. xviii. 1) to that of Samuel. 1 Sam. iv. 4.

Shechem, spoken of several times in the history of the patriarchs, a Levitical city and a city of refuge. Josh. xxi. 21. Here Joshua delivered his last address to the people. Josh. xxiv. 1. Jeroboam made it his residence after the schism. 1 Kings xii. 25. In John (iv. 5) it is called Sychar; it was there that our Lord conversed with the woman of

Samaria beside Jacob's well. It was subsequently called Neapolis, and in modern times this has been corrupted to Nablus.

Samaria, built by Omri, king of Israel (1 Kings xvi. 24), from which time it was the capital of the ten tribes, until the kingdom was finally overthrown by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria. 2 Kings xviii. 9, 10.

Jezreel, which gives name to the valley on the edge of which it lies. Here Ahab had a palace, here was the vineyard of Naboth which Ahab coveted (1 Kings xxi. 1), and here King Joram, Jezebel and the whole house of Ahab were slain by Jehu. 2 Kings ch. ix., x.

A short distance westward in the valley is Megiddo, where King Josiah was slain in battle with Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt. 2 Kings xxiii. 29.

Shunem, where the Philistines encamped against Saul prior to his last battle (1 Sam. xxviii. 4), and where the woman lived who entertained Elisha, and whose son he raised from the dead. 2 Kings iv. 8.

Nain, where our Lord restored the widow's son. Luke vii. 11.

Endor, where Saul consulted the woman with a familiar spirit. 1 Sam. xxviii. 7.

Nazareth, where our Lord's childhood was passed. Luke iv. 16.

Gath-hepher, the residence of the prophet Jonah. 2 Kings xiv. 25.

Cana, where our Lord's first miracle was wrought. John ii. 1.

Kedesh, a Levitical city and a city of refuge (Josh. xxi. 32), and the residence of Barak. Judg. iv. 6.

CITIES IN THE PLAIN OF THE JORDAN.

Beginning in the north and proceeding southward we find—Dan, also called Laish or Leshem, first mentioned in the

life of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 14), taken possession of by a party of Danites, though the proper territory of their tribe lay in the south of the land. Josh. xix. 47; Judg. xviii. 29. It was one of the chief seats of the worship of the golden calves established by Jeroboam. 1 Kings xii. 29.

Cæsarea Philippi, already spoken of as distinguished from Cæsarea Palæstina on the coast.

Then follow several places on the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret familiar from the history of our Lord's ministry—Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum (Matt. xi. 21, 23), Magdala (Matt. xv. 39), Dalmanutha (Mark viii. 10), Tiberias (John vi. 23), and, on the other side of the lake, Gadara. Luke viii. 26.

Beth-shan, where Saul's body was fastened to the wall of the town, and thus publicly exposed by the Philistines. 1 Sam. xxxi. 10. Its later name, Scythopolis, has been thought to confirm the statement of Herodotus that the Scythians once made an irruption into this region.

Bethabara, where John baptized (John i. 28), probably the same as Beth-barah (Judg. vii. 24), where Gideon checked the Midianites at the crossing of the Jordan.

Jericho, also called the city of palm trees (Deut. xxxiv. 3), was the first city taken by Joshua. Josh. ch. vi. The curse pronounced on him who should rebuild the walls miraculously thrown down (Josh. vi. 26) was fulfilled upon Hiel the Bethelite. 1 Kings xvi. 34. Sons or pupils of the prophets were residing in Jericho in the time of Elijah and Elisha (2 Kings ii. 5); here Elisha healed the fountain by casting in salt (2 Kings ii. 21); here King Zedekiah was overtaken when attempting to flee from the Chaldeans (2 Kings xxv. 5); here our Lord was the guest of Zaccheus (Luke xix. 1-5) and cured the blindness of Bartimeus. Luke xviii. 35.

Gilgal was the first encampment of Israel in the promised land. Josh. iv. 19. Sacrifices were offered here by Samuel (1 Sam. x. 8; xi. 15) and by Saul. 1 Sam. xiii. 7-9. This

was one of the places of Samuel's judgment. 1 Sam. vii. 16. Agag, king of the Amalekites, was here hewed to death by Samuel before the Lord. 1 Sam. xv. 33. Judah came to Gilgal to meet King David returning after the death of Absalom. 2 Sam. xix. 16. It is also mentioned in the life of Elijah (2 Kings ii. 1), and was the scene of one of Elisha's miracles. 2 Kings iv. 38. There was another Gilgal in the vicinity of Antipatris, to which it has been supposed by several scholars that some of these events are to be referred.

En-gedi lay on the western shore of the Dead Sea. David concealed himself in the adjacent wilderness when pursued by Saul. 1 Sam. xxiv. 1. Here Ammon, Moab and Edom combined against Jehoshaphat when he gained his signal victory over them. 2 Chron. xx. 2.

The Dead Sea covers the sites of the cities of the plain which God overthrew by fire from heaven—Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim. Deut. xxix. 23. Zoar was spared at Lot's intercession when the rest were consumed. Gen. xix. 21, 22.

Kadesh-barnea was on the southern border of Palestine. Num. xxxiv. 4. It was from this place the spies were sent who brought back an evil report of the land. Num. xiii. 26. Here Miriam died (Num. xx. 1) and Moses and Aaron committed the trespass which excluded them from the promised land. Num. xx. 12.

CITIES EAST OF THE JORDAN.

Beginning in the south and proceeding northward—Machærus was a strong fortress east of the Dead Sea which is not named in the Bible, but where, according to Josephus, John the Baptist was imprisoned and executed.

Ramoth-gilead, a Levitical city (Josh. xxi. 38), and one of the three cities of refuge east of the Jordan (Josh. xx. 8), the other two being Bezer in the south and Golan in the north. Here Ahab was slain in battle by the Syrians (1 Kings xxii. 29-34), Joram, the son of Ahab, was

wounded (2 Kings viii. 28), and Jehu was anointed king over Israel by Elisha's direction. 2 Kings ix. 1, 2.

Mahanaim, where Jacob was met by the angels of God as he was returning to Canaan from Padan-aram (Gen. xxxii. 2), where Ishbosheth, Saul's son, was made king in opposition to David (2 Sam. ii. 8), and whither David fled when pursued by Absalom. 2 Sam. xvii. 24.

Jabesh-gilead, from which wives were taken for the remnant of Benjamin in the general massacre of the tribe. Judg. xxi. 14. It was threatened by the Ammonites and relieved by Saul. 1 Sam. xi. 1-11. Its inhabitants took the bodies of Saul and his sons from the scene of their shameful exposure by the Philistines, and buried them. 1 Sam. xxxi. 11-13.

LESSON IV.

OTHER BIBLE LANDS.

ANTEDILUVIAN geography embraces the garden of Eden (Gen. ii. 8, ff.), with its four rivers, the Pison, which compassed the land of Havilah, the Gihon, which compassed the land of Cush,* the Hiddekel and the Euphrates; also the land of Nod (Gen. iv. 19), to which Cain was banished, and the city of Enoch (ver. 17), built by him. None of these can be certainly identified at the present time, except the two rivers the Euphrates and the Hiddekel, which is the Hebrew name for the Tigris. Dan. x. 4.

After the flood the ark rested upon the mountains of Ararat (Gen. viii. 4), which is not in the Bible the name of a single peak, but of the high table-land of Armenia

*See the margin of the English version. It is not the Ethiopia known to later history which is intended, but some region now unknown, which was occupied by Cush (Gen. x. 7), or a portion of his descendants.

(2 Kings xix. 37; Jer. li. 27), which contains the sources of the Euphrates and Tigris. On the banks of the former, in the lower portion of its course, lay the land of Shinar (Gen. xi. 2), where the tower of Babel was built, whose site was subsequently enclosed in the great city of Babylon. In the days of Abraham the king of Shinar, with others, invaded Canaan. Gen. xiv. 1. A goodly Babylonish garment is mentioned among the spoils of the city of Jericho when it was taken by Joshua. Josh. vii. 21. Babylon reached its greatest splendor and the height of its power under Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. iv. 30), by whom Jerusalem was destroyed and Judah carried into captivity. Its superb palaces and other structures, and the vast compass and height of its walls, made it the wonder of the world. After its capture by Cyrus (Isa. xlv. 1) it gradually declined until it became an utter desolation. Isa. xiii. 19, ff. The cities of Erech, Accad and Calneh (or Calno, Isa. x. 9), which, with Babel, formed the beginning of Nimrod's kingdom, were also in the land of Shinar. Gen. x. 10. So was the plain of Dura (Dan. iii. 1), where Nebuchadnezzar set up his golden image.

Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, an exceeding great city of three days' journey (Jon. iii. 3), lay on the eastern bank of the Tigris. Rehoboth, Calah and Resen (Gen. x. 11, 12) were in the same vicinity. Cuthah, Ava (or Ivah), Sepharvaim (2 Kings xvii. 24) and Hena (xix. 13) were on or near the Euphrates, and subject to the king of Assyria.

Media is in the Bible commonly associated with Persia, to which it was united under Cyrus and his successors. Dan. v. 28; Esth. i. 3. The captive Israelites were located by the king of Assyria in the cities of the Medes, and by Habor, the river of Gozan. 2 Kings xvii. 6. Whether this is the same as the river Chebar (Ezek. iii. 15), where the captives of Judah were subsequently settled, is disputed.

The capital of Media was Achmetha (Ezra vi. 2), or Ecbatana; this was the royal residence of Cyrus, where, accordingly, the official records of his reign were preserved. Elam was at first an independent kingdom (Gen. xiv. 1), but was afterward incorporated in the Persian empire. Its chief city, Shushan, near the river Ulai (Dan. viii. 2), was the residence of Darius and the later Persian kings. Parthians are mentioned (Acts ii. 9), along with Medes and Elamites, as present in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. India is once mentioned in the Bible (Esth. i. 1), and it has even been conjectured that China is referred to under the name of Sinim. Isa. xlix. 12.

The district between the Tigris and Euphrates, north of Babylonia, is known as Mesopotamia (Gen. xi. 10), or Padan-aram. Gen. xxv. 20. Here was Haran (Gen. xi. 31), to which Terah, the father of Abraham, removed from Ur of the Chaldees, which some likewise place in this same region, though others, with greater probability, seek for it further south, in Chaldea proper or Babylonia. Pethor, the native place of Balaam, was in Mesopotamia. Deut. xxiii. 4. So was Carchemish on the Euphrates, where Nebuchadnezzar gained a victory over Pharaoh-necho. 2 Chron. xxxv. 20; Jer. xlvi. 2.

Padan-aram, literally, the plain of Aram, is a part of the territory called Aram (Num. xxiii. 7), or Syria, in the Old Testament, where this term is used in its widest sense as extending from Lebanon to the Tigris. Hence Bethuel and Laban are called Syrians because they resided in Padan-aram. Gen. xxv. 20. More commonly the term is restricted to the territory west of the Euphrates; and so understood, it was in the time of Saul and David divided into several minor states or kingdoms, as Bethrehab, Zobah, Maacah (2 Sam. x. 6), Geshur (2 Sam. xiii. 37; xv. 8) and Damascus. 2 Sam. viii. 6. Tiphseh, on the Euphrates, is spoken of (1 Kings iv. 24) as marking the eastern limit

of Solomon's dominions. Tadmor, built by Solomon in the wilderness, is known in later times as Palmyra. Damascus, in a fertile plain watered by the Abana and Pharpar (2 Kings v. 12), is at least as old as the time of Abraham. Gen. xv. 2. It was subdued by David (2 Sam. viii. 6), but recovered its independence under Solomon (1 Kings xi. 24), and was subsequently the capital of a formidable power. To this city Paul was going at the time of his conversion (Acts ix. 3), and he lodged there in the street which was called Straight. It was at this time subject to Aretas, an Arabian king. 2 Cor. xii. 32. Antioch, on the river Orontes, was the city where the disciples were first called Christians (Acts xi. 26), and from which the apostle Paul set forth on his missionary journeys. Its seaport was Seleucia, at the mouth of the river, whence Paul and Barnabas sailed for Cyprus. Hamath, called by the prophet Amos (vi. 2) Hamath the Great, was situated on the Orontes, about midway between Antioch and the source of the river. The entrance of Hamath, repeatedly mentioned as the limit of the promised land (Num. xxxiv. 8; 1 Kings viii. 65), is either a stream or depression by which Hamath was readily reached from the sea-coast. Still higher on the Orontes was Riblah, in the land of Hamath, where Jehoahaz was put in chains by the king of Egypt (2 Kings xxiii. 33), and the eyes of Zedekiah were put out by Nebuchadnezzar. 2 Kings xxv. 7.

We shall now pass from countries east of Palestine to those which lay south of it. South of the territory of Israel, east of the Jordan, and separated from it by the Arnon, lay the land of Moab, with its cities Kir of Moab and Ar of Moab (Isa. xv. 1); the former was also called Kir-hareseth. Isa. xvi. 7. The southern limit of Moab was the brook or valley of Jared. Num. xxi. 12. Next follows the mountainous district of Edom or Idumea, also called Mount Seir, which extends to the northern extremity of the Red Sea. ✓

Mount Hor, where Aaron died (Num. xx. 23), is one of its most conspicuous summits. Its ports, Ezion-geber and Elath, are first mentioned at the time of the Exodus. Deut. ii. 8. In the former Solomon built his navy of ships for foreign trade. 1 Kings ix. 26. The latter, having been in the possession of Judah from the conquest of Edom by David (2 Sam. viii. 14) till its revolt in the reign of Joram (2 Kings viii. 22), was again restored to Judah and fortified by Uzziah (2 Kings xix. 22), though it at a later period fell into the hands of the Syrians. 2 Kings xvi. 6. Bozrah, near its northern border (Gen. xxxvi. 33; Isa. xxxiv. 6), and Sela (Isa. xxxiv. 6) were its principal cities. Sela was taken by King Amaziah, and called by him Joktheel (2 Kings xiv. 7); at a later time it was the residence of the Nabathean king Aretas. 2 Cor. xi. 32. It is the same as the Roman Petra, from which this portion of Arabia received the name of Arabia Petræa. Teman was either a town or a district in the south of Edom; the precise location of Dedan is uncertain. Jer. xlix. 7, 8. Mount Seir is skirted on the west by the valley which extends southward from the Dead Sea to the eastern arm of the Red Sea. Between this and the Mediterranean lies the desolate region known as the wilderness of Paran (Gen. xxi. 21); its western portion, adjacent to the land of Egypt, was also called the wilderness of Shur (Ex. xv. 22), or of Etham. Num. xxxiii. 8. This was occupied by roving tribes of Amalekites and others (1 Sam. xxvii. 8), and was drained by the river of Egypt (1 Kings viii. 65), which was not the Nile, but the modern wady el-Arish, and marked the boundary between Egypt and Palestine.

Between the two projecting arms of the Red Sea lies the peninsula of Sinai, so named from Mount Sinai, near its southern extremity, where the law of God was given to Israel (Ex. xix. 18), and which was an individual summit in the mass of mountains collectively called Horeb. Ex. iii. 1. The adjacent portion of the desert was known as

the wilderness or desert of Sinai (*Ex. xix. 1, 2*), between which and Etham lay the wilderness of Sin. *Ex. xvi. 1*; *Num. xxxiii. 11*.

Sheba, whose queen was attracted by the fame of Solomon (*1 Kings x. 1*), was in Southern Arabia. It has been disputed whether Ophir, which was so famous for its gold (*Job xxviii. 16*), and which was visited by Solomon's vessels (*1 Kings ix. 28*), was in Arabia, Africa or India.

If we except Mesopotamia, from which Abraham removed to Canaan, no Gentile land is more intimately associated with the early history of the chosen race than Egypt. Abraham went down thither when there was a famine in Canaan (*Gen. xii. 10*); so did Jacob and his family, who were settled in the land of Goshen, in that part of Egypt which was nearest Palestine. On, where Joseph's father-in-law was priest (*Gen. xli. 45*), was a city of Lower Egypt near the head of the delta of the Nile. It was called Bethshemesh (house of the sun) by Jeremiah (*xliii. 13*), and by the Greeks Heliopolis (city of the sun). Pithom and Raamses were treasure-cities built by the Israelites for Pharaoh. *Ex. i. 11*. Pi-hahiroth, Migdol and Baal-zephon (*Ex. xiv. 2*) are mentioned in the march of Israel out of Egypt, and lay near the eastern frontier. Sin (*Ezek. xxx. 15*), or Pelusium, which is called by Ezekiel the strength of Egypt, lay near the eastern or Pelusiac mouth of the Nile, and gave name to the adjacent wilderness of Sin. *Ex. xvi. 1*. Tahpanhes, to which the wretched remnant of Jews fled after the destruction of Jerusalem and the murder of Gedaliah (*Jer. xliii. 7*), was upon the same branch of the Nile. Pi-beseth (*Ezek. xxx. 17*) and Zoan, which is said in *Num. xiii. 22* to have been built seven years after Hebron, were on a canal connecting the Pelusiac arm of the Nile with the sea. Alexandria, the birthplace of Apollos (*Acts xviii. 24*), was the capital of Egypt under the Ptolemies, and was founded by Alexander the Great, whose name

it bears. Both the ship in which Paul was wrecked (Acts xxvii. 6) and that in which he sailed from Malta to Italy (xxviii. 11) were from Alexandria. Memphis, also called Noph (Isa. xix. 13), the capital of Lower Egypt, was in the vicinity of the pyramids and ancient tombs. Hos. ix. 6. Hanes (Isa. xxx. 4) is by some placed a short distance south of Memphis, and by others identified with Tahpanhes, already mentioned. Pathros (Ezek. xxix. 14) probably denotes Upper Egypt, and No (Jer. xlvi. 25), or No-amon (English version, populous No, Nah. iii. 8), was its celebrated capital, known to the Greeks as Thebes. Syene was on the southern border of Egypt, whence "from Migdol to Syene" designated the land throughout its entire extent. Ezek. xxix. 10; xxx. 6 (in the margin of the English version). Beyond Syene lay Ethiopia, which was often united with Egypt under the same king. This was the case under Zerah, who invaded Judah in the time of King Asa (2 Chron. xiv. 9), and Tirhakah, the antagonist of Sennacherib. 2 Kings xix. 9. Seba, though sometimes distinguished from Ethiopia (Isa. xliii. 3; xlv. 14), was more commonly included under it; it denotes the so-called island of Meroe, beyond the rivers of Ethiopia (Isa. xviii. 1)—that is to say, the tongue of land included between the two main branches of the Nile. Philip baptized a eunuch of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians (Acts viii. 27, ff.), as an earnest and first fruits of the promise, "Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God." Ps. lxxviii. 31.

The entire north of Africa, west of Egypt, went by the general name of Libya. Libyan troops are spoken of in the armies of Egypt. Jer. xlvi. 9. One of its principal cities was Cyrene, from which Simon came, who bare the cross of Jesus. Mark xv. 21. There was a synagogue in Jerusalem composed wholly or in part of Cyrenians. Acts vi. 9. Men from this city and its neighborhood were present on the day of Pentecost (Acts

ii. 10), and were subsequently active in spreading the gospel. xi. 20.

North and west from Palestine lay Asia Minor, Europe and the islands of the Mediterranean and Ægean Seas.

There are twelve divisions of Asia Minor commonly recognized. Three were on its southern coast, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia; three on its western, Caria, Lydia, Mysia; three on its northern, Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Pontus; and three in the interior, Cappadocia, Galatia, Phrygia. The apostle Paul was born in Cilicia, in the city of Tarsus. Acts xxi. 39. Perga, in Pamphylia, was the first city in Asia Minor visited by Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey (Acts xiii. 13); Attalia, six miles distant on the coast, is the port at which they embarked on their return. Acts xiv. 25. From Patara, in Lycia, Paul sailed for Phœnicia on his way to Jerusalem. Acts xxi. 1. At Myra, as a prisoner, he entered an Alexandrian ship bound for Italy. Acts xxvii. 5. Caria, Lydia and Mysia constituted the Roman province of Asia, and it is in this limited sense that the word Asia is used in the New Testament—*e. g.*, Acts ii. 9; xvi. 6, 7. The seven churches in Asia (Rev. i. 4) accordingly were in this region, viz.: Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea, though the last named was in Phrygia, and therefore farther inland than the rest. Trogyllium, mentioned in Paul's last missionary journey (Acts xx. 15), and Miletus, where he took final leave of the Ephesian elders (v. 17), were on the coast of Lydia. Troas, from which Paul first sailed into Macedonia (Acts xvi. 8), and where he restored Eutychus to life (xx. 19), was the capital of Mysia. When Paul proposed to go into Bithynia on his second missionary journey, the Spirit suffered him not (Acts xvi. 7), it being the will of God that he should pass on into Europe. The apostle Peter addressed his first Epistle to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithy-

nia. 1 Pet. i. 1. Dwellers in Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia were in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. Acts ii. 9. Aquila, with whom Paul abode at Corinth and engaged in his occupation as a tent-maker, was born in Pontus. Acts xviii. 2. Galatia, to which the apostle Paul directed one of his Epistles, in its widest sense included Lycaonia and Pisidia, and consequently the cities of Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 14)—so called in distinction from Antioch in Syria—Iconium (xiv. 1), Lystra and Derbe (v. 6), visited by Paul and Barnabas in their first missionary journey. Colosse, to which one of Paul's Epistles was written, and Hierapolis (Col. iv. 13) were in Phrygia.

Macedonia was the first country in Europe in which the gospel was preached by the apostle Paul (Acts xvi. 10), he having been directed thither by a special vision. He landed at Neapolis and proceeded at once to Philippi, so named from the father of Alexander the Great. Here he met Lydia of Thyatira, and his imprisonment led to the conversion of the jailer and his household. Acts xvi. 12, ff. He likewise visited Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica and Berea. From Berea he hastened to Greece, where he visited Athens and made his defence before the court of the Areopagus (Acts xvii. 15); also Corinth (xviii. 1), the chief city of Achaia, where he was brought before the judgment-seat of Gallio, and its seaport Cenchrea (v. 18), the residence of Phebe. Rom. xvi. 1. He also preached the gospel as far as Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19), which was west of Macedonia and bordered on the Adriatic Sea. Paul speaks (Titus iii. 12) of having resolved to spend a winter in Nicopolis, probably the city of that name in Epirus, south of Illyricum, though the subscription to the Epistle (which is, however, of little authority) refers it to a Nicopolis in Macedonia.

Between Illyricum, on the one side, and Italy, on the other, lay the Adriatic Sea; this name was sometimes

extended to that portion of the Mediterranean bounded by Italy and Sicily on the west, Africa on the south, and Greece and Crete on the east. It is in this wide sense of the term that Paul and his fellow-passengers are said to have been driven up and down in Adria. Acts xxvii. 27.

In Italy mention is made not only of Rome, but of the places through which Paul passed in journeying toward it, viz.: Rhegium, in the extreme south of the peninsula; Puteoli, near Naples, where he landed; Appii Forum, which was thirty-five miles from Rome; and The Three Taverns, which was five miles nearer the imperial city.

The westernmost country spoken of in the Bible is Spain, which Paul proposed to visit, though it does not appear that his intention was ever carried into effect. Rom. xv. 24, 28. The Tarshish of the Old Testament for which Jonah set sail (Jon. i. 3), and to which Solomon traded, was probably a Phœnician colony in the south of Spain.

The islands named in the Bible are Cyprus, the native country of Barnabas (Acts iv. 36), and over which Barnabas and Paul passed from Salamis, on its eastern coast, to Paphos, on its western; Crete, with which many have identified the Caphtor of the Old Testament, from which the Philistines originally came. Amos ix. 7. Here Paul left Titus to labor. Tit. i. 3. In Paul's last voyage mention is made (Acts xxvii. 7, 8) of the promontory of Salmone, at the north-eastern extremity of the island, and of Lasea, The Fair Havens and Phenice (v. 12), on its southern side. The island Clauda (v. 16), a short distance south of Crete, Rhodes, Coos (Acts xxi. 1), Patmos, to which the apostle John was banished (Rev. i. 9), Samos, Chios (Acts xx. 15), Lesbos, the capital of which was Mitylene (v. 14), and Samothracia (Acts xvi. 11) were in the Grecian Archipelago. Paul was shipwrecked on Melita or Malta (Acts xxviii. 1), and after leaving this island stopped at Syracuse on the eastern coast of Sicily. v. 12.

ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE BIBLE.

LESSON I.

FOOD.

THE archæology of the Bible is an account of the customs and usages described or referred to in the sacred volume. So far as these are different from those which prevail at the present day or amongst ourselves, a knowledge of them is important for the illustration of the passages in which these references occur, being sometimes essential to a right apprehension of their meaning and at others adding greatly to their force or beauty. Archæology may be conveniently divided into three parts, corresponding to three several spheres in which human life may be regarded as moving. We may consider man in a threefold aspect, as he is a member of the family or of the community or of the nation. The family has its domestic and social usages, which may therefore be held to constitute the first branch of archæology; the second relates to the various trades and occupations practiced in the community; and the third embraces the civil and political regulations belonging to the nation.

The full and satisfactory discussion of these several themes would require a volume. We find ourselves unable to compress even the most meagre account of them into the few pages that are allotted to this subject in the plan of the present treatise. It will only be possible to present a few

topics as specimens and representatives of the whole. We shall accordingly make a selection from the first branch of the general subject, or domestic and social archæology. This has its two divisions, viz., internal and external. The former relates to the constitution of the family itself, and concerns—1. The bond of marriage, upon which the family is based. 2. The relationship which it creates of parents and children, masters and servants. 3. Its varied experiences of joy or sorrow, as connected with social intercourse, with sickness or with death. The remaining division, which in contrast with the preceding has been called external—and it is to this that our attention shall be exclusively directed—is occupied with the provision made in the family for the supply of the outward physical necessities of its members, viz.: 1. Food; 2. Clothing; 3. Dwellings.

As to the articles of food in ordinary use among the Hebrews, and the mode of their preparation, there is much that is obvious and common to them with ourselves. They subsisted partly, of course, upon the products of the soil, and partly upon such animal food as was accessible. Bread was with them, as with us, the staff of life (Isa. iii. 1), as is shown by the current phrase to “eat bread” for partaking of food. Gen. iii. 19; xxxi. 54. It was prepared from the various cereals, particularly wheat (Ps. lxxxix. 16), which was preferred, and which is accordingly commonly meant when “corn” is spoken of in the Bible, as Gen. xlii. 1; though barley was also used (Judg. vii. 13; 2 Kings iv. 42), and in case of necessity poorer and coarser grains (Ezek. iv. 9) might be employed which in ordinary times were only fed to cattle. Grain might be eaten in the ear in its natural state, as by the disciples of Jesus, who plucked it as they walked through the field (Luke vi. 1), or when newly ripe it might be parched or roasted, as by the reapers of Boaz. Ruth ii. 14. It was mostly, however, made into cakes or bread, and for this purpose was first beaten fine in mortars

(Prov. xxvii. 22) or ground into flour (Ex. xxix. 2) in the mill. Num. xi. 8. This latter was an article of ordinary domestic use, and consisted of two millstones, the nether, which was fixed (Job xli. 24), and the upper, which was movable, and was turned by women (Matt. xxiv. 41) or by slaves. Judg. xvi. 21; Lam. v. 13. Two sat facing each other, one of whom grasped the handle and impelled it halfway round; then the other completed the revolution. In consequence of the menial character of this occupation the extremes of society are indicated in Ex. xi. 5 by saying "From Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne unto the maid-servant that is behind the mill." And the prophet Isaiah expressed the utmost degradation of the daughter of Babylon by bidding her to take the millstones and grind meal. Isa. xlvii. 2. The sound of the mill was daily heard in every house, so that its ceasing betokened desolation (Jer. xxv. 10; Rev. xviii. 22), and from its indispensable character it was forbidden to take a millstone in pledge for debt. Deut. xxiv. 6. Larger mills were turned by asses; and when Jesus speaks of a millstone being hanged about a man's neck and his being drowned in the sea (Matt. xviii. 6; Luke xvii. 2), the term used in the original Greek shows that it was one of this larger sort which was intended.

The flour thus prepared was baked, either leavened or unleavened (Gen. xix. 3; Ex. xii. 39), in the hot ashes or on heated stone (1 Kings xix. 6) or iron plates (Lev. vii. 9) or in a sort of ovens. Hos. vii. 4-6. These last were stone or earthen cylinders about three feet high, in which fire was made, and the dough was spread upon their heated exterior, or holes dug in the ground, in which bread or cakes, or, thinner still, wafers (Lev. xxix. 23), were baked on the tilting of the bottom or sides, after the fire had been drawn out and the ashes swept away. What are called loaves of bread were thin circular disks, which were not cut but broken. Lam. iv. 4; Matt. xiv. 19; xxvi. 26. Professional

bakers are not only spoken of in royal households, as that of Pharaoh (Gen. xl. 1) and Saul (1 Sam. viii. 13), but there were likewise public ovens (Hos. vii. 4, 6), at least in the later portions of the Old Testament history; and from the mention (Jer. xxxvii. 21) of the bakers' street, it would appear that the usage then prevailed which is still maintained in Oriental cities of appropriating whole bazaars or rows of shops to certain trades or kinds of business.

Various vegetables are mentioned, as lentiles, of which Jacob made pottage (Gen. xxv. 34), cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions and garlic, which the children of Israel had eaten in Egypt, and for which they longed in the desert (Num. xi. 5), beans (2 Sam. xvii. 8), garden plants (1 Kings xxi. 2), and plants growing wild which were gathered for food (2 Kings iv. 39; Prov. xv. 17); likewise fruit of different kinds (2 Sam. xvi. 1; Amos viii. 2), particularly apples (Sol. Song ii. 5), pomegranates (Num. xx. 5), grapes and figs (Matt. vii. 16), which were not only eaten fresh, but dried as raisins, or compacted into a solid mass as cakes of pressed grapes or figs. 1 Sam. xxv. 18. Grape cakes were esteemed very refreshing (Cant. ii. 5), and were distributed with other provisions among the people assembled at the removal of the ark to Zion (2 Sam. vi. 19); they are also mentioned among the delicacies associated with idolatry (Hos. iii. 1); in each of these passages the English version incorrectly has "bottles" or "flagons of wine." The word "dates" occurs (2 Chron. xxxi. 5) in the margin of the English Bible, though it is not the proper rendering of the original term; the palm tree, which is repeatedly spoken of in Scripture (Deut. xxxiv. 3; Ps. xcii. 12), however, is the date-palm, and the use of its fruit, though not expressly mentioned, is implied. Cant. vii. 8. Sycamore fruit was gathered and eaten only by the humbler classes. Amos vii. 14. Mention is also made of almonds and other species of nuts. Gen. xliii. 11; Cant. vi. 11.

It has been made a question whether animal food was in use before the flood, inasmuch as it was not explicitly contained in the grant made to Adam (Gen. i. 29), while it was in that made to Noah and his descendants (Gen. ix. 3); though the keeping of sheep and cattle (Gen. iv. 2, 20), clothing made from skins (Gen. iii. 21) and the distinction between clean and unclean animals which was recognized prior to the flood (Gen. vii. 2, 8) seem to imply that it was made use of from the earliest periods. In so warm a climate as that of Palestine it was less necessary than in colder regions. And the fact that meat could be kept but a short time, and the whole animal had consequently to be eaten soon after being killed, added to the expense and led to its being but sparingly used, except upon the tables of the rich and great, as of King Solomon (1 Kings iv. 22, 23) or Nehemiah, the Persian viceroy (Neh. v. 18), or on special occasions of hospitality (Gen. xviii. 7), festivity (Luke xv. 23) or religious observance. Ex. xii. 8; Deut. xiv. 26; xv. 19, 20. The Jewish law forbade the eating of any but clean animals. Lev. xi. 2, ff; Deut. xiv. 4, ff. These are among quadrupeds those which part the hoof and chew the cud, as oxen, sheep and goats, together with deer and some other kinds of game; among fish—of which they had already learned to be fond in Egypt (Num. xi. 5), and which were supplied by the Sea of Galilee (Matt. iv. 18), as well as brought by Tyrians to the markets of Jerusalem (Neh. xiii. 16)—such only as have fins and scales; among birds all but certain prohibited species, which were mostly birds of prey, or such as fed in marshes, or on worms, carcasses or other impurities. Quails, doves, partridges, sparrows and fatted fowl (1 Kings iv. 23), by which were probably meant geese or ducks, are mentioned in the Old Testament; chickens only in the New. Luke xiii. 34; xxii. 60. That eggs were eaten appears from Job vi. 6; Isa. x. 14; Luke xi. 12. Among insects, the esculent locust (Lev. xi. 22; Matt. iii. 4) was allowed to be eaten, as it still

is by the poorer classes in Arabia and the East, by whom it is salted and cooked, or ground into flour and baked. The sacrificial system further made it unlawful to eat blood (Lev. vii. 26, 27; xvii. 10–14) or flesh in which the blood remained (1 Sam. xiv. 32), and by consequence animals strangled or killed by wild beasts (Ex. xxii. 31; Lev. xvii. 15); also those fat pieces which were customarily burned upon the altar. Lev. iii. 17; vii. 23–25. The sinew was also extracted from the thigh for a special reason. Gen. xxxii. 32.

The care of cattle is associated with the products of the dairy. The milk of cows, goats and sheep (Deut. xxxii. 15; Prov. xxvii. 27) was used in its natural state or made into cheese (1 Sam. xvii. 18; Job x. 10) or butter, the latter denoting not merely butter in the modern sense (Prov. xxx. 33), but more commonly curds, of which the Orientals are very fond. Judg. v. 25. Honey is often joined with milk in describing the fertility and abundance of Canaan (Ex. iii. 8), or, as in Isa. vii. 22, those natural means of subsistence which still remained when the country was ravaged and agriculture suspended. Besides the honey made by bees, which was often found wild (Deut. xxxii. 13; 1 Sam. xiv. 25; Matt. iii. 4), there was also a honey artificially prepared; at least it is the opinion of many scholars that this name was also applied, as by the modern Arabs, to a sweet syrup made from grape juice or from dates. Gen. xliii. 11; 2 Chron. xxxi. 5; Ezek. xxvii. 17.

Oil and salt, though not themselves articles of food, were used in preparing and seasoning it. Lev. ii. 4; Job vi. 6. With allusion to its preserving quality, a "covenant of salt" (Num. xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5) is a perpetual covenant, and the disciples of Christ are called the "salt of the earth." Matt. v. 13. As it is the opposite of both insipidity and corruption, the apostle directs that our speech should be always "seasoned with salt." Col. iv: 6.

The drinks spoken of in addition to water and milk are

wine, strong drink (Lev. x. 9, prepared from barley, honey or dates, and so called from its intoxicating properties), and vinegar, which was a sour wine. Num. vi. 3; Ruth ii. 14. Wine when drunk was sometimes weakened with water (Isa. i. 22) in the proportion, as the Rabbins say, of three parts of water to one of wine; sometimes it was rendered more exciting by the infusion of spices. Prov. ix. 2, 5; Cant. viii. 2. Hence an ambiguity in the expression "mixed wine." Thus the wrath of God is compared to wine "full of mixture" (Ps. lxxv. 8)—*i. e.*, with its strength increased by intensifying ingredients; and it is said to be "poured out without mixture" (Rev. xiv. 10)—*i. e.*, undiluted. Wine also became stronger by being left upon its lees, when it required to be strained to free it from dregs or insects. Isa. xxv. 6; Matt. xxiii. 24. Sour wine mingled with myrrh or other bitter ingredients was sometimes given to those who were executed to stupefy them and render them insensible to suffering. Prov. xxxi. 6; Matt. xxvii. 34, 48.

The chief meal of the ancient Egyptians was at noon, and accordingly Joseph dined at this hour (Gen. xliii. 16); so was the principal repast throughout the Old Testament, Ruth ii. 14; 1 Kings xx. 16. But in the New Testament the Greek and Roman custom prevailed of having the chief meal at night, and entertainments were generally suppers. Mark vi. 21; Luke xiv. 12, 16; John xii. 2. The primitive posture of the Hebrews, as of the Egyptians, at table was sitting. Thus Joseph's brethren sat when they ate with him (Gen. xliii. 33); Jacob invited his father to "sit and eat" (Gen. xxvii. 19); the Levite and his father-in-law in Bethlehem-judah "sat down and did eat and drink." Judg. xix. 6. David sat at meat with Saul, and when absent left his seat empty (1 Sam. xx. 5, 18, 24); the man of God out of Judah "sat at the table" in Bethel. 1 Kings xiii. 20. At a later period luxurious livers adopted the fashion of reclining; thus Amos (vi. 4) says that they "lie upon beds of

ivory and stretch themselves upon their couches"—not for sleep, as appears from what follows in the very same sentence—"and eat the lambs out of the flock and calves out of the stall." And the Persian origin of this new fashion is distinctly intimated in the book of Esther (i. 6), where the banquet-hall of Ahasuerus is described as containing "beds" or couches. In our Saviour's day the universal custom was to recline on couches, called in Greek *triclinia* because they usually held three persons. The knowledge of this usage is absolutely necessary to explain how John could "lean on Jesus' bosom" at the table (John xiii. 23; xxi. 20); for as each person supported himself on his left arm, he was brought into this relation to the one who lay next to him. It also shows how the woman who anointed him had access to his feet. Luke vii. 38. Modern Orientals sit on their heels or with their legs crossed before a waiter placed upon a wooden stool about a foot high, or before a round piece of leather spread upon the floor and provided with rings in its outer edge, so that it can be drawn together like a bag and hung up after eating. It has been suggested that such a table might easily be likened to a snare. Ps. lxix. 22; Rom. xi. 9. In the absence of knives and forks, the food was taken with the fingers, which explains our Lord's expression, "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish" (Matt. xxvi. 23), as well as his act of dipping the sop. John xiii. 26. Hence the hands were washed before and after each meal, which the Pharisees erected into an obligatory religious ceremony. Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 2, ff; Luke xi. 38. Allusions to the usual practice of asking a blessing or giving thanks before eating occur in the case of Samuel (1 Sam. ix. 13), and repeatedly in the history of our Lord. Matt. xiv. 19.

When entertainments were given, invited guests were notified by servants at the proper hour (Prov. ix. 3; Matt. xxii. 3, 4); they were welcomed with a kiss upon their arrival (Luke vii. 45), their feet were washed (Gen. xviii. 4; Luke vii. 44),

their hair and beard anointed (Ps. xxiii. 5; Amos vi. 6; Luke vii. 46), and places were assigned them at the table according to their rank. Gen. xliii. 33; 1 Sam. ix. 22; Luke xiv. 8, ff. As a mark of special honor choice pieces were sent them by the host (1 Sam. ix. 24), sometimes double the ordinary quantity (1 Sam. i. 5), or even more. Gen. xliii. 34. As an illustration of the modes of diversion sometimes resorted to on such occasions may be mentioned the riddle propounded at Samson's wedding. Judg. xiv. 12. Excess of revelry and riotous festivity were rebuked by the prophets. Isa. v. 11, 12; Amos vi. 4-6. In the Greek and Roman period the appliances of luxury had greatly increased, and musicians and dancing-women were introduced to amuse or charm the guests. Matt. xiv. 6; Luke xv. 25. Christians are repeatedly warned against all improper indulgence. Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 3. Women and children were present at social entertainments (1 Sam. i. 4; John xii. 3), and at sacrificial meals men-servants and maid-servants, Levites, strangers, the fatherless and widows were invited. Deut. xvi. 11, 14. Eating together was a pledge of friendship, and established a claim to protection. Josh. ix. 14; Ps. xli. 9; John xiii. 18.

LESSON II.

CLOTHING.

OUR first parents sewed fig leaves for their covering (Gen. iii. 7), and the Lord made them coats of skins. ver. 21. The materials for clothing subsequently mentioned in the Bible are wool, linen, cotton, silk and the hair of goats and camels. The use of wool for this purpose even in the most ancient times is implied in Abel's keeping sheep

(Gen. iv. 2), which was no doubt for the sake of their fleece as well as of their flesh, and especially in the shearing of sheep, which is expressly mentioned in the case of Laban (Gen. xxxi. 19), and of Judah. Gen. xxxviii. 12. Job clothed the poor with the fleece of his sheep (Job xxxi. 20), and Moses speaks of woolen garments as in common use. Lev. xiii. 47. The cultivation of flax is first alluded to during the sojourn in Egypt (Ex. ix. 31), where it was a staple article of trade and manufacture from a very early period. Its use among the Hebrews is shown in the direction that the priests' garments should be of linen. Lev. xvi. 4. The "fine linen" of the Bible, such as that with which Joseph was arrayed (Gen. xli. 42), and which was used in the construction of the tabernacle (Ex. xxv. 4; xxvi. 1), and which the rich man in the parable is represented as wearing (Luke xvi. 19), was the ancient byssus, which has been supposed to have been in most cases a cotton fabric, though recent microscopic investigations of mummy wrappings have shown that they at least exhibit the cylindrical fibre of flax, and not the flat fibre of cotton. This byssus is improperly translated "silk" in Prov. xxxi. 22, and in the margin in a couple of other passages. Silk does occur, however, at a later period (Ezek. xvi. 10, 13; Rev. xviii. 12), as an elegant and costly material. Goats' hair was spun for the sanctuary (Ex. xxvi. 7; xxxv. 26), as well as made into sackcloth (Rev. vi. 12); and John the Baptist had his raiment of camels' hair. Matt. iii. 4. The mingling of different materials, as of linen and woolen, in the same piece was prohibited (Lev. xix. 19; Deut. xxii. 11), like all other heterogeneous mixtures, from a religious point of view, as a confusing of what God had made distinct. Clothes were commonly made by the women, as by Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 19) and Dorcas (Acts ix. 39), and even, as in classic lands, by ladies of rank and wealth. Prov. xxxi, 22.

There were two striking points of difference between the

Oriental dress and that which is in use among ourselves. The first is its loose and flowing character as distinguished from our tightly-fitting dress, so that the same suit of clothes would answer for one person as well as another. The second is the permanence and uniformity of Eastern fashions as compared with ours, so that the best illustration of the apparel in use in the days of Abraham is in some respects furnished by that worn by the Arabs at the present time. It hence resulted that clothing became an important element of wealth, as its value was not impaired by frequent changes nor by want of adaptation to any who might wish to wear it. The accumulation of clothing is accordingly spoken of along with that of the precious metals as indicating riches Ex. xii. 35; Josh. xxii. 8; 2 Chron. ix. 24; Zech. xiv. 14; Acts xx. 33. Thus Job (xxvii. 16) combines heaping up silver as dust and preparing raiment as the clay. A man of property in a time of general impoverishment is described as one who has clothing. Isa. iii. 6. The apostle James (v. 2) denounces woe upon the rich by saying, "Your riches are corrupted and your garments are moth-eaten." And our Lord exhorts his disciples (Matt. vi. 19), "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt." Comp. Josh. vii. 21; 2 Kings vii. 8. Hence we find a "keeper of the wardrobe" among the officials of the royal household (2 Chron. xxxiv. 22); and the house of Baal contained vestments enough for all his worshipers. 2 Kings x. 22. Guests at a royal festival were supplied with garments for the occasion, which accounts for the displeasure of the king at seeing one present at the marriage of his son who had not on a wedding-garment. Matt. xxii. 12. On the return of the prodigal the servants were directed to bring forth the best robe and put it on him. Luke xv. 22. This explains also the frequent mention of changes of raiment or presents of clothing as of peculiar value. Thus the thirty changes of garments paid by Sam-

son to the Philistines (Judg. xiv. 12), the ten changes of raiment sent by the king of Syria to the king of Israel (2 Kings v. 5), the presents of clothing given by Joseph to his brethren (Gen. xlv. 22), by Jonathan to David (1 Sam. xviii. 4), by Esther to Mordecai. Esth. iv. 4.

The essential articles of dress, as in ancient Greece and in the modern East, were two, viz.: the undergarment, which was put on and worn next the body, and the upper or outer garment, which was loosely thrown over it. These belonged alike to both sexes, though with such a discrimination in style or in the quality of the material, and with such additional articles belonging exclusively to one sex or to the other, that the dress of men was readily distinguishable from that of women, as is implied in the prohibition in the law that neither sex should wear the garments of the other (Deut. xxii. 5), a prohibition based not only on decorum, but possibly also, as has been conjectured, on opposition to certain practices in heathen worship in which such interchange was customary.

The undergarment (commonly called "coat"* in the English version) was a narrow tunic or gown, mostly woolen, though those of the priests were linen (Lev. xvi. 4), and worn alike by young and old (Gen. xxxvii. 3; 2 Sam. xv. 32), and by persons of either sex. Cant. v. 3. It commonly had short sleeves, reached nearly to the knees, and was confined at the waist by a belt or girdle. As worn by persons of superior rank, and particularly ladies, it sometimes had long sleeves and extended to the ankles; such was probably the coat with which Joseph was honored (Gen. xxxvii. 3), and the garment of King David's daughter Tamar (2 Sam. xiii. 18), improperly rendered by our

* But "garment" in 2 Sam. xiii. 18, 19; Ezra ii. 69; Neh. vii. 70, 72; Jude ver. 23, "robe" in Isa. xxii. 21, and "clothes" in Mark xiv. 63; "coat" in 1 Sam. ii. 19 represents a different word, and in Dan. iii. 21, 27, another still.

translators "of many" or "divers colors." A person who had nothing on but this undergarment unbelted was called naked; so Saul among the prophets, when he had thrown off his upper garment (Eng. Ver. clothes) (1 Sam. xix. 24), and Isaiah when he had loosened or thrown off his dress of sackcloth (Isa. xx. 2), and Peter when his fisher's coat was ungirt. John xxi. 7. While that which has now been described was the only undergarment considered indispensable and universally worn, two others are also spoken of that were finer and more costly, and belonged chiefly to the rich. A shirt was sometimes worn under the tunic (Judg. xiv. 12, marg.), which is in Isa. iii. 23; Prov. xxxi. 24 rendered "fine linen," this being the material of which it was made. There was also a "robe" or "mantle,"* as it is usually translated in our version, which was without sleeves and larger than the tunic over which it was worn. This formed part of the official dress of the high priest (Lev. viii. 7), and was worn by Samuel in his childhood (1 Sam. ii. 9) as the attendant upon Eli, as well as in his later years when he was invested with high authority in both civil and religious matters. 1 Sam. xv. 27; xxviii. 14. So, too, by Ezra the priest. Ezra ix. 3, 5. It was also worn by kings (Ezek. xxvi. 16), as by Saul (1 Sam. xxiv. 4) and David (1 Chron. xv. 27), and by members of the royal family, as Jonathan (1 Sam. xviii. 4), and king's daughters (2 Sam. xiii. 18), and by nobles or men of distinction, as by Job (i. 20; xxix. 14) and his three friends. ii. 12. Hence the high-priest (Mark xiv. 63) is said to have rent his tunics—*i. e.*, both his robe and his tunic proper. To this custom of the wealthy of wearing two undergarments John the Baptist has been supposed to allude as to a needless extravagance in saying to the people (Luke iii. 11): "He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none," and our Lord in directing his disci-

* But "coat" (1 Sam. ii. 19), and "cloak." Isa. lix. 17.

ples when he sent them forth not to put on two coats. Mark vi. 9.

The upper garment (in the English Version commonly "garment," "raiment" or "clothes"*) was a sort of shawl, or a large square piece of cloth, which was wrapped round the person. It was thrown over the left shoulder and brought round over or under the right arm, and fastened either in front or at the right side, the pendent ends being called "skirts." Hag. ii. 12; Zech. viii. 23. A fringe or tassels were attached to the four corners by a blue cord (Num. xv. 38, 39; Deut. xxii. 12) to remind the wearer of the law and its heavenly origin. These are the "borders of their garments" which were enlarged by the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 5), and possibly also the hem or border of Christ's garment touched by the woman who was healed. Matt. ix. 20; Luke viii. 44. These upper garments were used as a spread upon their couches at night, in consequence of which they were not to be taken in pledge for debt. Ex. xxii. 26, 27; Deut. xxiv. 12, 13; Amos ii. 8. To this our Lord alludes (Matt. v. 40): "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat," or undergarment, which he might legally do, "let him have thy cloak also," the upper garment, to which he was not entitled. The inactive found in the ample folds of this dress a convenient resting-place for the hands. Hence the Psalmist, entreating God's active interposition, beseeches him to pluck his right hand out of his bosom. Ps. lxxiv. 11.† They might also be used as a

* Also "robe" (2 Chron. xviii. 9, 29; Mic. ii. 8; Jon. iii. 6; John xix. 2, 5), and "cloak." Matt. v. 40; Luke vi. 29.

† In Prov. xix. 24; xxvi. 15, the word rendered "bosom" properly means "dish," as it is correctly translated 2 Kings xxi. 13. The man is too lazy to lift his hand to his mouth from the common dish, out of which each took his portion with his fingers, according to Oriental usage.

pocket.* Thus Haggai speaks (ii. 12) of carrying holy flesh in the skirt of the garment, and our Lord of good measure being given into one's bosom. Luke vi. 38; compare Ps. lxxix. 12. Or the garment might be taken off and spread out to receive whatever might be wrapped in it, and then carried like a bag on the shoulders, as the kneading-troughs at the exodus (Ex. xii. 34), the earrings taken from the Ishmaelites (Judg. viii. 25), the barley given to Ruth (iii. 15), where "veil" should be "upper garment," the wild gourds gathered for pottage. 2 Kings iv. 39; compare Prov. xxx. 4. It was the upper garment that Ahijah snatched from Jeroboam and rent into twelve pieces (1 Kings xi. 30), that the adherents of Jehu laid beneath him on the stairs (2 Kings ix. 13), that were put upon the ass on which Jesus rode and spread in the way before him. Matt. xxi. 8. The looseness of the upper garment impeded action; hence Bartimeus cast it away in his haste to go to Jesus (Mark x. 50), the workman going to the field left it behind him (Matt. xxiv. 18), Jesus laid it aside to wash his disciples' feet (John xiii. 4), resuming it when he had finished (ver. 12), the witnesses who took part in stoning Stephen laid it down at the feet of Saul (Acts vii. 58), and the mob incensed at Paul cast it off as they threw dust into the air. Acts xxii. 23.

The upper and under garment are sometimes spoken of together in the same passage. Thus at the crucifixion of Jesus the soldiers divided his upper garment into four parts and parcelled it among them, but cast lots for the coat, or undergarment, which was without seam, woven from the top throughout. John xix. 23, 24. Peter was shown the coats (or tunics) and (upper) garments which Dorcas had made

* In Prov. xvii. 23, "A gift out of the bosom," and xxi. 14, "a reward in the bosom," may be one taken from or received into the pocket of the dress; or "bosom" may denote the privacy of a man's thoughts, and the expression mean a secret bribe.

(Acts ix. 39); Ezra (ix. 3, 5) rent his (upper) garment and his mantle, or the undergarment worn over the tunic as his robe of office.

A peculiar sort of upper garment to which the Hebrews gave a special name is in our version rendered four times garment (Gen. xxv. 25; Josh. vii. 21, 24; Zech. xiii. 4), five times mantle (1 Kings xix. 13, 19; 2 Kings ii. 8, 13, 14) and twice robe. Jon. iii. 6; Mic. ii. 8. It appears to have been made of skin, with the hair or fur retained. Gen. xxv. 25; compare Heb. xi. 37. Such was the garment of the prophets (Zech. xiii. 4), the mantle of Elijah (1 Kings xix. 13), and the robe of ordinary people (Mic. ii. 8), which doubtless were plain and unpretending. Sometimes, however, they were elegant and costly, as that imported from Babylon and coveted by Achan (Josh. vii. 21), and that worn by the king of Nineveh. Jon. iii. 6.

Breeches or drawers were worn by the priests (Ex. xxviii. 42), but not generally by others. Some authorities explain the word rendered "coats" in the dress of the three men cast into the fiery furnace (Dan. iii. 21) as meaning trowsers. Others, with greater probability, think it to denote mantles, as it is in the margin.

The girdle was an important part of the Eastern dress. It was used to confine the loose undergarment, which would otherwise impede motion. Hence Elijah girded up his loins when he ran before Ahab (1 Kings xviii. 46), and David when he danced before the Lord (2 Sam. vi. 14), Gehazi (2 Kings iv. 29) and the son of the prophets (2 Kings ix. 1), when sent upon an errand by Elisha, and our Lord when he washed his disciples' feet. John xiii. 4. To have the loins girded is a figure consequently for vigor (Ps. xviii. 32) and readiness for action. Luke xii. 35. The soldier wore his dagger (Judg. iii. 16) or sword (1 Sam. xxv. 13; 2 Sam. xx. 8; Ps. xlv. 13) in his girdle or belt, which was accordingly a necessary part of his equipment (Isa. v. 27; Eph. vi. 14), and

to gird himself was to prepare for battle. 1 Kings xx. 11; Isa. viii. 9. Money was also carried in the belt (Matt. x. 9; Mark vi. 8), where the word translated purse is properly girdle. The girdle was made of leather (2 Kings i. 8; Matt. iii. 4), of linen (Jer. xiii. 1), and fine linen or byssus. Ezek. xvi. 10. It was sometimes very elaborately wrought or richly decorated with gold and precious stones (compare Dan. x. 5; Rev. i. 13), and was highly prized as an article of female adornment (Isa. iii. 24; xlix. 18; Jer. ii. 32, where the word rendered "attire" means properly "girdle"), and given as a present (1 Sam. xviii. 4; 2 Sam. xviii. 11) or made an article of trade. Prov. xxxi. 24. It was also reckoned among the insignia of office. Isa. xxii. 21.

It remains to consider what was worn on the feet and on the head. Their shoes were simply sandals of wood or leather fastened on by straps or thongs (Gen. xiv. 23; Isa. v. 27), and put off on entering a room or going into a sacred place (Ex. iii. 5; Josh. v. 15), though worn at the passover (Ex. xii. 11), which was eaten as if in readiness for a journey. Shoes were commonly of a paltry price (Amos ii. 6; viii. 6), but those of ladies were often elegant (Cant. vii. 1) and of costly material. Ezek. xvi. 10. In business transactions drawing off the shoe and giving it to another was the sign of the transfèr of property upon which it had trodden. Deut. xxv. 9, 10; Ruth iv. 7; compare Josh. i. 3. The sandals of the wealthy were put on, taken off and carried by slaves. This is hence spoken of as a menial service. Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 7.

Turbans were worn by both sexes (Job xxix. 14; Isa. iii. 20; Ezek. xxiii. 15), especially by the rich and noble, and on festive occasions (Ezek. xxiv. 17; Isa. lxi. 3, where "beauty," and ver. 10, where "ornaments," properly denote a head-dress). But it seems likely that people commonly went without any covering on their heads other than perhaps a simple band to confine the hair. When the angel

summoned Peter to leave the prison (Acts xii. 8), he bade him gird himself, bind on his sandals and cast his upper garment about him, but said nothing about putting anything on his head. Mourners went barefoot, and with their head covered by their dress. 2 Sam. xv. 30.

The veil was regarded as indispensable to well-bred ladies (Gen. xxiv. 65; Cant. v. 7), though in patriarchal times there seems to have been more freedom in this respect than subsequently. Gen. xii. 14; xxiv. 15; xxvi. 8. Of female ornaments a list is given (Isa. iii. 18-24), some particulars of which are now obscure. The principal of them are necklaces, bracelets, rings—not only on the fingers and in the ears, but in the nose—mirrors of polished metal worn upon the person, and gold or silver chains connecting the metallic plates upon the ankles, so as to regulate the step and at the same time to produce a tinkling sound. Men carried a cane or staff, and a seal-ring either upon the finger or on a cord suspended from the neck (Gen. xxxviii. 18); and both Joseph in Egypt (Gen. xli. 42) and Daniel in Babylon (Dan. v. 29) were honored by putting a gold chain about their necks.

Two foreign articles of dress are mentioned in the New Testament. The scarlet robe put on the Saviour in mockery (Matt. xxvii. 28) was the mantle worn by Roman generals and officers, and even by emperors at a later time. The cloak of Paul (2 Tim. iv. 13) was worn by both sexes over the tunic. It had no sleeves, merely an opening for the head, and a hood which could be drawn over the head in cold or wet weather.

LESSON III.

DWELLINGS.

It has been conjectured that in the earliest ages men contented themselves with the rudest possible habitations, seeking shelter in natural caverns, which they afterward improved by art, or in booths and sheds slightly constructed from boughs of trees, until they gradually learned to provide themselves with better and more suitable abodes. Whatever may be thought of this theory, it derives no support from the facts recorded in the Bible, which speaks of a city as already built by Cain (Gen. iv. 7), implying, of course, houses and permanent dwellings. A more rational and better accredited opinion regards the different styles of habitation as contemporaneous rather than successive, and seeks the ground of their diversity in the various grades of civilization in which men are found, the nature of their occupation and the materials within their reach.

The Horites, or primitive inhabitants of Mount Seir (Gen. xiv. 6 ; Deut. ii. 12), are thought to have derived their name from their living in the caves with which that region abounds, and which, in later times, were fashioned into the elegant rock-hewn structures of the city of Petra. And Job (xxx. 6) speaks of miserable vagabonds dwelling in caves. The numerous and spacious caverns of Palestine are often spoken of as affording concealment and refuge. Thus Lot and his daughters took up their abode in a cave after the destruction of Sodom. Gen. xix. 30. Five kings of the Amorites, fleeing before Joshua, hid themselves in the cave at Makkedah. Josh. x. 16. Israel, oppressed by Midian (Judg. vi. 2) and by the Philistines (1 Sam. xiii. 6), Samson, beset by foes (Judg. xv. 8), David, pursued by Saul (1 Sam. xxii. 1 ; xxiv. 3), prophets persecuted by Ahab (1

Kings xviii. 4), and godly men in other periods of persecution (Heb. xi. 38), sought concealment in caves. They were also resorted to by lawless or distressed classes (1 Sam. xxii. 2) to escape the restraints or burdens of society; but they were not used as places of permanent abode until they were occupied for this purpose by the hermits of a later period. Tradition indicates certain grottoes as the scene of our Lord's nativity (Luke ii. 7), and of various other events of the sacred history, but, so far as appears, without any good foundation.

Booths are only spoken of as constructed for cattle (Gen. xxxiii. 17), or to afford temporary shelter in case of need, as in the case of Jonah before Nineveh (Jon. iv. 5), of gardeners and husbandmen (Job xxvii. 18; Isa. i. 8), and of the entire people at the feast of tabernacles. Lev. xxiii. 42.

Nomad tribes dwelt in tents, which could easily be transported from place to place. Judg. vi. 5; Isa. xiii. 20; Hab. iii. 7. So did soldiers under arms (2 Kings vii. 7) and shepherds whose care of flocks obliged them to lead a roving life. Isa. xxxviii. 12. Jabel, the son of Lamech (Gen. iv. 20), is said to have been the "father of such as dwell in tents and have cattle." The patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob lived in tents in Canaan as pilgrims and shepherds (Gen. xviii. 1; xxvi. 17; xxxiii. 18), though their ancestors and relatives in Mesopotamia had houses and settled abodes. Gen. xxiv. 10, 23. Tents were sometimes covered with skins or mats, but mostly with cloths, or, as they are called, curtains, woven from wool or from goats' hair. Ex. xxvi. 7, 14. Those of goats' hair were black. Cant. i. 5; iv. 1. These cloths were stretched over one or more upright poles and fastened to the ground by cords and pins. Ex. xxxv. 18; Judg. iv. 21; Jer. x. 20. Tents, whether round or oblong, were divided by hangings into two, or those of the better class into three, apartments, one for the women and children, one for the men and one for ser-

vants or cattle. Wealthy families had separate tents for women. Gen. xxiv. 67; xxxi. 33. The towns and castles of the sons of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 16) and the villages of Kedar (Isa. xlii. 11) were collections of tents or nomadic encampments.

Houses were sometimes built of brick, either burned, as at Babel (Gen. xi. 4), or simply dried in the sun, as those made by the children of Israel in Egypt, in which straw was mingled with the clay. Ex. v. 7. The use of the latter explains the fact that it was possible to dig through a wall (Ezek. xii. 5, 7), and that a house neglected and exposed to the vicissitudes of the weather would be reduced to a heap of dirt. Dan. iii. 29. Stone was, however, regarded as the nobler and better material (Isa. ix. 10), the use of which is presupposed in the narrative of the tower of Babel (Gen. xi. 3), as well as in the law of leprosy. Lev. xiv. 40, 42. The temple (1 Kings v. 17) and palace of Solomon (1 Kings vii. 9) and the residences of the rich (Amos v. 11) were of hewn stone, which were often very costly, so that the term "precious stones" is used both of those employed in building (2 Chron. iii. 6; Isa. xxviii. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 4) and of gems. 1 Kings x. 2; 1 Chron. xx. 2. We read of marble among the materials of the temple (1 Chron. xxix. 2) and in the palace of Ahasuerus. Esth. i. 6. The festivity connected with laying the corner-stone of public edifices is alluded to. Ezra. iii. 10; Zech. iv. 7; Job xxxviii. 6, 7. The cement used at Babel was slime, Gen. xi. 3—*i. e.*, bitumen or asphaltum. Isaiah (xxx. 12) speaks of lime, and the same word is rendered plaster. Deut. xxvii. 4. Mud was also used for mortar (Lev. xiv. 42, 45, where the word so translated means properly "dust" or "earth"). The acquaintance of the ancient Hebrews with the structure and use of the arch is directly vouched for, if this is intended, as able scholars suppose, by the words improperly translated "eminent place" (Ezek. xvi. 24) and "troop." Amos ix. 6. The

going to the roof to fight (Judg. ix. 51), of booths erected there during the feast of tabernacles (Neh. viii. 16); and a general excitement or commotion in a city is represented by saying that the whole population had gone up to the house-tops. Isa. xxii. 1. The friends of a paralytic in bringing him to Jesus uncovered the roof where he was, and after breaking it up let the sick man down through the tiling. Mark ii. 4; Luke v. 19. Some have sought to accommodate these expressions to the removal of an awning stretched over the court, but their proper force implies that they dug through the earth or plaster of the roof and let him down into the room beneath where Jesus was with the crowd. They were able to reach the roof by steps leading to it from the street without passing through the house, which likewise explains our Lord's direction (Mark xiii. 15): "Let him that is on the housetop not go down into the house."

Frequent mention is made of the "upper chamber," a large and important room in the second story, sometimes itself constituting all there was of a second story, being built above the general level of the roof. It was in this King Eglon was found when Ehud came to him. Judg. iii. 20. It was often appropriated to the use of guests, as the chamber occupied by Elijah (1 Kings xvii. 19), the chamber on the wall assigned to Elisha (2 Kings iv. 10), and the guest-chamber where our Lord and his apostles partook of the Last Supper. Mark xiv. 15. It was in an upper chamber that David mourned for Absalom (2 Sam. xviii. 33), that Daniel thrice a day offered prayer (Dan. vi. 10), and that the early disciples assembled after the ascension of the Saviour. Acts i. 13. It was in an upper chamber too that the body of Tabitha was prepared for interment. Acts ix. the arch is in Troas where Paul preached (Acts. xx. scholars suppose "second loft" or third story. The only other things mentioned in Scripture of which this is expressly

stated are Noah's ark (Gen. vi. 16), the structures adjacent to the temple (1 Kings vi. 6, 8) and the house of the forest of Lebanon. 1 Kings vii. 4, 5.

The house was entered by an outer gate, on the side-posts and lintels of which passages were often inscribed from the law (Deut. vi. 9; xi. 20), and which was opened by a porter or maid (John xviii. 16; Acts xii. 13), and led into a vestibule (called a porch Matt. xxvi. 71; Mark xiv. 68) that served as an ante-room from which one could either ascend by steps or winding stairs (1 Kings vi. 8) to the roof or upper chamber, or pass on through a door into the court, whence access was gained to the several rooms of the house. The doors were commonly low (Prov. xvii. 19), though in stately edifices high folding-doors were used. 1 Kings vi. 34; Ezek. xli. 24. Tenons inserted in the top and bottom of the door, and moving in sockets in the lintel and sill, answered for hinges. 1 Kings vii. 50; Prov. xxvi. 14. The doors were fastened by bars or wooden bolts, which, when pushed into place, were secured by pins dropping into holes to which they were severally fitted. These pins could be raised and the bolt withdrawn by a key from the outside. Judg. iii. 25; Cant. v. 5. The windows were unglazed lattices, extending nearly to the floor, and opening not merely upon the court, as is almost exclusively the case in modern Oriental houses, but likewise upon the street, so that the mother of Sisera could watch for his coming (Judg. v. 28), Jezebel be thrown into the street on the demand of Jehu (2 Kings ix. 30-33), a bride could see her beloved's approach (Cant. ii. 9), one within the house have a full view of what was passing without (Prov. vii. 6), and Daniel could have his windows opened toward Jerusalem. Dan. vi. 10. The blank walls which Oriental houses now present on their exterior are the result of long oppression, and have been resorted to as a defence against espionage and unwelcome intrusion. The passages above cited also show that the

women were not restricted, as now, to apartments looking out upon the garden at the back of the house.

Walls were mostly whitewashed. Matt. xxiii. 27. The word rendered "untempered mortar" (Ezek. xiii. 10) properly means "whitewash," which the prophet declares cannot hide the defects of the badly-constructed wall. In palaces the interior walls were painted with more showy colors and wainscoted. Jer. xxii. 14; 1 Kings vii. 7. The "ceiled houses" spoken of in Hag. i. 4 are properly houses thus wainscoted. For still greater elegance they were sometimes inlaid with ivory, as the ivory house of Ahab (1 Kings xxii. 39), those spoken of in Amos iii. 15 and the ivory palaces of Ps. xlv. 8. The floors were of plaster or mosaic. In cold weather fire was kindled in the court (Luke xxii. 55), or in a vessel set in the centre of the apartment, for which there was sometimes a cavity sunk in the floor. Isa. xlvi. 14. The hearth before which King Jehoiakim sat (Jer. xxxvi. 22) was such a pot or pan of coals. In Eastern houses at the present day, when the fire has burnt down, a frame like a table is placed over the pot, and the whole is then covered with a carpet; and those who wish to warm themselves sit upon the floor and thrust their feet and legs, and even the lower part of their bodies, under the carpet. There were no chimneys, but the smoke escaped through the windows. The word translated "chimney" (Hos. xiii. 3) means a "lattice." In the houses of the rich there were sometimes distinct apartments for summer and for winter. Judg. iii. 20; Amos iii. 15. The "boiling-places" spoken of (Ezek. xlvi. 23, 24) were probably kitchens.

The furniture of dwellings varied then, as now, of course, with the wealth and taste of the owner. In the room provided for Elisha (2 Kings iv. 10) there was a bed, table, stool or chair, and candlestick or lamp-stand. A raised platform at the end or on the sides of the room with cush-

ions and pillows (Ezek. xiii. 18),* or a low bedstead (Ps. vi 6; Amos iii. 12), which in the houses of the rich was often inlaid with ivory (Amos vi. 4) and supplied with costly coverings (Prov. vii. 16), answered the double purpose of a seat by day and of a bed at night. Chairs were more usual among the ancient Israelites (Prov. ix. 14) and Egyptians than in the East at present.

The population dwelt both in walled cities, which were often strongly fortified, like those of Bashan, which were "fenced with high walls, gates and bars" (Deut. iii. 5), and in unwallied towns and villages. Lev. xxv. 29, 31; 1 Sam. vi. 18; Ezek. xxxviii. 11. The streets, as in Eastern towns in modern times, were doubtless for the most part narrow and crooked, though the principal avenues were broader (Nah. ii. 4; Cant. iii. 2); and one street in Damascus bore the name of "Straight." Acts ix. 11. The vast size of Babylon and Nineveh, which is called a city of three days' journey (Jon. iii. 3), is accounted for by the existence of gardens and large open spaces within the city limits. The mire of the streets (Isa. x. 6; Zech. ix. 3) implies that they were commonly unpaved, though, if Josephus is to be credited, Solomon paved the roads leading to Jerusalem with black stone—a process which would probably be extended to the principal streets of the city itself. He further states that Jerusalem was paved with white stone by direction of Herod Agrippa. Open spaces near the gates were used for markets (2 Kings vii. 1), for tribunals of justice (2 Sam. xv. 2; Job v. 4; xxix. 7), for the transaction of business (Gen. xxiii. 10; Ruth iv. 1, 11; Prov. xxxi. 23) and for public assemblies. 2 Chron. xxxii. 6; Neh. viii. 1.

* Literally, "Woe to the women that sew pillows to all hand-joints," the soft appliances by which false prophets lull the people to an easy security being represented by an over-refinement of luxury which would place pillows not only under the arms and elbows of those who recline or lean upon them, but under the very wrists and knuckles.

A SUMMARY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

BY

FRANCIS L. PATTON, D. D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF
~~THE NORTHWEST~~, CHICAGO, ILL.

Princeton N. J.

INTRODUCTORY.

AN opinion is one thing, a fact is another. If a man says that he believes the moon is inhabited, we may very properly say, "That is your opinion, but we differ with you." And since the opinion in question is at present not capable of proof, prolonged argument would not be called for.

Many entertain the idea that what are called "the doctrines" are only conjectures or opinions for which there is little or no evidence, and certainly no proof.

This is a mistake.

We may assent or not to an opinion as we please; if we reject a fact, we only advertise our stupidity. If a man denies that the three angles of a triangle are together equal to two right angles, we can demonstrate the proposition. If he says that Brutus did not kill Cæsar, we can open the books of history and convince him. In the one case we reach mathematical certainty, in the other moral. If in face of evidence a man persists in denying facts, he acts unreasonably. Now, "the doctrines" are facts.

But though truth for truth's sake is the motto of the philosopher, it is nevertheless certain that we cannot know everything, and there may be considerations which make some truths more important than others. The sick man wishes above all things to know what medicine will help his case. And the most important truth to every man is that which makes known the conditions of a happy hereafter. "The doctrines" claim a position above all other truth

because of their practical value. If any one chooses to call this a utilitarian philosophy, he may. Certainly, if there were no questions of destiny pending, there might be more excuse for those who are jubilant over the discovery of a fossil, but indifferent to the facts of Christianity. The doctrines are truths which are capable of proof, and which stand in vital relation to the life that now is and to that which is to come. These considerations will shape the method to be observed in the following pages,

LESSON I.

THE FACTORS IN RELIGION: MAN AND GOD.

RELIGION is the bond which unites God and man. It supposes, therefore, two factors—man, the subject of religious feelings, and God, the object of religious worship. To cast doubt on either of these factors would be to damage or destroy religion. If the universal beliefs of mankind had been allowed to pass unchallenged, it would not be necessary to offer arguments for the existence of mind or of God. Infidels, however, have put Christians on their defence, and their bold denials of fundamental truth make it proper, and perhaps necessary, that, even in so brief a statement of doctrine as this is intended to be, something should be said to show how we can vindicate our religious nature.

I. MAN.

The most pretentious form of current philosophy denies our existence, or rather, that element in our existence which gives it value: the mind. The student of theology has a battle to fight at the threshold, and his first foe is the materialist; for if it should turn out that what we call mind is only material force, it would be absurd to talk of

religion, since there could be no God to worship and no "we" to bow down to him. Suppose, now, that some disciple of Maudesley should hear us arguing for the being of God from the laws of mind, and should meet us plumply with the question, How do you know that such a thing as mind exists? What should we say? We might feel that this is a question which we were not expecting—we should certainly feel that, metaphysical though it is, it has a great deal to do with religion, and demands an answer. Our reflections when written out might take a form something like the following:

1. I exist. This is taken for granted in everything I do, say or think. There can be no knowing, feeling, willing, without an "I" to know, feel and will. What is this something which goes by the name. "I," "me," "self," "ego"? It is not my body, for I know I am separate from it. It is not any part of my body; my brain is *mine*, not *me*. There is a necessity laid upon me of thinking that I exist; for if I should think I did not exist, I should have to exist in order to think that I did not. This brings us to Descartes' famous utterance, "I think, therefore I am."

Now, I have certain powers or attributes which my body does not have, which no part of my body has. I will to lift my arm. I know that my arm could not exert an act of will, nor is it possible for me to conceive of any material substance exercising volition. Will power is a power which "I" exert; and when I see a manifestation of it which is not due to me, I at once attribute it to another "I" or "self" similar to me—that is to say, to another *person*. I know. Knowledge is one of my prerogatives which material substances do not possess. A stone cannot know or feel.

To sum up: There is a something, ens, entity, substance—called "I," "me," "self." This something has attributes which matter has not, and it has not the properties of mat-

ter. We are compelled to think that it is a different substance, and we call it mind. The more we attempt to realize the proposition that mind is matter, the more its absurdity grows upon us, and the more does the distinction between the two assert itself as a necessity of thought. In philosophical language we say that the distinction is a fact of consciousness.

2. The philosophy which denies mind a place in the universe ought to be able to support its terrible conclusions by the presentation of evidence. But when asked on what authority they deny the universal beliefs of mankind, these philosophers have very little to say. To be sure, they are able to show that there is an intimate connection between mind and body, and they talk learnedly about nerve-currents and the grey matter of the brain. But between matter and thought, between nerve-currents and personality, there is a breach which this philosophy does not fill. The belief in mind is a necessity of thought—a necessity felt none the less by those who write books to prove that mind does not exist. The materialist has encountered two barriers which rise mountain-like to dispute his passage into the realm of mind: the one is the mystery of life, and the other is the mystery of personality. The attempt to bring a living thing out of dead matter and to make mind a department of physiology has been a failure.

3. The hypothesis that thought is a function of brain is beset with endless confusion, and is palpably absurd. According to it, the rationale of conversation is this: A movement takes place in A's brain which we call A's volition to speak; other movements follow which we call thoughts; these are attended with the articulation of certain sounds; these fall on the tympanum of B's ear, affect the auditory nerve and cause the movements or nerve-currents called hearing; other movements follow in B's brain, attended by corresponding articulations, which constitute

B's reply. Talking is just telegraph-operating *without the operators*.

The theory involves the following incongruous elements : (a.) Matter thinks, feels, wills. (b.) The irresistible conviction of this thinking matter is that it is not matter, but mind. (c.) Thinking, feeling, willing, as it does, this matter is necessarily of the opinion that matter cannot think, feel or will.

And further, we might say to him who seeks to convince us that mind does not exist : It is folly for you to undertake any such task ; for if your theory is true, I am not properly the subject of argument. You might as well expect a dead man to find comfort in his funeral sermon. Convincing me, were you to succeed, would only mean setting in motion certain nerve-currents in a material organism. And besides, you, in the act of arguing, are only a material organism, with a set of material forces at work which you call your philosophical opinions. One Leyden jar might as well be supposed to discuss chemistry with another Leyden jar as for you and me to talk metaphysics.

And yet again : If I am convinced that you are right, I am convinced that consciousness has played me false. But if in regard to this fundamental conviction I am deceived, how can I be sure of my eyes and my ears when they tell me that you are present and that you speak ? To be convinced that consciousness is a false witness seems to be impossible, when I remember that my belief in the existence of my philosophical acquaintance is founded on a belief in the veracity of consciousness. I must trust my consciousness in order that I may be convinced that it is mendacious, which involves an absurdity akin to that of a man trying to take himself up in his arms.

II. GOD.

The belief in God is universal. All men believe in the existence of some being or beings above them to whom they are responsible and whom it behooves them to propitiate. This belief is not the result of argument, for the majority of men have never faced the question why they believe in God. The fact that this belief is so widespread is a strong argument in favor of its truth. It would be strange if the human race were unanimous in entertaining a falsehood like this; and though the atheist will say that this is not more strange than the fact that men for ages believed that sun, moon and stars revolved round the earth, yet a moment's thought will show that the cases are not parallel. The sun seemed to them to rise and set, and the stars to move from east to west. It was perfectly natural that they should trust their eyes. Or if it should be said that men have held with considerable unanimity the belief in many superstitions regarding the supernatural, we should reply again that, given the fact of a widespread conception respecting the supernatural, it is not difficult to understand the multiplied misconceptions. But it is not easy to explain how it happened that a universal belief in the supernatural should have taken possession of the minds of men if there is no supernatural. If God exists, we can account for the crudities which are associated with the belief in his existence. But on the hypothesis of materialism, the *genesis* of the idea of God is without explanation. Atheism leaves us with a universal effect without any assignable cause. Our belief in God we will allow is open, however, to honest criticism. If evidence could be brought to show that it is without foundation or is false, we should listen to it and give it all the consideration it deserves. On the other hand, it is fair to require of him who undertakes to overthrow the world's faith that he present some objection

which goes beyond an assertion of his own skepticism. The atheist as yet has not met this requirement. If he reminds us that advancing science is banishing polytheism, we shall remind him, on the other hand, that it is at the same time establishing theism. If he tells us that the phenomena in the material world occur in accordance with universal law and are due to the operation of one force, we shall tell him that he must believe in one omnipotent and omnipresent Being before these generalizations can have any significance, that they do not conflict necessarily with our belief in God, and that they do not add much to what we learned from the Book which says: "In him we live and move and have our being" (Acts xvii. 28), and which tells us that "In him and through him and to him are all things." Rom. xi. 36.

Belief in God is universal; this is a presumption in favor of the doctrine of God's existence, and lays the burden of proof on him who undertakes to set it aside. The atheist may be defied to show that any fact of science is inconsonant with theism. We, however, are able to produce arguments which abundantly serve to vindicate our faith and to condemn the atheist.

We shall notice four: (1.) That which is based on the idea of cause. (2.) That which arises out of our moral nature. (3.) Scripture. (4.) Congruity.

1. Cause. We are so constituted that whenever any event occurs we are necessarily led to ask a reason for it, or to believe that it was due to some cause. This fact in our mental constitution is the basis of the two methods of reasoning which are commonly known as the cosmological and the teleological arguments.

(a.) The cosmological argument. Every change is due to some cause. Let us see where this statement will lead us. We exist. We owe our existence to our parents. Our parents owe theirs to their parents, and so on. Unless we adopt Darwinism, we must conclude that the human race is

eternal, or that the chain of which parent and child are the links terminates in our first parents. But we cannot believe that the human race is eternal, for this would be like supposing that one link of a chain is supported by the one above it, and that by the one above it, and so back to infinity. By a necessity of thought we must think of a first link which is fixed and which supports all the rest. So the chain of causes must bring us to the first man, the father of the human race, and he must be self-existent, or he must seek for a cause of his existence. How did he come into being?

Take other species of animal life. There is no evidence that any species has developed by gradual transition out of a lower species; so that, tracing the individuals of any species backward, we come, as in the case of man, to the first individuals of the species. And the question occurs again, What is the cause of their existence?

We are of necessity led to believe in the existence of a necessary self-existing First Cause; and unless we adopt the theory of evolution, we soon come to a point where it becomes necessary to look for that cause outside of matter. But were the hypothesis of evolution accepted, it would relieve us of no difficulty; for grant that the effects or changes in the material world can be traced back in a chain of finite causations till we come to an original ether, this ether is in motion or else it is at rest. If it is in motion, the motion is a change which demands a cause; and as an infinite series of finite causes is inconceivable, we must believe that matter is the originator of motion or is self-moved. But this is inconceivable. Plato argued, and we see no reason to doubt the correctness of his reasoning, that, since it is impossible for the mind to conceive of matter originating motion, there must be a mind as the first cause of motion.

(b.) The teleological argument. This likewise is as old as Plato, though made more familiar to us by the writings of Paley and others. If, says Paley, we were walking on the

sea-shore, and should find a watch on the sand, we should discover on examination that it was intended to be a measurer of time, that the parts of the watch are contrived for bringing about this result; we should never dream that the parts were fitted to each other and with such delicate adjustment, as a matter of chance. We could not resist the feeling that the watch was the product of wonderful skill, and the work of a designing mind. Applying this reasoning to what we observe in nature, we conclude that the universe is not only an effect which has a cause, but an effect which has an intelligent cause. Paley's watch is none the worse for wear; and however much some are disposed to disparage this line of argument, it is nevertheless true that it is impossible for the mind to face the evidences of design in nature without feeling that they testify to an intelligent Creator. A man may say that it is possible that these so-called adaptations are nothing more than a fortuitous concourse of atoms. When he says this, however, he is not seeking truth, but seeking an excuse for not assenting to the force of evidence. As long as he is in this state of mind it will be of no use to multiply the evidences of design. The man who can see no evidence of design in the structure of his own body is not likely to be convinced by illustrations drawn from the latest discoveries in science.*

2. The moral argument. There are two pairs of correlative expressions which we all use, and which, if we stop to think, almost necessarily suggest the idea of God. These expressions are—right and wrong; ought and ought not.

Some actions we pronounce right, others we say are wrong. Benevolence is right, envy is wrong. The same

* For illustrations of design in nature, we refer to the admirable summary of the teleological argument in the first volume of Dr. Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, to the numerous works on natural theology and to the volumes of lectures published by the Christian Evidence Society of London.

thing may be called right and wrong, it is true, by different persons, but all feel that the distinction is fundamental and necessary. It is not because a word or action pleases us that we call it right. Its moral quality we know is something altogether different from the feeling of pleasure or displeasure which it occasions. We are conscious, when we say of a word or act that it is wrong, of appealing to an absolute standard, and our judgment is simply an expression of its want of conformity with it. A standard there must be, or the words right and wrong would have no meaning. What is that standard? Some tell us that there is an eternal principle of right, but what meaning can we attach to a principle of right as the standard of moral action? Let us, however, believe in the existence of a perfect moral being, whose nature constitutes the ground of right, and then we use language intelligibly when we speak of right and wrong.

Again, morality is obligatory. We are conscious of this. There are some things which we *ought* to do and some which we *ought not* to do. There is a vast difference between saying to a man, "It will be better for you to be honest, for honesty is the best policy," and saying, "You are bound to be honest." The difference is so great that, though the attempt has more than once been made to show how the idea of obligation can be developed out of the idea of expediency, it has never succeeded. If there is no God, why do I feel under obligation? Who has a right to command me? If atheism is true, obligatory morals are impossible. Our moral nature speaks, however, in the imperative mood. We must believe in God, or believe that the root of our nature is a lie.

3. Scripture. A great deal of our knowledge rests on the testimony of others. Testimony, however, would be worthless if we believed that men would lie as readily as they would speak the truth. Now, supposing that we were not led by the constitution of our nature to believe in God, there is no

reason why the Bible should not be competent to give independent proof of His being. If the testimony of travelers is enough to satisfy us as to the appearance and habits of men in the heart of Africa whom we have never seen, the Bible, if it is authentic history, is enough to satisfy us of the existence of a Being who made all things, who works miracles and knows the end from the beginning. Some facts, we concede, require more evidence than others, for their support. The Bible history, however, is supported by evidence enough to satisfy every just demand. If any history is veritable, the history of the Jews is; but take God out of the Jewish history, and what would remain? Prophecy is not explainable on atheistic principles, but the Bible contains the record of prophecy and the record of its fulfillment. The resurrection of Christ is certified not only by the testimony of those who saw Him alive after his passion, but by the fact that the gospel was first preached in Jerusalem, where neither the desire nor the material was wanting for the destruction of Christianity, if it were true that the apostles appealed to a falsehood when they referred to the resurrection. If we cannot believe in God's existence on the testimony of the Bible, we might as well burn our books of history. A man cannot deny its testimony unless he says plainly, "No amount of testimony will convince me of the supernatural." Of course such skepticism is incurable.

4. Congruity. We know that we have the wrong key when it does not fit all the wards of the lock. On the other hand, it is a strong argument for the truth of a theory that it explains all the facts in the case. The belief in a self-existent personal God is in harmony with all the facts of our mental and moral nature as well as with all the phenomena of the material world. If God exists, a universal belief in his existence is natural enough; the irresistible impulse to ask for a first cause is accounted for; our religious nature has an object; the uniformity of natural law

finds an adequate explanation, and human history is vindicated from the charge of being an immense imposture. Atheism leaves all these matters without any explanation, and makes not history alone, but our intellectual nature itself, an imposture and a lie.

The line of argument which we have pursued has brought us first to a reasoned belief in ANIMISM, and secondly to a reasoned belief in THEISM. The atheist, however, may say, "This mode of reasoning is not demonstration. It *may* be there is no God, and that my consciousness bears false witness." Of course, if a man goes so far as to charge his very nature with falsehood, we have nothing more to say. Discussion would be useless. It is worth while to note the fact that the strongest argument of the atheist is that the theist has not demonstrated the being of God; and in reply it is enough to say: (1.) We did not set out with a promise to demonstrate the being of God, but to vindicate a universal faith. This we claim to have done by arguments which ought to convince you and which are enough to condemn you. (2.) Your complaint is a confession; for when you seek to justify your disbelief on the ground that *possibly* there is no God, you virtually confess that the question of God is at least immensely probable. We have no wish to discuss the question whether the existence of God is a demonstrable proposition. We ask you simply to consider the peril in which you stand when you assume the responsibility of denying the existence of a Being whom you must one day face. (3.) Probability is the guide of life. You admit this in other matters; why do you deny it in this? If you go to sea on a raft because there is a bare possibility that you will cross the ocean safely, you act like an idiot. If you persist in atheism in face of all the evidence of God's existence, you are what the Bible calls a "fool."

LESSON II.

THE RULE OF FAITH.

OUR moral nature prompts us to ask many questions, and makes us impatient until they are answered. What is the origin of the human race? How does it happen that sin is universal? What is the character of the Being to whom we are responsible? May we trust him, or must we be in terror? How are we to know what is right and what is wrong, since the judgments of men conflict? Are we immortal? Is it a happy hereafter which awaits us? Does that depend on anything which we can do? If so, what must we do?

Whither shall we go for a satisfactory answer to these inquiries? We cannot rest until we find some standard of truth which we can regard as infallible. Where are we to find it? In your reason, says one. In the Church, says another. In the Bible, says a third. The decisions we reach respecting our rule of faith will determine whether we shall be Rationalists, Romanists or Protestants. Let us consider these answers in the order mentioned.

I. REASON.

There are two ways of investing reason with infallibility. A man may say that he needs no other revelation than the light of his own intellect, in which case he makes reason the source of knowledge; or he may say that, conceding that the Bible contains divine revelations, he will receive nothing which he cannot comprehend or which conflicts with his sense of right, in which case he makes reason the criterion of truth.

To one who denies the necessity or the possibility of a revelation we should reply by saying:

1. If you deny that God can or will give a revelation,

you simply make yourself a pope and proclaim your infallibility. Argument with you is, therefore, out of the question.

2. The need of a revelation is seen in the conflicting opinions which men entertain respecting fundamental questions. If twelve clocks at the same instant indicate a different hour, it is certain that at least eleven of them are wrong. The conflicting verdicts of the human conscience on matters of right and wrong prove that without a revelation the race is hopelessly in the dark.

3. The need of a revelation and its possibility are questions which are set aside by the undoubted fact that God has given a revelation, and that we have it in the Old and New Testaments. When the steam-engine was invented, it was argued that it never could be made a means of land-travel. The railroad is a refutation of the reasoning.

When, however, the rationalist takes the position that reason is the criterion by which we are to decide what is and what is not properly a part of divine revelation, it is necessary to remind him that there is a proper and an improper exercise of reason in matters of religion. If a man were to say that up in the moon two and two make five, we should deny it point blank. If he said that in the moon there is a race of men who can fly, we should say, Possibly; the thing is certainly not inconceivable. This illustrates the first prerogative of reason, the right to pronounce against a statement which contradicts a necessary belief. We cannot believe a contradictory proposition; we cannot believe that an event occurred without some cause of its occurrence. We cannot believe that right is wrong or that wrong is right. Any book that asks us to believe these things asks an impossibility, asks us to assent to unthinkable propositions, and therefore cannot be from God. Again, the Bible comes to us as a revelation. So do other books—the Koran, for example. Why do we accept the Bible and reject the

rest? Because the Bible gives evidence of being a divine revelation. The mind, therefore, must be allowed to weigh the evidence which accredits the Bible and determine whether it is adequate. To deny this would be to deny that there is any reason for believing one alleged revelation rather than another. The rationalist, however, wishes the privilege of sitting in judgment on the contents of Scripture. His position is open to obvious objections.

1. It does not follow that a doctrine is untrue because it is incomprehensible. The Bible teaches the doctrine of the Trinity. The rationalist denies it. It is a contradiction, he says. But it is not a contradiction, for the human mind cannot believe a contradiction, and the doctrine of the trinity is a cardinal one in the Christian's creed. Incomprehensible it undoubtedly is, but this is no argument against it, unless, indeed, the man who makes it is omniscient. ↙

2. A man has no right to settle beforehand what God may or may not do, and then condemn the Scriptures because they do not harmonize with his view. God cannot do wrong, we know. But what may be wrong for us to do may not be wrong for God to do. It may be wrong for a man to chastise another man's child, though quite proper for him to punish his own. We have no right to kill a man; it does not follow, though, that God has none. The rationalist raises moral objections to the Bible because he makes the mistake of applying to God the laws which were meant to govern the relations of men.

3. We must not form our judgment of God by the light of the Bible, and at the same time criticise the Bible by our idea of God. If an Eastern prince should send us a package containing a letter and his photograph, it might be well enough to take the necessary means of satisfying ourselves that the package came from the person in question. But that fact being ascertained, we must take the photograph as a genuine picture, even though it should be very unlike

what we would have expected. Now, the Bible is a portrait, if we may so speak, of God. We learn from it that God is just, and that he will take vengeance on those who obey not the gospel of his Son. It is our business to determine whether the Bible gives evidence of being sent to us from God; but having satisfied ourselves of that fact, it would be a very foolish thing to reject any part of it because it does not correspond with the notions we had formed of God.

II. THE CHURCH.

Roman Catholics regard the Church as infallible and her teachings as authoritative. They believe that the Scriptures are infallible and inspired, but deny that they are sufficient. They say that the Church is the custodian of a body of unwritten truth communicated by Christ and his apostles and preserved in the form of tradition. But how are we to distinguish between true and false traditions? Romanists apply the tests of catholicity and antiquity: what has always been believed, and by all Christians, is true. The peculiar doctrines of Romanism will not meet the requirements of this canon, however, and the only way in which they can be justified is to fall back upon the infallibility of the Church. Romanists claim that the traditions are true because endorsed by an infallible Church. Romanism therefore stands or falls with the doctrine of the Church's infallibility. Some say that infallibility resides in the pope as vicar of Christ, and others in the Church, speaking through the majority of her bishops. A word or two, first, on the general question of infallibility:

1. Proof of infallibility is, in the nature of the case, impossible, for the appeal must be made either to Scripture or to tradition. The Scripture cannot be cited to prove the infallibility of the Church, for a favorite point which the Romanists make against Protestants is that

we have no infallible interpretation of the Scriptures. If the Romanist is correct in this argument, it applies with equal force to himself. He cannot appeal to the Scriptures to sustain the infallibility of the Church ; and if he does, he must assume that his Church is infallible in order that he may have an infallible interpretation of those passages of Scriptures on which the infallibility of the Church is based. On the other hand, he cannot appeal to tradition, for his belief that a particular tradition is true depends upon the infallibility of the Church which holds the tradition. Roman Catholic reasoning is proverbially circular. The appeal is to tradition to support infallibility, and to infallibility to certify tradition.

2. The Church of Rome is not infallible, because it contradicts the Scriptures ; and the Scriptures, it concedes, are infallible. The Bible teaches that only God can forgive sins ; Rome says the priest can. The Bible says, Worship God only ; Rome says, Worship the Virgin Mary too. The Bible says there is one Mediator ; Rome says every priest is a mediator. The Bible says that Christ offered himself once for all ; Rome pretends to repeat the sacrifice in celebrating the eucharist. The Bible says we are justified by faith ; Rome says we are justified by baptism. If the Church of Rome is infallible and the Bible is infallible, we have two infallibilities contradicting each other.

But there are special difficulties connected with the infallibility of the pope and the infallibility of the bishops or of general councils. The doctrine of the pope's infallibility is attended with difficulties like the following :

(1.) It is not certain whether the infallibility of the pope follows from the infallibility of the Church, or the infallibility of the Church from the infallibility of the pope. Archbishop Manning holds the latter opinion. "The tradition of the Church is not to test the teaching of the pontiff

by the assent of the Church, but to take the doctrines of the pontiff as the test of the doctrines of the Church." A writer in the *Catholic World* takes the other view, and says: "The infallibility of the pope is implicitly contained in and logically concluded from the infallibility of the Church in general."* And Archbishop Manning himself turns round and appeals to the infallibility of the Church to certify the legitimacy, and therefore the infallibility, of the pope. He says† "that St. Peter was bishop of Rome, . . . that the Council of Trent and the Council of the Vatican are œcumenical—that is, legitimately celebrated and confirmed; that Pius IX. is the successor of St. Peter by legitimate election. These truths are not revealed, . . . yet they are so necessary to the order of faith that the whole would be undermined if they were not infallibly certain. But such infallible certainty is impossible by means of human history and human evidence alone. It is created only by the authority of the Church."

(2.) Some important gaps in history must be filled before it can be shown that the pope is infallible.

(a.) It does not appear in the New Testament that Peter had any primacy among the apostles. Romanists base the doctrine on Matt. xvi. 18: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church."‡ We know, however, that Peter did not lay any claim to precedence, nor was any accorded to him by the other apostles. He writes, "The elders who are among you I exhort, who am also an elder." He did not preside at the Council of Jerusalem. Paul, on one occasion, withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

(b.) It cannot be shown that Peter was ever in Rome.

* *Catholic World* for August, 1871.

† *Petri Privilegium*.

‡ For an exposition of this verse see Lange's *Commentary and Notes*.

(c.) And if it could, it would not follow that he had any successors.

(d.) And if he had successors, it would be impossible to prove that Pope Pius IX. is the legitimate occupant of the papal chair.

(e.) The advocates of papal infallibility are confronted with the damaging fact that the sixth general council, A. D. 680, anathematized Pope Honorius as a heretic.

The Gallican party in the Church of Rome deny that the pope is infallible, but believe in the infallibility of the Church—that is to say, they believe that the decisions of a majority of the bishops are infallible. This position, however, is as untenable as that of the Ultramontanes just noticed.

(1.) It is assumed that the “Church,” to whom promises are given and on whom privileges are conferred, is a visible organization, and is composed of those who are in subjection to the bishop of Rome. Christ promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church. The Church is said to be his body, the fullness of Him who filleth all in all. Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by his blood, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having a spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. It cannot be shown that these statements refer to any visible organization, and far less that that organization is the Church of Rome. We know, moreover, that these statements do not refer to any visible Church; they are true of no one organization as such. They are true, however, of all believers as such, and no organization has a monopoly of them.

(2.) The promises of Christ do not imply infallibility. It is not denied that the New Testament sometimes uses the word church to convey the idea of visible organization,

though in the passages which are most relied on by Romanists we know it has not that signification. Our Lord evidently has referred to the local organization in Matt. xviii. 15, when he speaks of church discipline and says: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." But his promises, whether referring to visible societies of Christians or to Christians as members of his invisible Church, never imply that those to whom they were made were to be preserved from error.

(3.) No argument for the infallibility of the Church—*i. e.*, the bishops—can be based on apostolic succession.

It is claimed that the bishops are successors of the apostles, and have the gifts of the apostles. But the New Testament gives every evidence that the apostolic office was special, and did not survive when the original twelve passed away. There is no evidence that they had any successors, and those who claim apostolic honors do not have the "signs" which accredited those whom Christ ordained. They cannot work miracles, nor are they inspired, nor have they seen the Lord. But the exclusive claims of the Roman Catholic and the Anglo-Catholic communions rest upon the absurd figment of apostolic succession.

If, however, the Church is infallible because the bishops are successors of the apostles, the infallibility of the bishops should be analogous to that of the apostles. The latter were infallible as teachers because they were inspired. Their infallibility was individual and not collective. Romanists do not claim that each bishop is infallible, but that a majority of fallible opinions in a general council amounts to an infallible decision.

(4.) The Church of Rome is in a dilemma.

For if the council was infallible which anathematized Pope Honorius, the pope cannot be above a general council, nor can he be infallible. On the other hand, if the pope is

infallible, the council did wrong in anathematizing Honorius, and must be fallible. And yet, again, if a general council may be fallible, of what value is the decision of the Vatican council which declared the pope to be infallible?

In the light of history, therefore, the claim of infallibility for either pope or council is ridiculous.

III. THE BIBLE.

Protestants deny the authority of tradition, and take the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. Is it an infallible rule? Let us mark the steps which lead to an affirmative answer to this question.

1. The historic credibility of the Bible is a settled question. The books of Moses were written by Moses. The Gospels are genuine biographies, and were written by the men whose names they bear. What is true of the Pentateuch and of the Gospels is true of all the other books of the Bible. The Scriptures have been subjected to the severest criticism, and their authenticity has been placed beyond question. The trustworthiness of the Scriptures as literary documents we therefore take as granted.

2. The Bible gives us a great deal of information respecting God and his relations to men, which we find nowhere else. The most cursory study of it will convince us of this. We find in it accounts of miracles which God did, and which show the close relation subsisting between God and his covenant people. Then, the Bible contains accounts of communications from God to men, and some of them are very extended. A large part of the Old Testament consists of prophetic utterances prefaced with the expression: "Thus saith the Lord." And, finally, the Bible contains doctrines which carry on their face the evidences of divine authorship, because they meet so exactly the wants of the human heart and are in such strong contrast with all hu-

man efforts to supply them. The doctrine of expiation by an incarnate God may be taken as an example.

A large part of the Bible being a written account of what God did and said, we may properly say that it contains the word of God.

3. The whole Bible is God's message. This is another step in advance. The Bible was not written simply because it occurred to several writers to put on record the facts in their possession or to reduce to writing their religious sentiments. God designed it to be an authorized message from him to men. Several considerations point to this conclusion. The official standing of some of the writers—Moses, for instance—would bespeak official value for what they wrote. And then, the Bible being the only means of making known the way of salvation, we may presume that it was designed to be an official communication. For, if it was not, there was no official communication, and we are left to believe that, although the scheme of redemption was of sufficient importance to engage the thought of God, it is due to accident that an account of it has been preserved. Besides, the Bible is an organism. The several books stand in designed relation to one body of truth, and the whole body is animated by the same spirit.

Parts of the Bible we know were written by express command of God—the Pentateuch, the prophecies of Jeremiah, the Apocalypse, for example. The books of Moses are frequently quoted as the law of the Lord. Christ referred to the Old Testament as authoritative. Peter says that the things which were written aforetime were written for our learning. The repeated occurrence of expressions like "It is written," "What saith the Scripture," "The Scripture saith," shows that writers of the New Testament regarded the Old Testament as a divine message.

4. The Bible is infallible. We should expect that God would protect his message against the errors which are in-

cident to mere human authorship. We should naturally suppose that no unauthorized books would be allowed a place in the sacred canon. The references to the Old Testament which we find in the New confirm this judgment. All the parts of the Old Testament are put on the same level. No difference of rank or value is recognized. They are all embraced in the same titles, and the titles indicate their sacred character: The Scriptures, The Holy Scriptures, The Hallowed Writings, The Oracles of God.

The greatest deference is paid the Old Testament by the writers of the New. Incidental circumstances in the life of our Lord are spoken of as fulfillments of prophecy. This cannot be accounted for on any other supposition than that the evangelists believed in the verbal infallibility of the Old Testament. Our Lord himself asserts the infallibility of the Old Testament: "The Scriptures must be fulfilled." "The Scriptures cannot be broken." "All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning me." Moreover, the verbal references to the Old Testament which we find in the writings of Paul prove that he and the Jewish people generally believed in the verbal infallibility of the Old Testament. Unless the infallibility of Scripture extended to its words, the apostle would not have been justified in making a single word the premise of a syllogism. He did so, however, in more instances than one, and we must conclude that Paul reasoned falsely or that the Old Testament is verbally infallible.

5. The Old Testament is declared to be of divine authorship.

Passages are cited from Scripture as the words of the Holy Ghost. Heb. iii. 7: "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Acts iv. 24: "And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said,

Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is; who, *by the mouth of thy servant David hast said*, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?" Acts i. 16: "And in those days Peter stood up . . . and said, . . . Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, *which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake* before concerning Judas." 2 Peter i. 20: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation, for the prophecy came not in old time of the will of man, but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16: "And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

"The New Testament canonizes the Old, the INCARNATE WORD sets his seal on the WRITTEN WORD. The incarnate Word is God, therefore the inspiration of the Old Testament is authenticated by God himself."* It will not require much evidence to convince one of the inspiration of the New Testament who believes in that of the Old. It may be inferred from the fact that it evidently forms part of God's revelation and is necessary to the full exhibition of the gospel scheme. Our Lord, however, promised the inspiration of the Spirit to guide the apostles: "The Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." Luke xii. 12. "For it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." Mark xiii. 11. And Paul says (1 Cor. ii. 13), "Which things also we speak not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." If the apostles were preserved against error in their oral utterances, how much more may we suppose them to have been inspired in writing what was to shape the Church's faith in all time! We know, however, that Peter

* Wordsworth on the Canon, p. 51, Am. Ed.

placed the writings of Paul on a level with the inspired writings of the Old Testament: "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you, as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also *the other Scriptures*, unto their own destruction." 2 Peter iii. 15-17.

The Bible, therefore, not only contains the word of God, but it is the word of God.

It is infallible because it is inspired. The Holy Ghost influenced the sacred writers to such an extent that what they said, God said. His influence, however, did not destroy their individuality or abridge their liberty. It made them infallible as teachers, but not perfect as Christians. Inspiration is one thing, sanctification another.

The Bible is a human book; it is also a divine book. It had human authors; it has a divine Author. Moses wrote history; David wrote psalms; Paul wrote letters. Suppose there were no inspiration guiding these writers. Moses might still have remembered his interviews with God, and have written them out with tolerable accuracy. He might still have been a trustworthy historian of the Exodus, though we could not feel sure that he had incorporated no errors in his books. David, being a religious man, might have written pious psalms, as religious men have since done, but he might have put wrong sentiments in them too; for good as he was, he was far from perfect. Paul might have written his doctrinal Epistles, and there would have been good reason for believing that Paul knew what was true and what was false. But Paul may nevertheless have had some wrong views, and we could not tell but what these views were expressed in his letters. The Bible might still contain a great deal of valuable information regarding God and our relations to him, but it would not be infallible.

But God is also the author of Scripture. God writes history. The history must therefore be true in every detail. God writes psalms. The psalms must therefore express proper religious feelings. God writes letters. The letters can give no unwise counsel, contain no false reasoning, propagate no false doctrine.

The doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures is one of practical and fundamental importance.

LESSON III.

SIN.

THE whole Bible is summed up in two words: Sin and Salvation. It is with the first of these that we have now to deal. The subject is very important; for the conclusions we reach regarding sin will affect our opinions in respect to the atonement. It is also very wide. In the discussion of it four distinct inquiries arise, each of which has been the subject of many volumes and much debate. These inquiries concern: (1.) The nature of sin. (2.) Inability. (3.) Original sin. (4.) Adamic relation.

I. NATURE OF SIN.

Is sin a misfortune; or is it a fault? Is it a disease which ensures suffering, or is it an offence which deserves punishment? Is salvation cure or pardon? Our Shorter Catechism says: "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God." This statement accords with the voice of conscience and the word of God. Violation of law is implied in the idea of doing wrong. Sense of guilt is the feeling that punishment is deserved. A crime may prove a blunder, for it may cost a man his liberty; and being a blunder, he may regret that he committed it. But this is a

very different feeling from that which a man entertains when he realizes that he did wrong and deserves punishment. Punishment may have a very salutary effect upon the criminal, or it may deter others from committing a similar offence. But neither the reformatory nor the deterrent element of punishment exhausts the idea which the word suggests. We feel that justice requires that the offender shall suffer—that he deserves to suffer.

If we turn to the Bible, we shall find that sin is spoken of as related to law. Man's first sin was disobedience. The relation subsisting between God and man, even when man was innocent, was that of ruler and ruled—of sovereign and subject. Great injustice is done the book of Genesis when men regard God exclusively as our Father, and forget he is our King. The nature of sin is clearly seen in God's treatment of it. The pain which the child suffers when he burns his finger is not punishment, nor is its removal pardon. Sin is always spoken of, however, as being punished or pardoned. The suffering which follows it is a judicial infliction. Confession of sin presupposes this. We pray for forgiveness, not for cure. The heathen are proven to be under condemnation though they never had the law of Moses; they are a law unto themselves, and are judged on the ground that they violated the law written on the heart.

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves. Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another.” Rom. ii. 14, 15.

“Sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John iii. 4.

Sin exposes us to punishment. The punishment of sin is death—death temporal, death spiritual, death eternal. Salvation must mean, therefore, deliverance from condemnation. It may include more than this; it does, as we shall

see, but it must assure us of pardon, or it is not salvation. The word used to express the idea of exposure to punishment is *guilt*. A religion which does not tell us how we may be free from guilt does us no good. It may have many excellencies, it may inculcate pure morals, but it leaves us under condemnation.

II. INABILITY.

All men sin. They have all gone out of the way. There is none righteous, no, not one. If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. We begin to sin when we begin to speak. As soon as children perform rational acts they show signs of sinful dispositions. They go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.

Sin is a tyrant. Even Christians are not altogether free from its dominion. "I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." Rom. vii. 22, 23.

How is the universality of sin to be explained? How is its power to be accounted for? There are three answers: The Pelagian, the Semi-Pelagian, and the Augustinian.

The Pelagian says that man is *well*, that he has full ability to do all that is required of him, and that sin is due to the effect that he exercises the power of a free agent and chooses to sin.

This is contradicted by conscience, and opposed to the Bible. We know that we ought to do what it is out of our power to do. Paul said he could not do the things he would. The drunkard knows he ought to be sober, but he is the slave of appetite. Besides, it does not explain the fact that all men do sin to say that they can sin. The Pelagian sees the tree of humanity bearing evil fruit, but fails to apply the principle furnished by our Lord.

The Semi-Pelagian says that man is *sick* and needs divine assistance, though he believes that he may repent of his sins and turn to God under the influence of persuasion, and without divine influence. And it must be confessed that he can repent and believe if he is disposed to do so. The difficulty is, however, that he has no disposition to repent and believe, and will have none until influenced by the Spirit of God. This is the opinion of the third class.

The Augustinian believes that man is *dead*, and spiritually can do nothing good. This is the doctrine of our Confession: "From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." chap. vi., § 4. Again, "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself or prepare himself thereunto." chap. ix., § 3.

This doctrine we believe to be true—

(1.) Because it serves best to explain the universality of sin and its controlling power.

(2.) Because faith and repentance are spoken of in Scripture as the gifts of God:

"By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." Eph. ii. 8. "For unto you it is given in behalf of Christ not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for his sake." Phil. i. 29. "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Acts xi. 18. "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." 2 Tim. ii. 25.

(3.) Because the doctrine is more or less directly affirmed in the Scriptures:

"No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him." John vi. 44. "And you hath he quickened

who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. ii. 1. "The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. viii. 7. "The natural man discerneth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14.

It is clear therefore that we need more than pardon. Salvation must deliver us from the guilt, and also from the power, of sin. It must change our legal condition, and also transform our character. The one is, as we shall see, the work of Christ, the other that of the Spirit.

III. ORIGINAL SIN.

A man may say: "I admit that I am so constituted that I must certainly sin. But am I under condemnation on account of the corruption of my nature, from which actual transgression proceeds?" Our standards answer this question affirmatively. The Catechism calls the corruption of our nature "original sin," and the Confession (ch. vi.) says: "Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner," etc.

This is true—1. Because it is difficult, if not impossible, to account for our being responsible for actual transgression, if we are not responsible for the corrupt nature from which all actual transgressions do proceed. The readiest way of explaining our responsibility for sins which our inability rendered certain is to suppose that we are accountable for our inability.

2. Because it is involved in our idea of character. The fact that a bad act is the indication of a wicked heart makes it all the more heinous in our sight. So far from a bad disposition being an apology for malicious conduct, the disposition itself is the object of our reprehension.

Moreover, we are conscious of and pray to be delivered

from evil thoughts and feelings which are not under our control, but which have moral quality, nevertheless.

3. Because sins of omission are heinous as well as sins of commission. We are responsible not only for doing what we ought not to have done, but for not doing what we ought to have done. We ought to be perfectly holy, and we are not, and cannot be. This cannot be explained without supposing that we are responsible for our corrupt nature.*

4. Because physical death is part of the penalty of sin, and infants die who have not been guilty of actual transgression. "And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. v. 12.

5. Because the Scriptures plainly teach it: We are by nature the children of wrath even as others. "For I was born in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. li. 5. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Matt. vii. 16-19.†

IV. ADAMIC RELATION.

But how do we become responsible for the corruption of our nature? We find the solution in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. There it is distinctly stated that the cause of our transgression was Adam's sin. By one man's disobedience many were made sinners. By the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation.

* See Shedd on the sin of omission, in "Sermons to the Natural Man."

† These verses were his [Augustine's] weapon against the shallow Pelagian scheme, which would look at men's deeds apart from the living root in man out of which they grew, and suppose that man's unaided will is capable of good.—*Alford, in loc.*

Our Catechism says: "The covenant being made with Adam not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression." In the explanation of this relation there is considerable difference of opinion among divines in our Church; some hold that Adam, being a sinner, begat children in his own likeness—that is to say, with corrupt natures; that, having corrupt natures, they are under condemnation on that account. Others hold that there is a oneness of relation between Adam and his posterity, so that what he did they did, and what he suffered they shared. This oneness is by some held to be a realistic oneness—that is, a oneness in the sense that we were actually in Adam when he sinned, and actually committed the offence. By others it is held to be a federal oneness—that is to say, that Adam was the representative of the race, and what he did was accounted as being done by his posterity. Spiritual death or inability is alike in the case of Adam and his posterity the punishment of sin as well as sin itself.

The inquirer will naturally ask how it can be that the fortunes of the race have been staked upon the conduct of one. Our inability to answer this question does not affect the fact that this is nevertheless the teaching of Scripture. It is our duty to accept the truth on God's authority. This, however, may be said—that, considering the way in which the race is perpetuated, no fairer probation can be conceived than that which the human race had in Adam, who was created in full possession of his faculties and in the image of God. It is a blessed thought, moreover, that where sin abounded grace did much more abound.

LESSON IV.

THE ATONEMENT.

SIN has been attended with two ruinous results. It has exposed the race to condemnation, and it has debased its nature. Salvation is therefore a twofold deliverance. This is beautifully expressed in Toplady's lines :

"Be of sin the double cure,
Cleanse me from its guilt and power."

Now, all who profess to be Christians regard Jesus as the Saviour. What do we mean, however, when we say that Jesus is the Saviour? What has he done to justify the use of this name? Different answers are given to these questions. They may all be grouped, however, under two heads, the Socinian and the sacrificial views. These two are the poles apart. They are so different as really to constitute two different religions. According to the one view, Christ is our Saviour because he influences us by his example, teaching, sympathy or otherwise, to lead a better life. Similarly, a drunkard might call a man his saviour by whose influence he was induced to become sober and abstinent.

The other view regards Christ as our Saviour because he died as a sacrifice for our sins. It considers the effect of Christ's work to be mainly that of expiating our guilt by his own death, and so delivering us from condemnation.

I. THE SOCINIAN VIEW.

Under this head are classed all who hold that the saving work of Christ consists in the effect produced upon our personal conduct, and who ignore or deny the fact that his death is the ground of pardon. It includes, we regret to say, some who believe in the supreme divinity of Christ, though it is difficult to see how men can believe that Christ

is God, and at the same time take this low view of his work.

1. Humanitarians say that Christ was a mere man. He taught and practiced a pure morality. He met death in the attempt to overthrow a false system. He bore witness to the truth, and died a martyr. This is simple enough, certainly; and if true, the wonder is that Paul ever said, "Great is the mystery of godliness." There would be no mystery about it.

2. Others go so far as to say that Jesus, though a creature, was far above every other creature, that he existed before he became incarnate, that he came to bear God's message, to disclose the doctrine of immortality, to preach a pure faith and be an example of a spotless life. His death was didactic. It was to teach us the lesson of self-sacrifice, and was that of a hero.

3. Some believe in the supreme divinity of Christ, but still believe that his saving influence consisted in supplying us with new motives for living a better life. He not only became incarnate that he might be an embodiment of perfect manhood, but he entered into partnership with us in the trials of life in order that he might win us by his sympathy, and induce us to leave our sins and lead a holy life. His death was a dramatic exhibition of his sympathy.

4. And there is a class of mystical thinkers who maintain, with those already mentioned, the subjective view of Christ's saving work, though they hold that the improved conduct of the Christian is not the effect of example, and is not the result of moral suasion, but is the result of a partaking, in some mysterious way, of the life of Christ.

Differing though these classes do from one another, we can see at a glance that they all identify salvation with personal holiness, or, rather, with reformation. The objections, therefore, which follow are to be urged against them all.

1. The Socinian view assumes that God will pardon men on condition of repentance and reformation. This is altogether contrary to Scripture. It teaches that condemnation is universal. "Judgment hath come upon all men to condemnation," that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God. This condemnation is everlasting, for it stands in contrast with the everlasting life which Christ gives; and those who reject that shall never see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them. From this condemnation it is impossible for men to be delivered by works of the law. "Therefore, by works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

2. This view identifies salvation with good conduct, but makes no provision for our deliverance from the bondage of sin.

Let it be granted that if we are holy God will forgive us. How are we to be holy? Men do not love holiness; they are, by virtue of their depravity, "made opposite to all good." Good example and a high standard will not influence men who are dead in sin. Nor will they be moved by Christ's sympathy. The view under notice fails to do justice either to the guilt or to the power of sin.

3. It does not explain the fact that salvation is so constantly referred to Christ's death. If the good we derive from Christ is his example, or his doctrine, or his sympathy, it is singular that the sacred writers refer so constantly to his death. We should expect them to say as little about the cross as those do who preach the views to which we are now alluding. On the contrary, Jesus Christ and him crucified was the theme of apostolic preaching.

4. But these opinions in regard to the work of Christ are false because they are in conflict with the passages which have a sacrificial import. These may be more properly alluded to, however, under the next view, to which we now pass.

II. THE SACRIFICIAL VIEW.

The view which we are now to consider embraces all those who hold that the death of Christ was a sacrifice, on account of which God pardons sin and receives us into his favor. There is room, of course, for a difference of opinion in regard to the exact relation in which the sacrifice of Christ stands to our salvation. But with this we are not at present concerned.

It should be remembered, however, that those who believe in the sacrificial character of Christ's death do not hold in less esteem than the advocates of the Socinian view his example, teaching and sympathy. On the contrary, it is through the benefits which flow from Christ's sacrifice that we are able to appreciate Christ's example, to improve under his teaching, or to be affected by his exhibition of sympathy.

The view to which reference has just been made is seriously false. Great care should be taken not to be imposed upon by theories which, though they retain orthodox phraseology, are in radical opposition to the gospel. A theory which denies that Christ is the propitiation for our sin, and that we have redemption through his blood, is not the gospel of Christ. The sacrificial character of Christ's death will appear:

1. From the fact that our salvation is so constantly referred to his death. It is his death which he would have us remember in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The bread represents his body, "broken for us;" the wine his blood, which was "shed for many for the remission of sins." We are "reconciled to God by the death of his Son." "We have redemption through his blood." "Christ died for the ungodly." These passages are unmeaning if Christ saves by moral suasion or force of good example. They are perfectly plain, however, if his death was an expiatory offering.

The Jews were accustomed to a sacrificial system; and when Jesus was spoken of as the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, they saw the reference at once to the sacrifice of the lamb without blemish which the law of Moses ordained.

2. Passages abound in Scripture which teach that Christ redeemed us. "We are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish." "Christ hath redeemed us to God by his blood." "We are bought with a price." Christ said that he came to give "his life a ransom for many."

3. Christ is a priest, and a priest, moreover, "who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, and then for the people's, for this he did once when he offered up himself." "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot unto God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 13, 14.

4. Christ is called a Sacrifice. He is said to have given himself "an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." "He is the propitiation for our sins." "He was made sin for us who knew no sin." "He bore our sins in his own body on the tree." "The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all."

5. If Christ was a sacrifice, the teachings of the Bible are consistent. If he was not, they cannot be explained. And this constitutes a very strong argument.

Those who say that Christ's death was not sacrificial are compelled—(a.) To do violence to language by saying that the Old Testament sacrifices were not expiatory; or (b.) to affirm that there is no analogy between the death of Christ

and the sacrifices of the old economy, and that the representations of the New Testament are figurative.

As to the first position, we can only say that if the book of Leviticus, and the sixteenth chapter particularly, does not teach that the offerings were penal, vicarious and expiatory, language cannot be found which will convey the idea. And as to the second, we remark that if the language of the New Testament is figurative, the writers of it were more given to poetical expressions than any writers who have ever lived. If the sober utterances of inspired men can be explained away on the ground that they are metaphorical, Talleyrand was truly right in saying that language was meant to conceal thought. Those, however, who assume that the apostles found it necessary to employ falsifying metaphors in order to commend the gospel to the Jews must assume that God's education of that nation was a failure. It would be strange if the effect of their being made the custodians of the oracles of God should be to unfit them for receiving the gospel except through the channel of falsehood.

The view which regards the death of Christ as a sacrifice is much simpler and more natural. It explains how his death is spoken of as the ground of salvation. It shows that the Jewish ritual was a type of Christ, and so preserves the unity of the two Testaments. It leads us, too, to see how God prepared for the advent of Christ by familiarizing the Jews with the language of the altar, so that it was no strange thing for them to learn that we have received "redemption through his blood."

The Bible represents Christ as executing the offices of prophet, priest and king. Our Shorter Catechism, in the answer to Question 25, says; "Christ executeth the office of a priest in his once offering up of himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and reconcile us to God, and in making continual intercession for us."

The relation of the sacrifice of Christ to the pardon of

our sins and our acceptance with God would be more properly considered under the head of Justification. Meanwhile, notice that three things are to be said of the death of Christ :

1. It was penal.

It was not the result of unavoidable circumstances, for Jesus said, I lay down my life ; no man taketh it from me. Nor was it didactic, merely, intended as a manifestation of sympathy or an illustration of heroism. It was judicial. He was delivered for our offences. He was made a curse for us.

2. It was vicarious.

He knew no sin ; and if he stood in legal relations and endured penalty, it must have been for others. He bore our sins in his own body on the tree. He died, the just for the unjust. He gave his life a ransom for many (in place of many).

3. It was expiatory.

The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin.

LESSON V.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

WHO is Jesus? We know what he did. He gave his life as our ransom. He died to expiate our guilt. He is our Saviour. Our Lord once asked his disciples, What think ye of Christ? and the same question has fallen upon the ear of humanity ever since. Three leading replies have been given. Humanitarians say that Christ is a man, and nothing more. Arians say that Christ, though a creature, was more than man. The Nicene or orthodox view, is that Christ is both God and man. Let us notice these replies in their order.

I. THE HUMANITARIANS.

Two classes are embraced under this head: (*a*) those who deny that there is anything supernatural in Christ's life, and who say that he was born, lived and died as other men; (*b*) those who believe that Christ was only a man, but who believed also in his supernatural birth, his divine commission and his resurrection from the dead.

Humanitarians affirm a very important truth when they say that Christ was a man. It may be well, therefore, to emphasize this fact, which we hold in common with them, before we consider the point of difference which separates us from them.

Jesus Christ was a man. He is spoken of eighty-two times in the New Testament as the Son of man. He is called the man Christ Jesus. He had a "true body." It was not a phantasm or shadow, as the Docetæ thought. Our Lord was born of a woman. His body grew and increased in strength. During the temptation he hungered. On the cross he cried, "I thirst." He was wearied. He slept once at night in a boat, and rested once at noon by a well. He had a true body after his resurrection. The doubting disciple had proof of this. He went up to heaven with a real, though a glorified, body.

He also had "a reasonable soul." This has been denied. The Apollinarians believed in what is called the tripartite nature of man, and held that, while Christ had a human body and the animal soul, the spirit was wanting, and that its place was supplied by the Logos. In a modified form this view is maintained by some at the present day. It is false, however; our Lord's life was as completely human as it was completely divine. He suffered; he rejoiced in spirit; he loved; he wept; he formed friendships; he used the language of indignation; he was tempted; he was made under the law; his soul was exceeding sorrow-

ful even unto death. If Christ had no human soul, these references would have no meaning. A human body is not a man. An angel in human form is not a man. God in the garment of flesh and blood could not be called a man. If Christ had no soul, he was not human, and was not our brother.

The full humanity of Jesus is a truth of vital importance. All that is precious in Christian experience is involved in it. Christ must be a man—

1. That he might be our example. He has left us an example that we should follow in his steps.

2. That he might sympathize with us. Having suffered, being tempted, he is able also to succor them who are tempted.

3. That he might take our place in law. He was made under the law that he might redeem them who are under the law.

4. That he might be our High Priest. "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin."

5. That he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God. "Being tempted in all points, like as we are, yet without sin."

And yet the humanity of Christ is of little worth if Christ is only a man. Humanitarians lavish eulogies on Jesus, but they are only laying garlands on the grave of the dead. We worship a living Christ. It is because he is more than man—that Christianity is not a system of philosophy on the one hand, or a system of hero-worship on the other.

We may appeal to Christ's character to prove that he was not an ordinary man—that he was, to say the least, divinely inspired. Some find in it proof of his divinity, but this is to make it responsible for conclusions which are not legitimately deducible from it. We are not shut up to the

belief in Christ's divinity because his character is, as Dr. Schaff says, "the greatest moral miracle in history." *

The character of Christ is peerless. The words of Pilate are the verdict of the ages: I find no fault in him. But perfect manhood is no evidence of Deity. When we are asked to account for this solitary instance of perfection, we are driven to the conclusion that Christ stood in intimate relation with God. As Nicodemus would have said: no man could have lived as he lived except God were with him. And yet Christ may have had a supernatural birth, have lived a perfect life and have risen from the dead, and still have been a man—a mere man, though by no means an ordinary man. But Christ was more than man, as we shall see.

II. THE ARIANS.

It is difficult to understand how any one can believe the teachings of the New Testament and suppose that Christ was a mere man. Arians, though they believe that Christ is a creature, reject the Humanitarian view. Their belief may be stated in the words of Dr. Samuel Clarke, an Arian of the last century: "With this first or supreme cause or Father of all things, there has existed from the beginning a second divine person who is the Word or Son." "The Father alone," he says elsewhere, "is, absolutely speaking, the God of the universe." Arians appeal to the numerous passages of Scripture which teach the pre-existence of Jesus,† such as John iii. 16: "But he that came down from heaven." ix. 64: "What if ye shall see the Son of man ascending up where he was before." xvii. 4: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world

* See Schaff's "Person of Christ," and Dr. Bushnell's chapter on the character of Christ in his "Nature and the Supernatural."

† Clarke on the Trinity.

See the admirable chapter on the pre-existence of Christ in Hill's "Lectures on Divinity."

was." The Arian finds that the Scriptures place Christ on a plane far above that of mere humanity, for they teach that Christ existed long before he came in the flesh, and that in his pre-existent state he exercised authority, wielded power, received homage, which proves him to be invested with a dignity which is shared by no other creature—which takes him out of the sphere of created beings altogether, we should say. But we shall come to that presently.

Arianism fails to explain the teachings of Scripture respecting Christ. It refutes Humanitarianism by showing that Christ is more than man. It is in turn refuted by Humanitarianism, which proves that Christ was at least a man. Arianism is false because it destroys Christ's humanity,* and because it denies his deity. His humanity has been proved. His deity must now be considered.

III. THE NICENE DOCTRINE.

The Council of Nice in 325 A. D. condemned Arianism, and affirmed that "the Son is begotten out of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of light, very God of very God, begotten not created, consubstantial with the Father." The Nicene creed expresses the faith of the Christian Church. But before the evidence for the deity of Christ is presented, notice that the Arian has already overcome the greatest difficulty connected with the person of Christ in admitting the supernatural element which enters into it. The Arian is the ally of the orthodox in proving, in opposition to the

* The incarnation, according to Arius, was merely the assumption by the Son of a human body, his nature supplying the place of a soul. Robertson's "Church History," vol. i., p. 208.

"You run counter to all the ancients in supposing the Logos to have supplied the place of a human soul, and making the Logos as such *possible*." Waterland's "Vindication" (reply to Dr. Clarke).

"We believe that Jesus is one mind, soul—one being, as truly as we are one, and equally distinct from the one God." Channing's "Unitarian Christianity."

Humanitarian, that Christ existed ages before he was born, and was in the bosom of the Father before the world was made. The question now is to determine whether Jesus is the highest of all creatures or whether he is God. There are some passages of Scripture which, though they naturally suggest the deity of Christ, may, we admit, be construed in an Arian sense; and since we can quote only a few, we shall not mention these at all. The following passages teach the deity of Christ unequivocally :

1. Christ claimed to be equal with God. He said, "I and my Father are one." "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." "That ye may know the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, I say unto thee, Arise." "Have I been so long a time with thee, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?"

On the supposition that Christ is less than God, these utterances cannot be explained. The Jews understood him to lay claim to divine honors, and stoned him on that account: "We stone thee for blasphemy because thou, being a man, makest thyself God." Christ did not tell them that they had misunderstood him. He accepted their interpretation of his claims. The claims of Christ are backed by his character and his miracles. It is impossible to believe that so pure a man as Jesus was would pretend to be what he was not, or that God would enable him to work miracles in support of a falsehood.

2. Christ is the angel of the covenant.* When God revealed himself to the patriarchs, it was usually in the form of an angel. An angel appeared to Jacob at Bethel, to Moses on Sinai. The angel of the Lord went before the camp of Israel in their journeying through the wilderness. We have abundant proof that this angel was not a created

* See Hill's "Lectures in Divinity" on actions ascribed to Jesus in his pre-existent state.

being ; he is invariably spoken of as God. "The angel of the Lord spake with me," says Jacob, "saying, I am the God of Bethel." The angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of the bush. "And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush." There can be no doubt that the same person is called angel and Jehovah. "The angel" or "the angel of the covenant" was understood by the Jews to mean the person who had appeared to the patriarchs, and who led Israel through the desert. This person was divine, for he is called Jehovah. If it can be shown that this person was Christ, it will prove that Christ is God. We read in Malachi iii. 1 : "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me : and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in." This prophecy is referred in the gospel to John the Baptist. John the Baptist is therefore the messenger of whom it is said, "He shall prepare the way before me." But John the Baptist prepared the way for Christ. Christ is therefore the one referred to in Malachi, in the next clause of the verse, as the Lord (Jehovah), the messenger (angel) of the covenant.

3. Christ is called God in the New Testament : "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us." John i.

"And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God." John xx. 28.

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts xx. 28.

"Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." Rom. ix. 5.

“Great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh.” 1 Tim. iii. 16.

“This (person, Jesus Christ) is the true God and eternal life.” 1 John v. 20.

“Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” Titus ii. 3.*

These passages directly assert the deity of Christ. It must be remembered, too, that he is referred to in the Psalms and the prophets in terms which would be inapplicable to any creature. He is called the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace. In the New Testament, he is constantly called the Lord, our Lord, the Lord of glory. He is before all things. He is the first-born of every creature. The world was made by him. He is the image of the invisible God. He is to be honored even as we honor the Father. He is the judge of men. He is the object of worship. He is omnipresent and omniscient. He does divine acts, is the subject of divine attributes, shares divine honors, and is called God. If we are willing to accept the Scriptures as our infallible rule of faith, the deity of Christ must be considered as proved.

It is urged by objectors that it is impossible to comprehend how the Son can be God and the Father God, and yet that there is only one God. It is a mystery, of course. But the doctrine is not false because it is incomprehensible. It is not strange that the relations which the persons of the Godhead sustain to one another baffle our comprehension.

It is also said that Christ speaks of himself as subordinate to the Father. He says, “My Father is greater than I.”

* Ellicott, Com. in loc., says, “It is difficult to resist the conviction that our blessed Lord is here said to be our μέγας Θεός, and that this text is a direct, definite, and even *studied*, declaration of the divinity of the eternal Son.”

He intimates that some things are known to the Father which are not known to the Son: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father." Mark xiii. 32.

But we must remember that Christ had a finite human nature as well as an infinite divine nature. Christ, though co-equal with the Father, was officially subordinate to him in his mediatorial work. These considerations fully explain the passages referred to without derogating from Christ's divinity.

The deity of Christ is a practical doctrine. Between those who believe and those who deny it the distance is measureless. If Christ is a creature, we are idolaters who worship him. If Christ is God, his death cannot be explained except upon the principle that without the shedding of blood there is no remission. Those who deny the deity of Christ, as a rule, deny the sacrificial character of his death. Those who believe that his death was the propitiation for our sins are naturally led to believe that he is God. It is well to notice how the doctrines confirm one another. Sin calls for sacrifice, as we have already seen; but the sacrifice of an angel could not save us. It must be a human sacrifice. Christ is the sacrifice, and he has a human nature. But the death of a mere man could not atone for our sins. It must be the death of a divine person to give it value. Christ had a divine nature.

The Scripture doctrine of the person of Christ is summed up in these propositions:

1. He had a complete human nature—*i. e.*, a true body and a reasonable soul.
2. He had a true divine nature. He was God.
3. These natures exist entire and distinct, without mixture or confusion.
4. He is one person.

Though having two natures, he has only a single person-

ality. He is the divine person who existed from all eternity.

Our Shorter Catechism expresses this by saying that "The only redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and continues to be, God and man, in two distinct natures and one person for ever."

LESSON VI.

THE TRINITY.

RELIGION presupposes God. Belief in God is universal, and is vindicated by valid arguments. There is need of an authoritative standard to give us information regarding God's nature, and to arbitrate between conflicting opinions. That standard is the Bible. These propositions have all been considered.

The Bible teaches—

1. That God is.

It does not offer proof of his existence. It takes it for granted. It relates what God said and did, and what he would have us believe and do.

2. That there is only one God.

"Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." Deut. vi. 4. "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things." 1 Cor. viii. 5. There is evidence in history, and apart from Scripture, that polytheism is the corrupted form of an original monotheistic faith. For a preservation of monotheism, however, we are indebted to revelation. Jews, Mohammedans and Christians believe in one God because they have been taught by the Bible.

3. That he is extra-mundane.

Pantheists profess to believe in God, but they identify God with the universe. God is everything, and everything

is God. The Scriptures teach that God is distinct from the world, for he made it: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." Ps. xc. 2.

4. That he is a spirit, infinite in every perfection.

"God is a spirit, and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv. 24. Our Shorter Catechism gives this answer to the question, What is God? God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth.*

5. That he is a person.

This is involved in the attributes first ascribed to him. He is not a force, a tendency, a law. He is a person whom we can address, whom we can love, who can reward or punish us. To deny the personality of God is, to all intents and purposes, to avow Atheism.†

But this is not all. We have reached conclusions regarding Christ which make it necessary to believe more than we have yet stated regarding God.

Jesus Christ is God. Jesus Christ is likewise the Son of God. So that we have God the Father and God the Son. We have God the Holy Ghost also, as we shall see. For it can be shown—(a) That the Holy Ghost is a person. Some orthodox people, because they are very thoughtless or very ignorant, speak of the Holy Ghost as *it*. The Holy Ghost is not simply the power of God, a divine influence or energy. He is a person, as we are clearly taught in passages like the following: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God."

* For remarks on the attributes of God, see the commentary on the Confession of Faith, by Dr. A. A. Hodge.

† Matthew Arnold defines God to be a stream of tendency according to which all things fulfill the law of their being. The great mistake of Christianity, according to him, consists in regarding God as a person.—*Literature and Dogma*.

Eph. iv. 30. "The Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." Rom. viii. 26. "The Spirit said unto Peter, Behold, three men seek thee." Acts x. 19. The Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Acts xiii. 2.

"The Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name; he shall teach you all things." John xiv. 26.*

(b.) That the Holy Ghost is God.

There are few who believe that the Holy Ghost is a creature. Those who deny the Trinity maintain that by the Spirit is simply meant the operation of God or the influence which God exerts. The deity of the Spirit seems to follow when his personality is established. It is very clear that he is not a creature. The unpardonable sin is blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Ananias was told that he had lied to the Holy Ghost. And when Peter repeated the statement, he said that he had lied unto God. To lie unto the Holy Ghost, therefore, is to lie unto God.

Again, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Christians are spoken of as temples of God, and this is explained by the statement that the Spirit of God dwelleth in them. We are taught to honor the Spirit as we honor the Father and the Son, for we are baptized in his name, and the apostolic benediction invokes the communion of the Holy Ghost as well as the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Scriptures teach, therefore, 1. That there is only one God. 2. That the Father is God; that the Son is God; that the Holy Ghost is God.

Those who accept these facts differ in their explanation of them, and their difference is brought out in the two leading opinions on the Trinity: the Sabellian and the Athanasian.

* See PEARSON on the Creed, art. viii.

I. THE SABELLIAN DOCTRINE.

The Scripture requires us to believe in the deity of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and at the same time preserve the doctrine of the divine unity. This is a difficulty. The first, and perhaps the most natural, solution of it would be what is known in Church history as Sabellianism, or the doctrine of a modal Trinity. Those who hold this opinion suppose that the same Being manifests himself, at one time and in one relation, as Father; at another time and in another relation, as Son; and at another time and in another relation, as Holy Ghost. As Creator, God is Father; as Redeemer, he is the Son; as Sanctifier, he is the Holy Ghost, just as the same man may be known by different names at different times and under different circumstances. As a church officer, he may be called deacon; as a professional man, he may be called judge; while a third party, associating his name with army reminiscences, may call him general.

The doctrine of a modal Trinity, however, does not teach the whole truth. It teaches truly that the Father is God, that the Son is God, that the Holy Ghost is God, and yet that there are not three Gods, but one God. But it denies that the Father is a person distinct from the Son, the Son a person distinct from the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost is a person distinct from the Father and the Son. "The scriptural facts are—(a) the Father says I, the Son says I, the Spirit says I. (b) The Father says thou to the Son, and the Son says thou to the Father, and in like manner the Father and Son use the pronouns he and him in reference to the Spirit. (c) The Father loves the Son, the Son loves the Father, the Spirit testifies of the Son."*

In other words, the Scriptures teach the doctrine of a tri-personal God.

* Dr. Hodge, "Systematic Theology," vol. i., p. 444.

II. THE ATHANASIAN DOCTRINE.

The full scriptural doctrine of the Trinity is set forth in the so-called Athanasian creed. We quote a few sentences:

“But this is the catholic faith, that we worship one God in trinity, and trinity in unity. Neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance. For the person of the Father is one, of the Son another, of the Holy Spirit another. But the divinity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is one, the glory equal, the majesty equal. Such as is the Father, such also is the Son, and such the Holy Spirit. The Father is uncreated, the Son is uncreated, the Holy Spirit is uncreated. The Father is infinite, the Son is infinite, the Holy Ghost is infinite. The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, the Holy Ghost is eternal. And yet there are not three eternal beings, but one eternal Being. As also there are not three uncreated beings nor three infinite beings, but one uncreated and one infinite Being.”

It is to be noticed that the Athanasian creed does not add anything to what the Scriptures themselves teach regarding God. The Bible teaches—(1) That there is only one God. (2) That the Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost God. (3) That Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three distinct persons. These three facts constitute the Church doctrine of the Trinity. The doctrine being proved, it is natural that we should find references to it in the Old Testament, where the word Elohim (God) appears in the plural form; where God says let *us* make man; in the trinal form of adoration: Holy, Holy, Holy; and in the threefold form of blessing. There are repeated references to it in the New Testament, but the most remarkable are found in the baptismal formula and in the apostolic benediction.

The three persons of the Trinity, though the same in substance, equal in power and glory, nevertheless sustain

such a relation to each other that the Father is first, the Son second, the Holy Ghost third. The second person is so related to the first as to be called the Son, but what the relation implies we do not know. The Son has been Son from all eternity, and did not assume the title at his incarnation. The Holy Ghost "proceedeth" from the Father and the Son, but what this expression implies we cannot say.

If the separate elements which enter into the doctrine of the Trinity are proved to be taught in Scripture, the only reasonable mode of objecting to the doctrine is that of denying the authority of Scripture; and many do stand in this defiant attitude. But there are many who are not willing to concede that the separate elements of the doctrine are taught in Scripture. In other words, they deny that the deity of Christ is taught in the Bible. Of course, as long as they do this, it is unnecessary for them to urge, or even for us to consider, further objections against the doctrine of the Trinity. Unitarians, however, are fond of making the doctrine of the Trinity appear ridiculous. And some who do not disbelieve the deity of Christ are perplexed by the difficulties which they meet in Trinitarian theology, and make a truce with doubt by assuming that, after all, the doctrine is not of much practical importance. To illustrate:

1. It is said that the doctrine of the Trinity involves a contradiction. But this is a mistake. The Church does not teach that three persons are one person, but that one Being exists in three persons. It is assumed always by those who ridicule Trinitarian faith that we suppose that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three persons, in the same sense that Peter, James and John are three individuals. But we do not. What do we believe? We believe—(1) that there is one God; (2) that God is tri-personal—that is to say, that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are so distinct

that the Father can address the Son, the Son address the Father and speak of sending the Spirit. The Scripture teaches these facts regarding the relation of Father, Son and Spirit, and the word person expresses them better than any other.

Again, it is asked how the Son can be as old as the Father. The object of the question is to involve the doctrine of the Trinity in a contradiction, for of course, if Christ is God, he is co-eternal with the Father. But we cannot fathom the meaning of the words "Father" and "Son" when used to express the relations of the first and second Persons of the Trinity. We know that there is a relation between them which these names are used to express. Beyond that we are in the dark.

2. It is said that the doctrine is inconceivable. But this is not true. Every statement of the Athanasian creed is a plain proposition. It is incomprehensible, without doubt. But that is not strange. The incomprehensibility of the doctrine should not make us doubt its truth or question its importance.

3. It is said that the subject is of no great practical value. This, too, is a grave mistake. This is a fundamental doctrine. Sin is the violation of God's law, hence our need of pardon. Pardon must be preceded by propitiation. The propitiation is made by Christ, and to give it value Christ must be divine. The divinity of Christ proves the doctrine of the Trinity. Those who deny the Trinity deny, as a rule, the deity of Christ, deny that Christ made an atonement, and deny that sin is such a violation of God's law that it incurs God's wrath and curse to all eternity.

The doctrines of Scripture are so related that if we deny the Trinity we part company with the gospel.

LESSON VII.

JUSTIFICATION.

A MAN dies and goes to heaven, let us suppose. Now, why? That is a practical question, certainly. And yet the answer to it fills a long chapter in theological discussion. It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that religion can be divorced from theology.

Between man the sinner and Christ the Saviour, there must be some relation which constitutes the foundation of Christian hope, and which furnishes material for an answer to the question which we have just asked. All professing Christians would agree, perhaps, in saying that Christ saves us by securing our *justification*, or that we enter heaven because we are *justified*. But there are differences of opinion respecting the *nature, ground, means and effect** of justification, and these differences represent different answers to the question just propounded, if, in fact, they do not constitute different religions.

I. THE NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION.

There are two, and only two, leading views on this subject; for justification must refer either to a change of character or to a change of legal condition. It must be *moral* or *forensic*. The difference between these views is apparent. A criminal under sentence of death is pardoned. The pardon does not alter the man's nature or reform his character; the change of which he is the subject is simply legal. If his pardon were called his justification, the word justification would be used in a forensic sense. Again, a man is imprisoned for crime, and under reformatory influ-

* These four points "may be justly said to include whatever is essential and fundamental in the doctrine of justification."—*Buchanan on Justification*, p. 113.

ences his conduct improves. If we should speak of the change wrought on the man's character as his justification, we should be using the word in a moral sense; therefore, when a man says that he believes in "justification by faith," it is very important to know whether he uses the word justification in a moral or in a forensic sense. Let us consider these senses separately.

1. MORAL.—The controversy between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics at the Reformation turned largely on the nature of justification, the latter using the word in a moral sense, though not to the exclusion of the forensic—the former using it in the forensic sense alone. Justification is defined by the Council of Trent* to be "not only the remission of sins, but the renewal and sanctification of the inner man." According to the Church of Rome, therefore, justification consists in a change of moral character produced by the removal of original sin and the infusion of righteousness. But besides this moral use of the word, in behalf of which they contended with the Protestants, they recognized its forensic or judicial meaning; and unless this is kept in mind, we shall fall into confusion when we study their position respecting the ground of justification, for they very strenuously teach, in opposition to Protestants, that we are justified by an inherent righteousness. But inherent righteousness *is* justification, as we have already seen; and how can inherent righteousness be the essence of justification and the ground of justification at the same time? The only solution is, that the Roman Catholics use the word both in its moral and in its judicial

* Conc. Trid., Sess. VI., cap. 7: "Justificatio non est sola peccatorum, remissio sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris dominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiarum et donorum unde homo ex injusto fit justus, et ex inimico fit amicus ut sit hæres secundum spem vitæ æternæ, etc."—Quoted in *Winer's Confessions of Christianity*.

sense—the moral when they speak of the nature of justification, and the judicial when they speak of its ground.

Those who hold the moral-influence theory of the atonement use the word justification in its moral sense. They take the element of guilt out of sin, the element of law out of the atonement, and the element of pardon out of salvation. Sin, they say, brings suffering. To get rid of suffering we must cease to sin. Christ is our Saviour because he delivers us from our sins. Men need cure and not pardon. Justification is a moral change and not a legal one. We go to heaven because we are holy.*

This view of justification is similar to that taught by the Roman Catholic Church, but it is more unscriptural and unevangelical. For, false as the Romish doctrine of justification is, it proceeds upon a recognition of the doctrine of original sin, the need of supernatural grace and the expiatory character of the atonement. The moral-influence theory ignores or denies these cardinal doctrines, while, in common with the Roman Catholics, it teaches that we go to heaven on the ground of what we are. And yet this doctrine has its defenders in so-called evangelical pulpits! We should be on our guard against it; it is another gospel.

* So the sinner is justified, and the justification is a most vital affair—"the justification of life." The true account of it is that Jesus, coming into the world with all God's righteousness upon him, declaring it to guilty souls in all the manifold evidences of his life and passion, wins their faith; and by that faith they are connected again with the life of God, and filled and overspread with his righteousness."—*Bushnell's Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 435.

"This first step, or look, Godward, this incipient but genuine movement of the child-spirit, is justification, rectification, the righting, rightening, setting right of the soul which was before wholly wrong."—*John Young's Christ the Light and Life of Men*, p. 171.

"Therefore, the pardon of sin, in any other sense than the revealing and the opening to us of the path of life, is now to us as undesirable as, in relation to the moral government of the Father of spirits, it is inconceivable."—*McLeod Campbell on the Atonement*, p. 183.

2. FORENSIC.—The Protestant churches hold the forensic view of justification. Calvinists and Arminians agree in affirming that justification expresses a change of legal condition, and not a change of moral character. But they differ in this way: Arminians, the later ones especially, say that justification means pardon; Calvinists say that it means pardon and acceptance. To illustrate: the executive pardons a criminal, but he does not treat him as if he had never done wrong. God, however, not only pardons his children, but he treats them as if they had never sinned. He counts them as if they were righteous. Our catechism says: “Justification is an act of God’s free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight.” It is easy to show that this is the scriptural view of justification—that is to say, that justification is a judicial act, and that it is more than pardon.

1. A JUDICIAL ACT.—The adjective *dikaios* in Greek is the epithet used to express the idea of being right in relation to the law. The verb *dikaioo*, translated “justify,” expresses the idea of placing one in the position implied in the adjective *dikaios*. Whether in a particular case it is used in the moral sense of “making righteous” or in the forensic sense “of pronouncing righteous,” must be determined by the context and the *usus loquendi* of the writer. It is clear that it is used in the latter sense in the New Testament.

(a) For if it were used in the moral sense, it would be possible to substitute the word “sanctify” for “justify” without destroying the sense. This cannot be done, however, as any one who will make the experiment will find.

(b) The judicial meaning of justification is apparent from Paul’s argument in the Epistle to the Romans. His theme is our relation to the law of God. All have sinned, all are under condemnation. By the deeds of the law there is no justification. Justification is an act of God—an act

done without regard to our works—an act of grace on the ground of the propitiation of Christ—an act of deliverance from condemnation. See Rom. iii. 19–26.

(c) Justification does not mean a making holy, for the Scriptures distinguish between justification and sanctification. 1 Cor. vi. 11.

(d) Paul speaks of David's describing the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works. Rom. iv. 6. The context shows that "imputing righteousness without works" is the equivalent of justification. Imputing righteousness without works does not mean transformation of character. Neither, therefore, does justification: both are forensic forms of expression.

(e) The word "justify" is used as the opposite of "condemn." Rom. viii. 33, 34: "It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?" To condemn is not to make sinful; to justify is not to make holy.

2. MORE THAN PARDON.—Arminians, as we have said, regard justification as synonymous with pardon.* But in this they err.

(a) Because the word *dikaiōo* does not mean "to pardon," and cannot be so translated.

(b) It is fair to suppose that if Paul had meant "pardon" where he says "justified," he would have said that we are *pardoned* by faith, *pardoned* without works, and that being *pardoned* we have peace with God; but he did not.

(c) The word *dikaiōo* means to pronounce righteous.† Pardon is therefore included in the justification of a sinner, since he cannot be pronounced righteous in the sight of the

* Justification is a "remission of sins," "a sentence of pardon." — *Watson's Institutes*, Part II., chap. 23.

The plain scriptural notion of justification is pardon, the forgiveness of sins.—*Wesley's Works*, vol. i., p. 47.

† Vide Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*.

law so long as he is under condemnation. He may be pardoned, however, without being pronounced righteous.

(d) The effects of justification are such as would not follow pardon. It is one thing to remit a penalty, and another thing to receive into favor and to give entrance into eternal life. Suppose that God should pardon a man, and leave the acceptance of him and his title to heaven to depend on his subsequent behavior. Would pardon bring peace? Could he feel that he was reconciled to God? Could he have any assurance of salvation? No. And if justification is the equivalent of pardon, how does it happen that the justified person has "peace with God," is "reconciled to God," "hath eternal life," "is persuaded that nothing shall separate him from the love of God," "is accepted in the beloved"? The effects ascribed to justification can be explained only on the supposition that justification effects a permanent, unalterable change in our legal condition, and that it includes not only the pardon of our sins, but the acceptance of us as righteous in the sight of God.

II. THE GROUND OF JUSTIFICATION.

What is that to which God has regard when he justifies us? Is it something within us or something without us? Is the ground of our justification *subjective* or *objective*? The opinions which are entertained on this subject may be grouped under these heads.

1. SUBJECTIVE.—If God pronounces men righteous, it must be on the ground of an inherent or a vicarious righteousness. In the controversy between the Romanists and the Reformers this fact was recognized, the Romanists affirming that we are justified on the ground of an inherent or infused righteousness. According to their scheme, the vicarious sacrifice of Christ procures for us the taking away of original sin and the infusion of righteousness. This takes place in baptism, which is the instrumental cause. And it

is to this remission of sin and renewal of nature that they give the name justification. When asked, however, on what ground God justifies the sinner, the answer is: On the ground of inherent or infused righteousness received in baptism.

The ground of justification according to the older Arminians was faith, and faith included or was synonymous with evangelical obedience. They believed that the atonement of Christ had the effect of lowering the requirements of the law, and that God, instead of requiring of us full obedience to the Adamic law, was pleased to count our faith—that is to say, evangelical obedience—in the room of righteousness.

The Socinian doctrine of justification proceeds upon the idea that God is a Father. It ignores the obligations of God's law, and denies therefore the divinity of Christ's person and the expiatory nature of his work. It reduces the gospel to the simple statement that God forgives on the ground of our faith and repentance.

2. OBJECTIVE.—Those who hold the subjective view as to the ground of justification agree in the opinion that when God pardons a sinner it is the state of the sinner's mind to which He has respect. In other words, that it is on the ground of something in the sinner himself. The objective view is the opposite of this. Those who hold it maintain that we are justified on the ground of what Christ has done, and not on the ground of what we do.

The Wesleyan Arminians belong to this class. Justification is defined by them to be pardon; and pardon, they are careful to say, is on the ground of the righteousness of Christ.* It is true that our subsequent acceptance with God and our title to heaven is, according to them, based on our evangelical obedience or obedience of faith. But the pardon of our sins they strenuously affirm to be on the ground of the

* "Watson's Institutes," Part II., chap. 23

righteousness of Christ. The doctrine of the Reformed confessions, our own among them, is that we are justified on the ground of the imputed righteousness of Christ. The Shorter Catechism says that "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us." That is to say, God regards Christ as the substitute of his people, both in his active and in his passive obedience. His death is their death, his righteousness their righteousness. When God pronounces men righteous, it is not because of anything in them, but on the ground of Christ's righteousness which he imputes to them. That this is the scriptural view is proved by the following considerations.

(a) To justify is to pronounce righteous. A perfect righteousness, therefore, must be the ground of justification. And since we have no righteousness of our own which will meet the requirements of the law, that to which God has regard in our justification must be a vicarious righteousness.

(b) The statement that Abraham's faith was counted unto him for righteousness does not mean that he was justified on the ground of his faith, nor does it sanction the doctrine that our faith or evangelical obedience is taken in lieu of a perfect obedience as the ground of our justification. For it is in the nature of the case absurd to say that God regards us as righteous on the ground of conduct which is unrighteous. Nor will it do to say that the demands of the law are lowered through the work of Christ. For while the Scriptures represent Christians as being delivered from the law, they never represent the law itself as the subject of any change. We have peace with God because the demands of the law have been met, and not because its behests have been made easier. If the law has been lowered at all, to what extent has it been lowered? And if our justification

depends on our obedience, what is the measure of obedience necessary? and how shall we know when we have attained it? And until we know, what is the ground of our peace? Besides, this view, as Dr. Hodge says, "is dishonoring to the gospel. It supposes the gospel to be less holy than the law. The law requires perfect obedience; the gospel is satisfied with imperfect obedience."* "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law."

3. It is distinctly stated that we are justified by faith without the works of the law, and that by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight. Both in the Epistle to the Romans and in that to the Galatians Paul argues that justification is not on the ground of anything which we can do, but on the ground of what Christ has done for us.

4. The doctrine of our Catechism is necessarily involved in the vicarious character of Christ's work. If Christ died, "the just for the unjust, that he might reconcile us to God," if he came "to give his life a ransom for (in the place of) many," if he was "made sin for us," if he was "made a curse for us,"—in a word, if the death of Christ was penal and vicarious, as the Scriptures abundantly teach, then it would follow that when God justifies the ungodly he has regard to the work which Christ has done in our room and stead.

5. But the doctrine of the Catechism is sustained by the direct testimony of Scripture. We are "justified by his blood." Rom. v. 9. God hath set him forth "to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God, . . . that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 25, 26. "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of

* "Systematic Theology," vol. iii., p. 169.

one the free gift came upon all men to justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. v. 18, 19.

Paul, in the tenth chapter of Romans, complains of his brethren because they seek to be justified by their own righteousness: "For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." He speaks of the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works (Rom iv. 6), and in Philippians he expresses his desire to "be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

To the question with which this chapter opens we reply by saying that we enter heaven on the ground of the imputed righteousness of Christ.

"Slain in the guilty sinner's stead,
His spotless righteousness I plead,
And his availing blood;
Thy merit, Lord, my robe shall be,
Thy merit shall atone for me,
And bring me near to God."

III. THE MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION.

We are justified by faith. All Christians will accept this statement. All will not say, however, that we are justified by faith alone, nor would all give the same answer to the question, How does faith justify? These points must now be noticed.

1. Justification by faith alone.

The Bible says we are justified by faith. Are we justi-

fied by anything else? Is anything in addition to faith necessary in order to justification?

Our catechism says that we are justified by the "righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone." This is the doctrine of the Bible. Paul says that we are justified by faith without the works of the law; that by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified. By works he does not mean the ceremonial law or works done before regeneration. His doctrine is that Jew and Gentile are alike under condemnation because they have violated the law of God, and that, being under condemnation, they can do nothing to justify themselves; for the law requires a perfect obedience, and this they cannot render. In excluding works from justification he excludes everything which we can do. He excludes faith itself so far as it is a work and lays claim to merit. We are not justified by works: we are justified by faith. There is no discrepancy between Paul and James, though the latter says that Abraham was justified by works, and adds, "Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Because (a) James is showing the relation of works to faith, and is not discussing the question of justification. Saving faith is followed by good works; where these are wanting faith is dead. (b) James cannot mean that Abraham was pardoned and accepted when he offered Isaac his son, for he had been pardoned and accepted long before.*

2. Relation of faith to justification.

Men may use the same language and mean very different things. This is illustrated in the matter before us. The Romanist believes that we are justified by faith. But what does he mean? He has two faiths and two justifications. In his first justification original sin is removed and righteousness infused. This takes place in baptism. He believes

* See Cunningham's "Historical Theology," vol. ii., p. 66; "Buchanan on Justification," pp. 239-249.

that he ought to be baptized; and that being baptized, he is justified. In this sense he is justified by faith as a predisponent to justification. This faith is only intellectual assent, *fides informis*. In his second justification he receives title to eternal life, and on the ground of his "works"—that is to say, of his character. Prominent among these "works" is "faith." But the word faith as now employed does not mean intellectual assent. It is synonymous with love. This is *fides formata*.*

The older Arminians believed that we are justified *on account of our faith*. Faith they considered as synonymous with evangelical obedience, and was regarded by them as imputed to us in the room of righteousness. Wesleyan Arminians say that we are justified—meaning pardoned—on condition of faith.

Those who hold the moral-influence theory of the atonement believe that we are justified by faith; but justification means personal holiness, and faith justifies because it stimulates to Christian activity. Faith is the secret of success. Have faith in a cause if you wish to conquer. Faith saves, because by it we overcome sin. The principle is true, but the adoption of it as an explanation of the gospel is a fundamental error. In opposition to these views our standards teach that "faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruit of it; nor as if the grace of faith or any act thereof were imputed to him for justification; but only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness."—*Larger Catechism*, Q. 73.

* Hodge, "Systematic Theology," vol. iii., p. 165.

IV. THE EFFECT OF JUSTIFICATION.

From what has been said respecting the nature and the ground of justification it will be easy to infer what opinions are entertained respecting the effect of justification. The Roman Catholic believes that the justification which he receives in baptism places him in the condition which Adam occupied before the fall. It does not secure his continuance in that state, however. His post-baptismal sins render him liable to eternal death if *mortal*, and to the fires of purgatory if *venial*. To escape eternal death and to mitigate the punishments of purgatory, it is necessary for him to make proper satisfaction in this life. It is a doctrine of the Church of Rome that a man may exceed the amount of praying, fasting and almsgiving requisite as a satisfaction for his own sins, and thus have something over which may be used for the benefit of others. The Church of Rome made merchandise of this excess in the iniquitous system of indulgences, the exposure of which led to the Reformation. The Arminians believe that justification is pardon, but that it secures no permanent change in our condition, and gives no title to heaven. Our acceptance depends on our persevering to the end, and our salvation will be the reward of our obedience.*

The doctrine of the Reformed or Calvinistic churches is that justification is a permanent change of legal condition. The justified person is no longer subject to condemnation. He is saved. He *hath* eternal life. This is one effect of justification. And, moreover, justification is always followed by sanctification. Hence the Reformers, when they

* "In asserting salvation by faith we mean this: (1) That pardon (salvation begun) is received by faith producing works. (2) That holiness (salvation continued) is faith working by love. (3) That heaven (salvation finished) is the reward of this faith."—Wesley's "Works," vol. v., p. 205.

affirmed that we are justified by faith alone, were careful to say that the faith which justifies was never by itself. It was a *fides sola*, not a *fides solitaria*. Good works are the evidence and the effect of saving faith. This must be so; for we know that without holiness no man shall see the Lord; and we know too that whom he justifies, them he also glorifies.

LESSON VIII.

REGENERATION.

WHAT is faith? Belief. But belief is assent when it terminates on a proposition and trust when it terminates on a person. I assent to the doctrine of plenary inspiration; I trust in Christ. The Romanists, regarding faith as assent, were in the habit of charging the Reformers with believing that men are saved by bare intellectual assent. The latter, however, maintained that saving faith included trust as well as assent; and this is the doctrine of our standards. From this definition of faith the necessity of both the external and the internal call may be inferred. The external call is necessary to faith. For says the apostle, "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" The gospel must be preached and the offer of salvation must be made before men can believe. But is the presentation of the truth through the Word sufficient? Are men willing to accept Christ as their Saviour even although the claims of the gospel are pressed upon their attention? We have found that men are "indisposed, disabled, made opposite to all good and wholly inclined to all evil." This is their condition by nature. While they remain in this condition *can* they exercise faith? *Can* they rest on Christ alone for salvation? Sin, we found, has produced two

great results. It has made man guilty. A scheme of salvation must therefore provide for his deliverance from condemnation. We have seen how this was done. But sin has likewise debased our nature; it has caused spiritual death. A scheme of salvation must provide also for our change of nature. This moral change is necessary in order that we may avail ourselves of the remedy provided for our legal liabilities. For to be justified we must have faith. But there is a barrier to the exercise of faith—to wit: that we are spiritually dead. Now, it is the work of the Spirit to effect the moral change whereby we are persuaded and enabled to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the gospel. This change he accomplishes in “effectual calling,” and the result itself is termed regeneration. We are to consider regeneration first as to its nature and secondly as to its mode.

I. NATURE OF REGENERATION.

{ It is an instantaneous, radical and permanent change in the moral nature, in virtue of which the subject is said to be born again, to be a new creature, to be raised from the dead. It is instantaneous, for it is a transition from death to life; it is radical for the same reason; it is permanent, for the life imparted in regeneration is immortal. Whom he calls he justifies, whom he justifies he glorifies. The change affects the whole soul. The mind is enlightened in the knowledge of Christ, the will is renewed, and we are persuaded and enabled to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the gospel. It follows, from the nature of the case, that the soul is passive in regeneration. A dead man cannot be instrumental in his own resurrection. The soul is regenerated; it never regenerates itself. We are commanded to repent, but not to be regenerated. Regeneration is necessary to salvation, but it is not a duty. This view of regeneration is proved—

1. From the doctrine of total depravity. If it is true, this follows of necessity.

2. This is taught in the second chapter of Ephesians, where spiritual life, as the antithesis of spiritual death, is attributed to divine power: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he hath loved us when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved), and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus."

3. It is involved in other statements of Scripture: We must be born again. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." "We are his workmanship." It follows, therefore—

(a) That regeneration is not a change of external relation. This was Archbishop Whately's view, and it is the view of others in the Church of England, who understand baptismal regeneration to mean nothing more than that in the sacrament of baptism the subject becomes externally related to the Church.

(b) It is not a change of purpose, as theologians of the New Haven school suppose; for the "purpose" presupposes the moral change in which regeneration consists.

(c) It is not moral reformation. Birth is different from growth. Resurrection is different from the life which follows it. Spiritual growth follows regeneration, but regeneration is the word which expresses the change from death to life.

(d) Nor is regeneration the same as conversion. The regenerated person turns to God—*i. e.*, is converted. The soul is active in conversion, passive in regeneration. Conversion is the fruit of regeneration.

II. THE MODE OF REGENERATION.

The agent in regeneration is the third Person of the blessed and adorable Trinity. "The wind bloweth where it list-

eth and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." John iii. 8. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. iii. 4, 5.

The doctrine is stated by the Confession of Faith in the following terms: "All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by his word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God, taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them an heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace. This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it."—*Confession of Faith*, chap. x., § 1, 2.

The agency of the Spirit in regeneration is immediate, sovereign and efficacious.

1. IMMEDIATE.—The change wrought in regeneration is through the direct exercise of divine power. Lutherans dispute this proposition. They do not believe in the operation of the Spirit except through the Word. They hold that there is virtue in the Word which, if not resisted, will result in the conversion of those to whom it is preached. This, however, cannot be the true state of the case, for the objective presentation of the truth to a man spiritually dead is surely not sufficient. Besides, the Scriptures dis-

tinctly say that it is not sufficient, for they affirm that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14. The Scriptures distinguish, moreover, between the influence of the Spirit and that of the Word. "Who, then, is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye have believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." 1 Cor. iii. 5, 6. That the influence of the Spirit in regeneration is by direct agency, and not through the moral influence of the truth, is seen in passages like the following: "For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Phil. ii. 13. "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves: if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." 2 Tim. ii. 25.

2. SOVEREIGN.—Regeneration is a sovereign act of God's Spirit, who works when and where he pleases. It is not on the ground of anything that a man does, or that God foresees he will do, that he regenerates him. Romanists, and those who hold high sacramentarian views, maintain that baptism is necessary to regeneration. This dogma is both extra-scriptural and unscriptural, however. The Bible does not teach baptismal regeneration, but it teaches the contrary. Baptism, we know, does not secure salvation; regeneration does. Whom he calls (regenerates) he justifies, whom he justifies he glorifies. The salvation of infants is not jeopardized by neglect of baptism. But "elect infants, dying in infancy" (and we believe that all infants dying in infancy are elect), "are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth."—*Confession of Faith*, chap. x., § 3.

3. EFFICACIOUS.—Regeneration is the result of a direct exercise of divine power. The soul is passive. There can be no co-working in regeneration. This view is opposed by

those who hold Semi-Pelagian views respecting sin, and who maintain that the work of the Spirit in regeneration consists in moral suasion. The best way to reply to this view is to prove the doctrine of original sin. A dead man is not in a position to be influenced by moral suasion. Besides, it is strange that the Scriptures should say that we are created in Christ Jesus unto good works, that we are born of the Spirit, and that we are raised from the dead, if they meant only to teach that the Spirit presents arguments and motives for our consideration. The Arminians believe in total depravity, but maintain that the Spirit of God is present with every man, granting him sufficient grace to enable him to attain eternal life, and that the difference between a believer and an unbeliever is that one co-operates, and the other does not co-operate, with the Spirit of God. To which it is enough to reply that if men are dead they *cannot* co-operate, and if they are alive they *need not* co-operate, for they are already regenerated.

Regeneration is God's act; conversion is man's. Conversion follows regeneration, and is evidenced by faith and repentance.

“Faith in Jesus Christ is a saving grace whereby we receive and rest upon him alone for salvation as he is offered to us in the gospel.”

“Repentance unto life is a saving grace whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of and endeavor after new obedience.” *

* “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 86, 87.

LESSON IX.

ELECTION.

To be saved we must be justified ; to be justified we must believe ; to believe we must be regenerated. God regenerates. All regenerated persons are saved. Those who die unregenerated perish. Thus we are led to a consideration of the doctrine of election. On this subject two contradictory opinions are entertained. Calvinists affirm, Arminians deny, that God for his own glory has from all eternity elected some to everlasting life. Every man who has an opinion on this subject must be, at least so far as this doctrine is concerned, an Arminian or a Calvinist.*

I. ARMINIAN VIEW.

Arminians agree in saying that the Bible speaks of an election of some sort. They agree in saying that it does not teach the doctrine of a sovereign election of individuals to eternal life. But they are not agreed in respect to what the Bible doctrine of election is. They fall into two classes.

1. Those who maintain that the election spoken of in the Bible is an election to the external privileges of the Church. God, they say, has shed gospel light on some parts of the world and kept the remainder in darkness. He has elected some to the enjoyment of Christian privileges, while others are in a state of heathenism. This election does not secure salvation, though it confers great advantages on those who are the subjects of it.† But it is very

* For a full discussion of this point, see Principal Cunningham's masterly essay on Calvinism and Arminianism in his "Reformers and Theology of the Reformation."

† "So, also, we may conclude no Christian is elected to eternal salvation absolutely, but only to the knowledge of the gospel, to the

clear that the election spoken of in the Bible is an election which secures salvation. Whom God predestinates he calls, whom he calls he justifies, whom he justifies he glorifies. It is an election of those "whom he had afore prepared unto glory," "whom he had chosen, that they should be holy and without blame," of those whom he had "predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son." This theory of election does not explain the facts, and therefore falls to the ground.

2. Those who maintain that God elects to everlasting life those who, he foresees, will repent and believe in Christ. But this view is equally unsatisfactory; for so far from our election proceeding on the ground of a foreseen faith, faith itself is the gift of God. God does not elect us because he foresees that we shall repent and persevere in holiness, inasmuch as the reason that we have repented is that he "hath granted" unto us "repentance unto life;" and the reason that we persevere is that we are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Election is not on the ground of a foreseen faith, but on account of God's good pleasure, "who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." 2 Tim. i. 9.

II. CALVINISTIC VIEW.

The Calvinistic doctrine assumes three forms.

1. SUPRALAPSARIAN.—According to this view, the decree of election takes precedence of the decree of creation. Out of the mass of creatable men God elects some and reprobates others for his own glory. To carry out this privileges of the Christian Church, to the offer of God's Holy Spirit, and to the promise of final salvation on condition of being a faithful follower of Christ.—Whately's "Essay on Certain Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul."

decree he created man and permitted him to fall. This view is not commonly entertained. It presents metaphysical difficulties to begin with.* It is unsupported by the word of God, and contrary to it. It requires us to believe that God has reprobated some of the human race without regard to their sins, whereas the Scriptures teach that, while God saves some out of his mere good pleasure, those who are passed by are punished on account of their sins.

2. *SUBLAPSARIAN*.—The advocates of this view maintain that the decree of election contemplates man as fallen. Out of the mass of fallen humanity God has predestinated some, they say, to eternal life. This is the doctrine of our standards, and, we believe, of the Scriptures. “God having, out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into a state of salvation by a Redeemer.” †

3. *INFRALAPSARIAN*.—This is the view which was advocated by the French Protestant theologians at Saumur “during the second quarter of the seventeenth century.” It contemplates man not only as created and fallen, but as redeemed. Its advocates say that God decreed to create man; to permit the fall; to provide a salvation for all men through Jesus Christ on condition of faith and repentance; but, foreseeing that none would accept Christ, that he decreed to give faith and repentance to some. This view involves a denial of the vicarious nature of the atonement, and is incompatible with the doctrine that Christ laid down his life for his sheep.

The advocates of these three views agree in affirming that election is (1) of individuals, (2) to eternal life, (3) of God’s mere good pleasure and not on account of a foreseen

* For a discussion of them, see Turretine, loc. iv., quæst. ix.

† “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 20.

faith. These are the essential elements in the Calvinistic doctrine of election. This doctrine is proved by the following considerations :

1. It follows from the doctrine of regeneration. This is obvious.

2. Faith and repentance are gifts of God, but they are necessary to salvation.

3. It is specifically affirmed in Scripture: "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son," etc. Rom. viii. 29. "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame," etc. Eph. i. 4. "God hath from the beginning chosen you unto salvation," etc. 2 Thess. xi. 13.

4. It is proved by the objection which Paul answers in the ninth chapter of Romans. The most common objection to this doctrine is that it destroys responsibility. This is precisely the one which Paul anticipates: "Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to show his wrath and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory?"

5. It is involved in the doctrine of decrees. The Confession of Faith says, chap. iii. : "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass ; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or

contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established.”

Election is simply part of God’s eternal purpose. That God’s purpose is eternal and that it extends to every event the Scriptures clearly teach. God notices the fall of a sparrow. He numbers the hairs of our head. He disposes of the lot. Every good and perfect gift comes from him. He directs our steps. He controls the free acts of men, giving faith, granting repentance unto life, working in us to will and to do of his good pleasure. The wicked acts of men are foreordained and overruled. Christ was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. Joseph’s brethren were carrying out God’s purpose when they sold him: “God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance.” Gen. xlv. 7. He has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Moreover, foreordination is involved in foreknowledge. It is admitted by all, except Socinians, that God from all eternity has foreknown whatsoever comes to pass. If God has foreknown every event, then every event has been fixed and determined from all eternity. God from all eternity foresaw the crucifixion of Christ. The crucifixion was inevitable, therefore, and God knew from all eternity that it would certainly occur. What made it certain? There is only one answer: It formed part of God’s eternal purpose “whereby for his own glory he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.”

The common objections to this doctrine are—

1. That it represents God as dealing unjustly. But this is not the case. It would have been just for God to have left the world to perish in its sins. This must be admitted if the atonement is believed in. There is no need of and no mercy in an atonement if the punishment of sin would have been an injustice. But if God might justly

have left the whole world to perish, who shall challenge his prerogative to have mercy on as many as he pleases?

2. It is said to destroy free agency. This must be because it makes our actions certain; but so does foreknowledge. If certainty is incompatible with free agency, the objection is involved against foreordination, as foreknowledge is foreordination. Certainty and liberty are not incompatible. God is free, but it is certain that he will not do wrong. Christ was free, but it was certain that he would not sin.

3. It is said to make the use of means unnecessary. Popularly stated: "If I am to be saved, I shall be saved no matter what I am; if I am to be lost, I shall be lost, do what I may." The mistake arises out of the fact that God's decree embraces *every event*, that he foreordains the means as well as the end. If God decrees the salvation of a soul, he decrees that he shall hear, heed and believe the gospel. In like manner, if God decrees that there shall be an abundant harvest, he decrees that the farmer shall prepare the soil, sow the seed, and that favorable influences shall combine to produce the result.

What practical influence should the doctrine of election exert upon the children of God? It should make them humble: "By the grace of God we are what we are." It should make them grateful, for what have we that we have not received? It should make them confident, for faith is the pledge that God hath "chosen them unto salvation."

"Why was I made to hear thy voice
 And enter while there's room,
 While thousands make a wretched choice,
 And rather starve than come?"

"'Twas the same love that spread the feast
 That sweetly forced me in,
 Else I had still refused to taste,
 And perished in my sin."

LESSON X.

SANCTIFICATION.

REGENERATION is related to sanctification as birth is to growth. The soul's new life begins at regeneration. Its development in spiritual strength and stature is its sanctification. We are here using the words regeneration and sanctification in the subjective sense to denote the state of being regenerated and sanctified. They are also used in the objective sense to denote the agency or process by which we are brought into this state, though the objective side of regeneration is expressed in our standards by the term "effectual calling." Let us consider sanctification first subjectively and then objectively.

I. SUBJECTIVELY CONSIDERED.

Sanctification is moral transformation, and is altogether different from justification, which is only a change of legal condition. At regeneration the Christian begins to lead a new life—a better, but not a sinless, life. Though a new nature has, so to speak, been grafted upon the soul, the old nature is not dead. The fruits of sin and the fruits of the Spirit hang side by side. Recovery from disease is not effected in a day. The patient is feeble long after all danger is past. So with the soul's convalescence. And it has not only been sick, but dead—dead in trespasses and sins. Sanctification is a gradual change of character; it is a putting off of the old man, which is "corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts," and a putting on of "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." In regeneration the child of God becomes "a new creature," and this becomes more apparent as sanctification goes on. He is the subject of new feelings, new pleasures, new motives, new aims. "Old things are passed away."

His is not so new, however, that he loses his individuality or ceases to be himself. Sanctification makes Christians like Christ, but does not destroy the differences which distinguish one Christian from another.* The agency of the Holy Ghost is present in sanctification as in regeneration—with this difference, however, that the Christian co-operates with the Spirit in sanctification. Sanctification is a duty. We are commanded to “grow in grace.” The doctrine of justification by faith alone is not responsible for neglect of personal piety. The Christian is commanded to be holy; and that he may attain holiness he is to be actively engaged striving against sin. Christian life is a warfare, and he is to put on the whole armor of God. It is a race, and he is to lay aside every weight. The Christian is both a sinner and a saint—a sinner, however great his attainments in holiness, and a saint notwithstanding his sins. It is certain that while he lives he will not be free from sin; it is just as certain that he will not fall away from grace. But we are assuming the truth of doctrines which merit a more explicit statement. Three great questions claim attention here: Antinomianism, Perfectionism and the Perseverance of the Saints.

1. ANTINOMIANISM.—Some have perverted the doctrine of justification by faith, and have held that as they are released from the law as the ground of justification they are under no obligation to keep it. This does not disprove the doctrine, however. Men did the same thing in the days of the apostles. The Epistle of James was aimed at Antinomian error. Some have said that the doctrine of justification by faith belittles conduct, which, as Matthew Arnold says, is three-fourths of life. But this does not disprove the doctrine. Paul had the same objec-

* The fig tree, formerly unfruitful, now becomes fruitful; but the rose never becomes the grape, the sanctified Peter never a James or a John.—Van Oosterzee’s “Christian Dogmatics,” vol. ii., p. 658.

tion to meet: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid." Some charge upon those who preach the doctrine of justification by faith a disregard of holiness as a pre-requisite of heaven, and speak boastingly of themselves as the special apostles of personal piety. The charge is a slander and the boast a mistake.

The Christian is under the deepest obligation to obey the law of God, and is urged by the strongest motives to strive after holiness.

1. This follows from the nature of the law; it is the expression of God's will—a transcript of his nature. It tells man what he ought to do. To break that law is to sin, and a scheme of salvation which would license sin is inconceivable.

2. We are commanded to be holy, to put off the old man and put on the new, to give diligence, to add to our faith, virtue, etc. Our Saviour prays that his disciples may be sanctified, and Paul prays for the Thessalonians that the very God of peace would sanctify them wholly.

3. It is the Christian's nature to live a life of growing holiness. He has been delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. He was dead *in* sin, he is now dead *to* sin. "How shall we who are dead to sin live any longer therein?" That a man should find in justification by faith an apology for moral laxity would be convincing proof that he had never been born again.

4. It is distinctly declared that without holiness no man shall see the Lord.

5. The Christian is influenced by the motive of gratitude. If we are saved by the precious blood of Christ, a life of consecration is a very obvious duty. "For we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead, and that he died for all that we who live should not henceforth live

unto ourselves, but unto him who died for us and rose again."

6. And he is influenced by another motive; for while we are not saved on account of our works, we are judged by our works. In no sense are men saved by works. They enter heaven only on the ground of the imputed righteousness of Christ. But they are rewarded with higher or lower degrees of blessedness according to their conduct here: "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ that every one may receive the things done in the body according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad." 1 Cor. v. 10.

2. PERFECTIONISM.—We ought to be like Christ; this is the Christian's aim. We are to be like Christ; this is the Christian's hope. But perfection is not attainable in this life: "No mere man, since the fall, is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God; but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed."

The proof of this is found—

1. In the experience of Paul. In the seventh chapter of Romans he says: "I delight in the law of God, after the inward man; but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members." In the Epistle to the Philippians he says: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which I also am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Paul's humility makes the claim of perfection on the part of a Christian seem like presumption.

2. We read: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." 1 John i. 8.

3. Our Lord gave his disciples a model for prayer, and it contains the petition, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." The perfect Christian, however, cannot offer that prayer.

4. Christian experience is opposed to the doctrine. Does any Christian suppose that he is as like Christ as he will be? Is there a man living who for a moment supposes that all his thoughts, words and actions conform to the law of God? The truth is that if by sin is meant "any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God," and if by the law of God is understood the law given to Adam, there is not a perfectionist in the world. Perfectionist theories are based on false views of sin or false views of the law. Let it be shown that the law by which we are bound is the moral law as it was given to Adam without abatement or change, let it be shown that sin is any want of conformity unto as well as transgression of this law, and Perfectionism becomes transparently absurd.

3. PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS.—The angels rejoice over the sinner's repentance. They are not disappointed. The sinner who once accepts Christ in a living faith never forsakes him. Spiritual life may languish, but it never dies.

On this point Calvinists and Arminians hold opposite opinions. The Calvinistic position is well stated in our Confession of Faith: "They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end and be eternally saved." This is the doctrine of the Bible.

1. It follows from the statements which teach a present salvation. "He that believeth hath eternal life." "We have passed from death unto life." "There is now no condemnation." These statements could not be made regarding Christians if their ultimate salvation were uncertain.

2. We read that whom he "calls he justifies, and whom he justifies he glorifies." Every Christian is therefore sure of glory.

3. The Bible says that he who believes shall be saved.

It also says : " Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." This doctrine harmonizes these passages, as it teaches that every believer will persevere in holiness.

4. The doctrine of Perseverance is necessary to account for the strong language of confidence employed by the apostle Paul : " Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness ;" " I know whom I have believed," etc. ; " I am persuaded that nothing shall separate me from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus my Lord." Paul was not self-righteous or self-confident. His assurance was based on the evidence that God had chosen him to obtain salvation.

5. It follows of necessity from the doctrine of election. God has chosen some to everlasting life. He has chosen them to salvation through faith. Faith is the fruit of regeneration, and regeneration is the proof of election. A living faith is a guarantee of election. This is necessarily so, for all who believe are saved ; but none are saved who are not elected. Therefore all who believe are elected. Hence those who are regenerated never die. " The gifts and calling of God are without repentance." They are not revoked.

6. The Scriptures affirm the doctrine : " I will give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." John x. 28. " He who hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. i. 6.

The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints is very precious and very comforting to the child of God, but it does not encourage indolence or pride. Along with this doctrine comes the exhortation to " give diligence to make your calling and election sure," and the caution, " Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Nor is it by any inherent strength that he resists temptation and perseveres in a holy life. He is kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

II. OBJECTIVELY CONSIDERED.

Our catechism says that sanctification is a work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and to live unto righteousness.

1. It is effected by divine agency. This is the uniform testimony of Scripture. The Father sanctifies, the Son sanctifies, the Spirit sanctifies. 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20, 21; Tit. ii. 14; Eph. v. 25. But it is especially attributed to the third person of the Trinity. In the work of redemption each person of the Trinity is especially concerned. The Father loved us, and sent his Son; the Son loved us, and died to expiate our guilt; the Spirit loved us, and made his abode in us, taking of the things that are Christ's and showing them to us. To his gracious influence the Christian owes not only the new birth, but growth in grace. Our growth in grace is a very different thing from moral reformation. It is not by culture, development or building up of manhood that souls grow in grace. The preaching which fails to recognize the agency of the Holy Ghost is not the preaching of the gospel, however fully and eloquently it may urge upon men a life and conversation becoming the gospel.

2. It is a work.

It is to the continued presence of God's Spirit that Christians are indebted for their advances in holiness. We are in Christ, and being in him derive spiritual sustenance: "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me." And being united to Christ the Spirit abides with us, and our bodies are made the temples of the living God. The Holy Ghost does not remove all trace of sin when he regenerates us, as Roman Catholics teach. Hence regeneration is only the beginning of a process which ends in complete sanctifica-

tion. Nor does he implant a germ of holiness and leave it to fight its way against opposing influences. It is by no inherent vitality that the soul perseveres in a holy life. We need the sanctifying and reviving influences of the Spirit of God. In times of spiritual declension we pray, "O Lord, revive thy work." At all times we pray, "Lord, increase our faith."

3. The Spirit works through means. Our Saviour prayed, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." Hence sanctification is a duty, and we are responsible for the use we make of the means of grace. The outward and ordinary means are the word, sacraments and prayer.

LESSON XI.

THE MEANS OF GRACE.

WHEN our Lord had raised the maiden from the dead, "he commanded that something be given her to eat." This illustrates the difference between regeneration and sanctification. Spiritual food will not impart life to a dead soul, though it will nourish and strengthen one already quickened. New life is due to the direct exercise of divine efficiency, but growth in grace results from spiritual nourishment. In regeneration the Spirit works immediately; in sanctification he works through means. Hence the apostle says: "Desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." Holiness is a duty. Without it no man shall see the Lord. Hence, in addition to faith in Jesus Christ and repentance unto life, God requireth of us a "diligent use of all the outward means whereby Christ communiceth to us the benefits of redemption." These outward means are God's ordinances, especially the word, sacraments and prayer.

I. THE WORD.

By the word is meant the Bible. It is the rule of duty. All questions, both of creed and conduct, are to be determined by it. To know what is true we are not to go to church councils, creeds or catechisms, but to the Bible. To know what is right we are not to consult private opinion or public sentiment, but the Bible. It is given by inspiration of God, and is therefore "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Do we desire to learn the way of God more perfectly? Then the Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation. Are we in heaviness through manifold temptations? Then let us consider Him who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself. Are we faint-hearted? Let us turn to the promises. Are we growing cold and formal in the service of Christ? Then the Epistles of Peter should stir us up by putting us in remembrance. Have we to do battle against the enemy of souls? Then let us wield the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. The Bible reflects God's glory; and beholding in it as in a glass the glory of God, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. The word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. How is the sanctifying influence of the word accounted for? There are three answers to this question.

1. Some say that the influence which the Bible exerts is only the natural result of the presentation of moral truth to the mind.

2. Lutherans say that there is an inherent virtue in the word which, if not resisted, produces blessed results in those to whom it is presented. Its influence is not due to the nat-

ural force of truth, but to the Spirit of God working in and with it.

3. The Reformed doctrine is different from both the foregoing views. The first view is not correct, inasmuch as the presentation of the truth to the mind does not enable a man to understand the truth, nor does it open his heart to the reception of it. This is the work of the Spirit. The second view is not correct, because it denies the personal agency of the Spirit as separate and distinct from the word. The doctrine of the Bible is that the word sanctifies by being made efficacious through the Spirit. The word may be presented without the attending influence of the Spirit, for it acts by no inherent power, and the Spirit works when and where he pleases. The word must be attended by the efficacious influence of the Spirit, or it is preached in vain. Hence the necessity of praying for the aid of the Holy Ghost in order that we may study the Scriptures with profit. Hence, too, the need of praying that God would give his word success, and that his Spirit would lead us into all truth.

II. SACRAMENTS.

Our Lord has enjoined upon his followers the observance of two ordinances through which, as well as through the word, he is pleased to communicate his grace. These ordinances are the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. "A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed and applied to believers."* "The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments rightly used is not conferred by any power in them, neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit and the word of institution, which contains, together with the precept authorizing the

* Shorter Catechism, Q. 92.

use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers.”* These statements express the idea of the sacraments entertained by the Reformed Churches. They are opposed—

1. To the Roman Catholic doctrine. The Church of Rome says that the sacraments contain the grace they signify, and convey it *ex opere operato*. As food has power to support life, so baptism regenerates and the eucharist affords spiritual nourishment without regard to the faith or want of faith of those receiving the sacraments.

2. To the Lutheran view. Lutherans deny the *ex opere operato* doctrine as taught by Romanists. They hold that faith is necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments, but they hold that when received in faith the sacraments convey grace by an inherent virtue, just as they maintain that the word sanctifies by an inherent virtue. The doctrine of our Church is that both word and sacraments are made efficacious by the work of God’s Spirit, and not by any inherent power in themselves.

3. To the Zwinglian view. According to this view, the sacraments cannot be properly called means of grace. They are only symbolical modes of stating Scripture truth. The doctrine of our standards is that the sacraments not only represent, but that they seal and exhibit or apply to believers, the benefits of Christ’s redemption.

In studying this subject we are to guard against two extremes. First, we are to be careful not to undervalue the sacraments or ignore the fact that they are channels of grace; secondly, we are to be careful not to regard them as channels of every grace, for they are sanctifying, but not regenerating, ordinances.† Passing from these remarks on the sacraments in general, let us consider each of these ordinances separately.

* Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii., § 3.

† “The substance of this matter may be embodied in these two positions: 1. That the Holy Spirit ordinarily employs the sacraments,

1. BAPTISM.—And here we are met by three inquiries : 1. The idea of baptism ; 2. The subjects of baptism ; 3. The mode of baptism.

1. The idea of baptism. A Hindoo, let us suppose, applies to the missionary for baptism. Shall the missionary take the ground that baptism is a regenerating ordinance, and baptize him without making any inquiry respecting his state of mind? Or shall he take the ground that baptism is the ordinance in which a profession of faith in Christ is made, and satisfy himself that the person applying for baptism is a Christian? If he follows New Testament precedent, he will adopt the latter course. The case supposed is analogous to the instances of baptism recorded in the New Testament. In this, and in all other cases of adult baptism, it is clear, therefore, that baptism presupposes regeneration, and cannot be a regenerating agent. If baptism ever regenerates, it must be in the case of infants. But we concede freely to the Baptist denomination that the New Testament does not give a single unmistakable instance of infant baptism. Baptismal regeneration is therefore discountenanced by every instance of baptism recorded in the Bible. Its only claim to be regarded as a doctrine of Scripture when received by persons duly qualified and rightly prepared, as means or instruments of conveying to them clearer views and more lively and impressive conceptions of what he has done and revealed in his word with respect to the provisions and arrangements of the covenant of grace and their special application to men individually. And, 2. That the Holy Spirit, acting in accordance with the principles and tendencies of our constitution, ordinarily employs the sacraments as means or instruments of increasing and strengthening man's faith with reference to all its appropriate objects, and thereby of imparting to them in greater abundance, all the spiritual blessings which are connected with the lively and vigorous exercise of faith—that is, all those subordinate blessings, as in a certain sense they may be called, which accompany and flow from justification and regeneration.”—Cunningham's “Reformers and Theology of the Reformation,” p. 287.

rests on a few isolated texts of Scripture, and these it can be shown will not bear the interpretation which the advocates of Sacramentarianism put upon them.

One of these passages is John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

But it is not clear that "born of water" refers to baptism; and if it does, it is not clear that "kingdom of God" means heaven. Another text is found in Titus iii. 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Here again there is good reason to believe that no reference to baptism is intended. The probable meaning is: "We are saved by that washing which is regeneration, namely, the renewing of the Holy Ghost."*

Baptism, being administered to adults on profession of faith, is to them a sign and seal of regeneration, not as effecting it, but as witnessing that it has been already effected. Regeneration and baptism are in this way closely related ideas, and this will explain such passages as the following: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins;" "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

2. The subjects of baptism. The heathen just referred to would be treated in the same way by a Presbyterian or a Baptist missionary. Neither would baptize him except on a credible profession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. And as the cases of adult baptism in the New Testament are analogous to the one supposed, they need not be the occasion of any difference of opinion (save as to the mode of baptism) between Presbyterians and Baptists. It is agreed that the converts to Christianity from Judaism or heathenism are to be baptized on profession of faith. To this ex-

* Hodge, "Systematic Theology," vol. iii., p. 596.

tent Presbyterians are firm advocates of "believers' baptism." But suppose that the heathen above referred to had children? What then? Should the missionary baptize them also? If he were a Presbyterian, he would; if he were a Baptist, he would not. And here we reach the real difference between our Baptist brethren and ourselves. The question between us is simply whether the children of believers are entitled to baptism. In answering this question two concessions are to be freely made. 1. That the New Testament does not contain one clear case of infant baptism. 2. That the doctrine of infant baptism does not rest on a positive command of Christ, but is arrived at inferentially. Neither of these concessions affects the case. It is not strange that the New Testament makes no specific mention of infant baptism. Let us illustrate: A Presbyterian missionary goes to a heathen land to preach the gospel. As the result of his preaching a heathen is converted. He is baptized, and the fact is reported. But in reporting the baptism the minister only wishes to emphasize the fact that this heathen has made a profession of religion, that being the important thing. If the convert has children, they are likewise baptized, and he may or may not refer to it. If he does refer to it, he will refer to it as a subordinate fact, and say that the children were baptized or the household was baptized. Now, the cases of baptism in the New Testament were cases like the one supposed. And while it is not strange that there is no typical case of infant baptism, like that of Cornelius, it is more than likely that where the sacred writers say that "he and all his" were baptized they are recording as a subordinate fact the baptism of the convert's children as well as of the convert himself. Nor is it a valid argument against infant baptism that our Lord does not command children to be baptized. He did not enjoin the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath.

We have not space enough to enter into an argument in defence of infant baptism. These, however, are the principles which govern us in the matter.

(a) The Church of the Old Testament and the Church of the New are one and the same Church.

(b) Children of believers were members of the church under the Old Testament dispensation. They are entitled to membership, therefore, in the Christian church, unless it can be shown that this right no longer exists. The difference between us and the Baptists is a question concerning the burden of proof. We affirm the doctrine of infant church membership because it cannot be shown that it is contrary to New Testament teaching. They deny the doctrine of infant church membership because it cannot be proved by direct testimony of the New Testament.

(c) If we are right in claiming for children under the New Testament the privileges which they enjoyed under the Old until it is proved that those privileges have been revoked, we are right in claiming that they are entitled to baptism; for if they are entitled to membership, they cannot reasonably be denied that which is the sign of membership. The view we have taken furnishes a natural explanation of those passages which refer to the baptism of Lydia and her household, of the household of Stephanas, of the jailer and all his. It is possible that there were no infants in these households, but the probabilities are the other way; and the references are just such as a missionary at the present day would make if he were reporting the conversion of a heathen and the subsequent baptism of himself and his family.

3. The mode of baptism. Baptism is a washing with water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. How much water is used and how it is applied are matters of small moment. Baptism may be performed by immer-

sion, affusion or sprinkling. Baptists claim that baptism means immersion, and that sprinkling is not baptism. For this position, however, they have no authority.

(a) The use of the words "bapto" and "baptizo" does not warrant it. These words are used where Nebuchadnezzar is said to have been "wet with the dew of heaven," where the washing of the hands, of pots and cups and tables (couches) is spoken of, and in Mark vii. 4, where we read: "And when they come from market, except they wash, they eat not."

(b) The use of the Greek prepositions translated "in," "into," "out of," does not sustain the Baptist position. Philip and the eunuch went down, both of them, "into" the water. But this does not necessarily mean more than that they went down to the stream and stood beside it. If it necessarily conveys the idea of immersion, we must hold that Philip was immersed too, for they both went down "into" the water.

(c) The cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament do not sustain the Baptist position. Three thousand converts were baptized on the day of Pentecost. Considering the short time in which this was done, and the scarcity of water in Jerusalem, it is hardly possible that they were immersed. The account of the baptism of Cornelius suggests the idea that water was brought for the purpose. "Can any man forbid water?" The Philippian jailer was baptized at midnight and in prison. It is highly improbable that he was immersed.

(d) The Baptist position is not supported by the remaining references to baptism in the New Testament. The Israelites were baptized in the Red Sea, but they were not immersed. We receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but we are not immersed in the Spirit. He is poured out upon us.

2. THE LORD'S SUPPER.—There are four leading views

in respect to this sacrament, the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Zwinglian and the Reformed.

1. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that by the act of the officiating priest the elements of bread and wine in the eucharist—or, as they call it, the mass—are changed into the body and blood of Christ. This is the doctrine of transubstantiation. The scriptural arguments in support of this are John vi. 53: “Then said Jesus unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;” and 1 Cor. xi. 24: “This is my body.”* The mass is both a sacrament and a sacrifice. As a sacrament it imparts spiritual nourishment *ex opere operato*. But as a sacrifice it is a satisfaction for sin. Romanism is a huge, though consistent (and this is more than can be said of high Anglicanism), perversion of Bible truth. It makes the minister a priest, the memorial meal a sacrifice; and instead of teaching that Christ was once (once for all) offered to bear the sins of many, it makes the satisfaction for sin depend on the repetition of that sacrifice in the mass.

2. The Lutherans deny that the substance of the elements is changed, but they believe in the corporeal presence of Christ *in, under and with* the elements. This is consubstantiation. They hold that faith on the part of the communicant is necessary in order that grace may be received, but they hold, likewise, that, as in the case of baptism, the eucharist has an inherent virtue.

3. The Zwinglian view regards the Lord’s Supper simply as symbolical, and as a means of grace only as it is another mode of presenting truth to the mind.

4. The Reformed doctrine is opposed to all the foregoing. It is opposed to the Zwinglian view, inasmuch as it teaches that the Lord’s Supper is a channel of grace. It is opposed to the Lutheran, inasmuch as it teaches that this

* See the commentaries on these versés.

grace is conveyed not by any inherent virtue in the ordinance, but only as the Holy Ghost uses it for our sanctification; and of course it is still more opposed to the Roman Catholic view.

Our Shorter Catechism says: "The Lord's Supper is a sacrament, wherein, by giving and receiving bread and wine according to Christ's appointment, his death is showed forth, and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of his body and blood, with all his benefits to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace."*

Looking at this ordinance as it is expounded in the symbols of the Reformed Church, and especially of our own, we may distinguish four leading ideas.

(a) The memorial idea. "Do this in remembrance of me." The love which brought salvation and the way by which salvation came are to be kept fresh in our minds by the periodic observance of the ordinance which commemorates Christ's death.

(b) The symbolical idea. As baptism teaches by symbol the doctrine of depravity and the necessity of regeneration, so the impressive ordinance of the Supper speaks to us of guilt and of the atonement. A Socinian theology has no adequate explanation of the eucharist.

(c) The social idea. This service is a memorial meal. It is the "Lord's table" which is spread, the "Lord's Supper" of which we partake. It is a communion of Christians with their Lord and with one another. The followers of Christ are brethren, and he is the Elder Brother of them all.

(d) The sacramental idea. There is no word which exactly expresses the thought which we wish to express under this head. High Churchmen speak of the sacramental principle, but by it they mean to convey the idea that the sign

* Shorter Catechism, Q. 96.

and the thing signified always accompany each other. We use the word sacramental in this connection because it serves better than any other to express the thought that this ordinance, besides being a memorial service and symbolical of precious truth, is really a means of grace to those who receive it in faith, that in a real, though not in a bodily sense, Christ is present, and that in a spiritual, though not in a corporal manner, believers do feed upon him to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace. It is a mistake to suppose that the Lord's Supper is only a memorial service or that it is merely a symbolical ordinance. The language used respecting it in the New Testament forbids our taking such a low view of it. Rejecting the Roman Catholic and Lutheran interpretations put upon the words of our Lord, it is nevertheless true that he did say, "This is my body," "This cup is the new testament in my blood." Remember, too, that Paul uses this strong language in regard to the eucharist: "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let him examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (judgment) to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. xi. 27-29. We read also, 1 Cor. x. 16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which he brake, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"* In this ordinance we not only remember Christ—we receive him.†

* For remarks on these passages, see Bannerman, "The Church of Christ," vol. ii., p. 133.

† "Christ is really present to his people in this sacrament, not bodily, but in spirit, not in the sense of local nearness, but of efficacious operation. They receive him not with the mouth, but by faith; they receive his flesh and blood, not as flesh, not as material particles, not as human life, not the supernatural influence of his

The Lord's table is spread for the Lord's people. None but Christians should come to it, and none who are Christ's should be kept from it. Hence, in admitting persons to sealing ordinances, it is not right to require them to subscribe to an elaborate creed, or to exact from them more than a credible profession of faith.* Men cannot read the heart, and Christ does not recognize a vicarious conscience.

Our Directory for Worship says :† “ Children born within the pale of the visible Church, and dedicated to God in baptism, are under the inspection and government of the Church, and are to be taught to read and repeat the catechism, the apostles' creed and the Lord's Prayer. They are to be taught to pray, to abhor sin, to fear God and to obey the Lord Jesus Christ. And when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady and have knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord's Supper.”

glorified body in heaven, but his body as broken and his blood as shed. The union thus signified and effected is not a corporeal union, not a mixture of substances, but a spiritual and mystical union due to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The efficacy of this sacrament as a means of grace is not in the sign, nor in the service, nor in the minister, nor in the word, but in the attending influence of the Holy Ghost.”—Hodge's Systematic Theology, vol. iii., p. 650.

* “ The principle (of communion), as it is notorious that the Presbyterian Church has always held it, does not constitute the pastor, elders or congregation judges of the actual conversion of the applicant, but, on the contrary, lays much responsibility on the applicant himself. The minister and kirk-session must be satisfied as to his competent knowledge, credible profession and consistent walk. They must determine negatively that there is no reason for pronouncing him not to be a Christian, but they do not undertake the responsibility of positively judging of his conversion.”—Candlish, quoted by Hodge in “ Outlines of Theology,” p. 516.

† Chap. ix., § 1.

III. PRAYER.

God is our Father. He loves us; he is able and willing to help us. We have access to him, and he has promised to hear us when we come to him in the name of Christ. We are invited to come boldly unto the throne of grace. We are assured that the Spirit maketh intercession in us, and that Christ ever liveth to make intercession for us. It is natural, then, that the child of God should seek communion with his Father in heaven. Saved by his grace, kept by his power, led by his Spirit, it would be strange if the Christian did not rejoice in the privilege of going to God with the language of adoration, thanksgiving, confession and petition on his lips.

And as prayer is the natural expression of religious feeling, so we might naturally expect that the religious life would be promoted by a prayerful habit. The face of Moses shone when he came down from the mount where he had talked with God. Nothing will impart radiance and beauty to Christian character like communion with God. He who would be God-like must walk with God as Enoch did. He who would resist the temptations of the world must descend to the daily duties of life from the mountain-top of prayer.

But it would be a great mistake to regard prayer as only a means of heightening our religious feelings and convictions, or to value it only for its reflex influence upon ourselves. One element in prayer is petition. God's blessings are given in answer to prayer. God says, "I will be inquired of by the house of Israel." Our Saviour says, "Ask," "seek," "knock." He tells us that earthly parents are not so willing to give good gifts unto their children as God is to give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Paul says, "Pray without ceasing." "In everything by prayer and thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto

God." We cannot complain if we lack the blessings which we have never craved. The Westminster Confession of Faith says, "Prayer, with thanksgiving, being one special part of religious worship, is by God required of all men; and that it may be accepted, it is to be made in the name of the Son, by the help of the Spirit, according to his will, with understanding, reverence, humility, fervency, faith, love and perseverance."*

The subject of prayer presents difficulties to some minds.

1. It is asked how the unqualified promise of our Saviour, "If ye shall ask anything in my name I will do it," is to be reconciled with the fact that so many prayers not are answered, and with the additional fact that, in the nature of the case, all prayers cannot be answered, as, for instance, when on the eve of battle both armies pray for victory. In replying to this question we must inquire who are meant by "ye" in the passage referred to. Does Christ pledge himself in this promise to answer every request which may be made, without regard to the persons who make it or the spirit in which it is preferred? Surely not. The promise is to his disciples, and must be limited in its application to Christians. But do Christians desire that their requests should be unconditionally granted? Does a Christian so far forget himself as to presume to know better than God what he needs? Surely not. Then the words of our Saviour are to be explained by the words of John: "This is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." 1 John v. 14. It is a great blessing that God does not answer all our prayers.

2. It is said that since the physical world is under the control of law it is irrational to pray for rain in dry weather, for a prosperous voyage or for recovery from sickness. To this we reply that a theory which makes God the slave of his own laws, which represents him as leaving

* Cap. xxi., § 3.

the universe under the exclusive control of physical causes, is unscriptural. We believe that "God's works of providence are his most holy, wise and powerful preserving and governing all his creatures and all their actions." Believing this, we believe that the area of prayer is as wide as that of our wants. Nor are we doubtful respecting the efficacy of prayer because we do not understand how it is answered. Whether God answers prayer by a direct exercise of divine power, or whether he does so by means of second causes, it matters not.* "Prayer and the answer of prayer are simply the preferring of a request upon one side and the compliance with that request upon the other. Man applies; God complies. Man asks a favor; God bestows it." † This is enough.

3. It is urged again that if God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, prayer is unnecessary, since it cannot change his purpose. But God's purpose is all-comprehensive. He foreordains the prayer as well as the answer to the prayer. He has no more decreed the one than the other.

* "I believe that God commonly answers prayer by natural means appointed for this purpose from the very beginning, when he gave to mind and matter their laws, and arranged the objects with these laws for the accomplishment of his wise and beneficent ends, for the encouragement of virtue and the discouragement of vice, and among others to provide an answer to the acceptable petitions of his people. God, in answer to prayer, may restore the patient by an original strength of constitution or by the well-timed application of a remedy. The believer is in need of a blessing, and he asks it; and he finds that the God who created the need and prompted the prayer has provided the means of granting what he needs."—Dr. McCosh in *Contemporary Review* for October, 1872.

† Chalmers, quoted by Dr. Hodge in "Systematic Theology," vol. iii., p. 694.

LESSON XII.

THE FUTURE STATE.

THE question of destiny is now to be considered. It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death—what? Before an answer is given to this question, notice must be taken of certain great events which are predicted in Scripture, and the occurrence of which will bring about the final consummation. These are, 1. The second advent; 2. The resurrection; 3. The judgment.

1. THE SECOND ADVENT.—The Church as Christ's army is to push its conquests until Jesus is owned the world over as King of kings and Lord of lords; then the Lord will come. That he is to come in person is abundantly taught in Scripture. He left the world with the promise that he would return: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." The disciples who watched his ascension heard these words from the angels: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." The writings of Paul abound in allusions to "the appearing of our Lord," "that day," "his coming," "the day of Jesus Christ;" and the Apocalypse closes with the prayer which is so often on Christian lips: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

2. THE RESURRECTION.—The Scriptures clearly teach that there is to be a general resurrection of the righteous and the wicked, and they associate this event with the second coming of Christ: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii. 2. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall

come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." John v. 28, 29. " I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God : and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life ; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the book, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell gave up the dead which were in them." Rev. xx. 12, 13. " We who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [precede] them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God ; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air ; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17.

3. THE JUDGMENT.—Besides the doctrines of the second advent and the resurrection of the body, the Scriptures teach that there is to be a final judgment, and there are good reasons for believing that these three events are to be contemporaneous. The following are among the leading passages which refer to this subject : " For he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." Acts xvii. 31. " We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. v. 10. " The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels : and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. xvi. 27. " When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory ; and before him shall be gathered all nations ; and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth the

sheep from the goats ; and he shall set the sheep on the right hand, but the goats on the left," etc. Matt. xxv. 31-33. "Then cometh the end." "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat ; the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up."

We do not know how near or how remote the end may be. We do know, however, that when Christ comes those who are alive shall be changed and all who are in their graves shall come forth ; and we know, moreover, that both quick and dead are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ.

In considering the subject treated in this lesson, we shall speak first of the state of the soul between death and the judgment, and, second, of its condition after the judgment.

I. BETWEEN DEATH AND THE JUDGMENT.

The doctrine of our Church on the condition of men between death and the resurrection is thus expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith :* "The bodies of men after death return to dust and see corruption, but their souls (which neither die nor sleep), having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies ; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none." This view is opposed, 1. To the doctrine of the "sleep of the soul ;" 2. To that of "Hades ;" 3. To the doctrine of "purgatory." Let us notice these briefly.

1. THE SLEEP OF THE SOUL.—Archbishop Whately has

* Cap. xxxii., § 1.

given the weight of his influence to the revolting idea that the soul falls into a state of unconsciousness at death, and remains in this condition until the resurrection. It is true that the Bible does speak of death as a sleep and of Christians as those "who sleep in Jesus;" and were there nothing positive on the subject in the Scriptures, we might think, perhaps, that the reference is to the soul as well as to the body. But it is difficult to understand how those who acknowledge the authority of the Bible can entertain this opinion. The dying Stephen saw the heavens opened and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. His last words were: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Jesus said to the penitent thief: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Paul desired to "depart and be with Christ, which is far better." To depart and remain unconscious for two thousand years would not have been far better. Christians have died in every age of the Church, and are dying every day, in the confident expectation of entering heaven and of seeing Jesus. We shall need more evidence than Whately has furnished to assure us that they have all been deceived.*

2. HADES.—This doctrine has always had its supporters, and it has many advocates at the present day. Briefly

* "Here, for example, is a passage from David Brainerd's last days: 'Lord's day, September 27, 1747.—I was born on a Sabbath day, and I have a reason to think I was new born on a Sabbath day; and I hope I shall die on this Sabbath day.' 'I am almost in eternity; I long to be there.' 'I long to be in heaven, praising and glorifying God with the holy angels.' October 6 he lay as if he were dying. He was heard to utter in broken whispers such expressions as these: 'He will come; he will not tarry; I shall soon be in glory; I shall soon glorify God with the angels.' But Archbishop Whately thinks that for a hundred and thirteen years Brainerd has been utterly unconscious, and that all these anticipations are not to be fulfilled for perhaps several thousand years."—Adams' "Evenings with the Doctrines," p. 361.

stated, it is that there is a place intermediate between heaven and hell which is the abode of the dead during the period between death and the resurrection. The blessed dead go to Paradise, where they are in a state of happiness, though it is far inferior to that which is in store for them in heaven. The impenitent dead are in another region of Hades, where they await in misery the judgment of the great day and the infliction of the punishment of hell.

On this it is enough to remark that the foregoing doctrine is in harmony with the teaching of our standards in so far as it affirms that the righteous will not experience the highest blessedness until the resurrection. But it is at variance with them in affirming that there is a middle state or place which is the abode of departed spirits between death and the resurrection. The Bible knows nothing of this middle state or place of abode. Christ we know is in heaven, and those who die in Christ are with him.

3. PURGATORY.—The doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting the future state is embraced in its teachings respecting heaven, hell and purgatory. Heaven is the place of highest blessedness, and is the abode of three classes of persons: first, of the Old Testament saints who were detained in Hades as spirits in prison until the resurrection of Christ, when they were led out in triumph; second, of the few who attain perfection in this life; third, of those Christians who die without being perfect, and who are required to make satisfaction for their sins and to be purified by enduring the pains of purgatory. Hell is the place of endless torment, and is the abode of all heretics and of those who die in mortal sin. The doctrine of purgatory may be stated as follows: The atonement of Christ only delivers men from *eternal* punishment. Temporal punishments, and especially the pains of purgatory in the next world, still remain to be endured as satisfaction for sin. The Church of Rome has always claimed the right of regulating the kind and de-

gree of this punishment, and she has done this in three ways : (a) By indulgences. The doctrine of the Church of Rome is that the "temporal pain, owing to the justice of God, either before or after death, . . . may be remitted by an application of the merits of Christ and of the saints, out of the treasury of the Church, the dispensation of which treasure is given to the bishops." A man might take his choice of doing penance or buying an indulgence. (b) By the sacrament of penance. Mortal sins, if not forgiven, render men liable to the pains of hell. To be forgiven they must be confessed to a priest. He then absolves from the penalty of eternal death, and prescribes the penance which must be performed as a temporal satisfaction. (c) By the mass. This is a propitiatory sacrifice, and avails for those for whom it is intended by the officiating priest, whether they be on earth or in purgatory. Thus it will be seen that this doctrine places the destinies of men in the hands of the Romish priesthood ; and it can readily be inferred that it is a source of great power and emolument. But it is as false as it is pernicious.

(a.) There is not a syllable in the Bible which lends it the least support. It is true that our Lord said the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven either in this world or in the world to come. He did not mean, however, that some sins may be forgiven in the next world, but only that this sin shall never be forgiven. The Scriptures teach that nothing that defileth shall enter heaven, and it is not claimed that men reach a state of sinless perfection in this life. But these facts do not prove the doctrine of purgatory, nor are they enough to show that the Christian carries the infirmities of his sinful nature with him into the next world ; we reach a different conclusion from these facts. For since it is true that men do not attain to sinless perfection in this life, and that there is nothing sinful in heaven, and that Christians go to heaven when they die, we conclude that the

“souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness.”

(b.) The doctrine is based on a false assumption. Those who maintain it assume that Christ has not made a complete satisfaction for sin. Hence there is great similarity between the doctrine of purgatory and the creed of a certain class of Universalists. The latter reject the atonement, and say that God always punishes men for their sins. Men who lead wicked lives, they say, must expect to be miserable in the next world. But the end of punishment is the good of the offender, and the result of it will be universal restoration to holiness and heaven. What the Universalists of this class believe respecting all men the Roman Catholics believe respecting all who go to purgatory. The answer to both is the same. We cannot make satisfaction for our sins, and we need not, for Christ has borne our sins in his own body on the tree.

(c.) The doctrine of purgatory contradicts the word of God. The Bible says that there is no condemnation to the Christian, that he hath eternal life, that when he dies he is blessed, and that for him to depart is to be with Christ.

II. AFTER THE JUDGMENT.

The statements of Scripture in respect to the judgment are very explicit. Thus, we read, “The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” Jude 6. “Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal” Matt. xxiv. 34-46. In

these passages the Scripture doctrine of hell and heaven is unfolded—to wit: that the wicked shall share the fate of the devil and the fallen angels and be the subjects of eternal suffering, and that the righteous shall be welcomed into the enjoyment of everlasting happiness. Let us state the doctrine more fully.

1. HELL.—The teaching of Scripture and the belief of the Christian Church is that the impenitent are punished in the next world, that the punishment is everlasting, and that it consists in pain. This doctrine is opposed (*a*) by the Universalists, properly so called, who deny that any punishment awaits men in the next world; (*b*) by the Restorationists, who admit the fact of future punishment, but deny that it is everlasting; (*c*) by the Annihilationists, who agree with the orthodox view in respect to the fact and the duration of future punishment, but deny that it consists in positive suffering or pain.

(*a*.) The Universalists. The Bible says that God is not willing that any should perish, and that he is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe. It says, too, that Christ “tasted death for every man,” and that he died “that the world through him might be saved.” We cannot discuss the meaning of these and similar passages which are such favorites with the Universalists, but we know that they do not teach that all men go to heaven, for the Bible distinctly asserts that some do go to hell. “These shall go away into everlasting punishment;” “The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them who know not God.” To say, as Ballou says, that the punishment spoken of in the Bible refers exclusively to sufferings endured in this life is simply absurd. Better renounce the authority of the Bible at once than trifle in this way with its most solemn facts.

(*b*.) The Restorationists. A great many, probably the

greater number, of those who belong to the Universalist denomination in this country admit that there is a punishment in store for the wicked in the next world, but they deny that it is eternal. They support their position by saying that God is too benevolent to allow his creatures to suffer eternally; that it would be derogatory to God's majesty for evil to have a place in his universe through all eternity; that punishment is for the good of the offender and must result in the sinner's restoration; and, finally, that the word *aionios* does not mean everlasting but only a limited period. To which it is enough to reply that we are not competent to say what God may or may not do; that there is no argument against the continuance of evil in the world which would not apply as well to its introduction and to its present existence; that the Bible does not intimate that the punishment of the wicked is a remedial measure; and that if the words used to express the duration of punishment do not teach that it is eternal it is difficult to tell how the idea of eternity could have been expressed. The same word is used to express the duration of punishment which, in a coordinate clause of the same verse, is used to express the duration of happiness. "We must either admit the endless misery of hell or give up the endless happiness of heaven."

(e.) The Annihilationists. The argument mainly employed by this class of men is based on the alleged meaning of the words "life" and "death." Put into syllogistic form, it comes to this: Life always and only means existence; death, non-existence. But the punishment of sin is death; therefore the punishment of sin is non-existence, or extinction of being. It must be admitted that if the word "death" is correctly defined in this argument it overthrows the doctrine of eternal punishment, but it must also be admitted that it makes nonsense at the same time of half the passages in which the word occurs. But death, as descriptive of the punishment of the lost, does not mean annihilation or extinc-

tion of being, for there are degrees of punishment, but no degree of death in the sense referred to. One stone is as dead as another. Death does not mean extinction of being, for the punishment of the wicked is torment: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. . . . And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." Rev. xx. 10, 14.

2. HEAVEN.—In answer to the question, What benefits do believers receive from Christ at the resurrection? the Shorter Catechism says: "At the resurrection, believers, being raised up in glory, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of judgment, and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity." If the Bible fails to gratify our curiosity by answering all our inquiries respecting heaven, it does not leave us altogether in the dark. We know that this mortal shall put on immortality, and that the body of the believer is to be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body. The Christian shall see Christ, shall behold his glory, shall be like him, shall be welcomed into the joy of his Lord. Faith will become sight and hope fruition. Now he knows in part, but then shall he know even as also he is known. He will sin no more, sorrow no more. His inheritance is incorruptible, undefiled and fadeth not away. Tears are wiped away from all faces. Entering heaven, the weary finds rest, the wanderer a home, and the pilgrim leaves his tent for a city that hath foundations. Earth's sinning Christians shall wear white robes. Earth's sorrowing disciples shall waken notes of joy from harps of gold.

HOW TO TEACH THE BIBLE.

BY

J. BENNET TYLER.

HOW TO TEACH THE BIBLE.

LESSON I.

THE PLACE AND PURPOSE OF THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

THE Sabbath-school has come to have an important place among Christian activities. It enters largely into the thoughts and plans, and enlists the active energies, of a large portion of the best talent and the most devoted piety of the Church. It opens a most inviting and promising field of labor—one which can be cultivated with comparative economy and ease, and which is already rich in most abundant fruit for the kingdom of our Lord.

I. ITS RELATIVE PLACE.

NEGATIVELY.—1. The school should never be a substitute for home training. God has set men in families. The home is a divine institution. Home and family ties constitute the most benign feature of our Christian civilization. The home is God's first and best agency for training young children, and the Christian mother is the best teacher. Right here she may find her highest sphere, her most glorious opportunity. It is her high privilege to love and cherish the young child, and to mould and fashion in the cherishing more than all other and later teaching.

The Christian father is to the child the type of the All-Father in heaven—poor, meagre and imperfect type indeed,

but yet the best and truest available. The genuine Christian home should be, and is, replete with all that is sweet and true and elevating, and in the way of moral and religious culture it ranks above any and all other agencies.

Parents have the authority. It is God-given, and on the part of young children intuitively recognized. They have the custody, not for an hour a week, but all the week.

Most obviously, God designed the home to be the first and best agency in the moral and religious training of young children.

2. The Sabbath-school should not be deemed a substitute for the church or the preaching service.

The church is the divinely-appointed agency for saving sinners, young and old, the pulpit is the great moral and religious educator, and both are specially ordained of God. The school should never directly or indirectly interfere with, or take the place of, the preaching of the word or the regular services of the church.

3. This Sabbath service, in the house of God, is not a secular school in any sense. It is not a singing-school, nor a legitimate place for fairs and festivals, for tableaux and cheap theatricals and absurd dramatic performances. It should not be considered a rostrum for itinerant Sabbath-school talkers, nor an arena for pushing forward precocious children.

POSITIVELY.—The true idea of the Sabbath-school makes it a subordinate and subsidiary institution. It is a department of the church, and should be subject to its most careful and affectionate supervision and control. If adults should be considered within the watch and care of pastor and session, why not the children? If the young people in any capacity, why not as an associated and organized power for religious education and training?

Conceding that the school is a department of the church, that it should be subordinate to and included in it as the

greater includes the less, and that it is entitled to its closest scrutiny and most loving and tender care, we are prepared to assume—

1. That it is its most important arm of service. (*a.*) It embraces the most easily reached and most impressible part of every congregation. We have right here the Church and State in embryo. We must look among the young for the great majority of our future converts, for the recruits for rank and file, for officers high and low, for the solid citizens, the teachers and the preachers of the future. (*b.*) The school is an organized power which, properly and judiciously utilized, is capable of immense possibilities of good to the cause of Christ and to the Church. (*c.*) It can and ought to subserve the highest and best interests of the Church as an educator in its doctrines and polity and in its benevolent plans and purposes.

2. Its recognized place and relative importance entitle it not only to careful supervision, but to generous support. (*a.*) It should be provided with a cheerful and pleasant place of meeting. Some houses are all parlor. Not a few churches consist mostly in luxurious pews and elegant appointments for adult worshipers, very little money or comfortable space being available for Sabbath-school purposes. If we can afford handsome houses in which to live and elegant churches in which to worship, we certainly ought to provide cheery and attractive, if not beautiful, rooms for this most important service. (*b.*) The legitimate expenses of the school should be provided from the church treasury, and as liberally and cheerfully as is the cost of the gaslight and the fuel. (*c.*) The library and papers and lesson notes for teachers and scholars should not only be provided, but official cognizance should be had concerning their character. Ordinary caution and sagacity would seem to dictate that each Church should insist that its own views of truth and doctrine should be taught through its own formulas,

and lesson notes and juvenile literature, prepared by its own authorized agencies, and also that unfit books are not furnished for the library.

3. The relative importance of this department of Christian work would seem to demand—(a.) The most careful and judicious selection of teachers, and by competent church authority; (b.) Some proper and adequate provision for training teachers for the future. (For appointment and pledge of teachers, see Appendix.)

II. THE PURPOSE OF THE SCHOOL.

The great object of the Sabbath-school should be Bible study for Christian growth, for immediate religious impressions and constant Christian culture. It should embrace old as well as young, parents and adults as well as children. The most systematic and thorough class teaching of the living word should be its leading feature.

1. IT SHOULD BE A BIBLE-SCHOOL.—The short service held but once a week will not admit of complicated systems of instruction. Yet the truth should be taught, and in the best manner and by the best teachers available. This is that by which we are saved and sanctified. It is the bread of heaven for young and old, the only source of spiritual life and power. Said Sir Walter Scott when about to look his last on earth, "Bring me the book." "What book?" said his daughter.—"There is but one book," replied the dying man. When we come to the real source of spiritual life and growth, there is but one book.

2. IT SHOULD BE MORE THAN A SCHOOL.—This service for Bible study should be infinitely more and better than a mere school. It should be pre-eminently a service of worship and song, of praise and prayer. It should be a religious service in the highest and purest sense, and the very atmosphere should be surcharged with spiritual influences at once cheerful, attractive and impressive.

3. IT SHOULD REACH THE HEART.—Each school should have a single and distinct design. It should aim with all available skill and culture, and with the most intense Christian earnestness, to reach the heart and conscience. It should seek to illustrate and impress the one truth of the current lesson. It should seek and expect immediate spiritual results, and this should be the central object toward which all the exercises, whether of song or prayer or class teaching or review, should certainly and unerringly tend.

4. IT SHOULD SUPPLEMENT THE HOME.—While the school is not designed to supplant home instruction, it should seek its cordial co-operation and support. The school needs the sympathy of the home, and the child is rarely fully reached without this common bond of union and interest.

Moreover, the sympathy of numbers, the healthy stimulus of competitive study, the social and religious associations of the school, together with the loving labor of a faithful teacher, can hardly fail to be a most helpful aid in the religious training of which the Christian home should be the source and centre.

5. IT SHOULD BE SUBSERVIENT TO THE CHURCH.—The school must, in the nature of the case, deal largely with that part of the congregation which is in its formative condition. Hence special pains should be taken to inculcate—(a.) That love for and sympathy with the church, its usages, doctrines, polity and plans of missionary operation, which underlie all true efficiency in any particular church. (b.) The school, in all the tenor of its instructions and in its indirect influences, should sustain the ordinances of the church and encourage attendance on the preaching service. There is, as it is thought, an increasing tendency to excuse the young people of the schools from attendance on the church service and the social meetings. One presbytery reports that only about one-fifth of the members of their schools attend church regularly. The tendency is as alarming as it is

prevalent. If these children are expected to love the house of God and unflinchingly sustain its ordinances in the future, it would seem but ordinary wisdom to cultivate the habit in youth. Our schools should be carefully guarded against any real or seeming antagonisms to the church and its interests. They should be thoroughly loyal to all its institutions and constitute a most effective force in sustaining and perpetuating them. The school that does not plant the germs of church unity and co-operation is sadly deficient in its plans and purposes. The school nurtured and cherished by a particular church that does not subserve its highest and best interests is an impertinence and a superfluity.

6. IT SHOULD BE A MISSION AGENCY.—We have spoken hitherto of the church and home school. The mission Sabbath-school is a most important and successful force in mission work. It is wellnigh universally recognized as the pioneer agency in all judicious plans for church extension. As such it may often take the place, for the time being, of the church and the pastor.

Ordinarily, the mission school should mean a self-sustaining church, or a feeder of one already established, and should be so located and managed as to become the one or the other. It should, if practicable, be under church supervision, and be brought into relations with church and pastor as speedily as possible. Such schools in cities, between parishes, in rural towns and on the frontier, constitute an invaluable and most effective method of carrying the gospel to the destitute. If judiciously located and carefully nursed, they often very quickly become preaching stations and feeders of existing churches, and not seldom grow with great rapidity into vigorous, self-sustaining churches. This form of home evangelization has special adaptation to our wide, sparsely settled country. It should come into the plans of each individual church as an easy and effective means of

stimulating lay activity as well as of reaching adjacent destitution. As an economical and promising method of carrying the gospel to the hearts and homes of the families dwelling in "the regions beyond," it should enter fully into the plans of the church at large.

LESSON II.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT.

I. ORGANIZATION.

SOME definite organization is essential to efficiency. Our government has its national, State and municipal departments, and these are so nicely adjusted that all work harmoniously one within another. Society and the church should not be less definitely and exactly organized. There should be as little machinery as possible, but that little is essential and should be simple and well adjusted, and it should link the school indissolubly to the church.

1. The school should by organic law be in entire sympathy and co-operation with the church and the pastor. Want of harmony here is fatal to usefulness as well as subversive of good order and the natural fitness of things.

2. There should be an annual readjustment or election of officers. Not for the sake of changes, for changes are often undesirable and perilous, but in order to provide for changes of administration when really necessary.

3. The officers should be a superintendent, an assistant superintendent, and if the school is large more than one, a secretary, treasurer, librarian and assistants.

4. The superintendent should be selected by and with the consent and authority of pastor and church, most

certainly. If the church itself is subject to the care and control of pastor and officers, there is certainly no good reason for excepting any of the departments of the church from the control of the central authority. If any institution anywhere should be most carefully and affectionately supervised, it should be that which undertakes so largely the religious instruction of the young people. Wise pastors and church officers, while not evading just and proper responsibility, will, on the other hand, never be officious or intermeddling. They will ever exercise their functions in school as in church with tact and kindness and delicacy. They will not foster antagonisms. They will not suffer them even in appearance. Details will differ. In some cases pastor and session will elect; in others, teachers will nominate, subject to the approval of the session, and this is perhaps the better way. The wishes of a faithful body of teachers should always have due weight. In all well-ordered churches there will be cordial co-operation and concurrent authority.

This matter becomes very simple, and is in fact divested of all complication, when pastor and church officers are in the school. Then in loving sympathy and active participation they will govern by virtue of possession rather than by abstract right.

5. Subordinate officers of the school should be selected by the superintendent, with consent and approval of the teachers.

II. MANAGEMENT.

The general management of the school should be absolutely in the hands of the superintendent. He, of course, should be subordinate and accountable to pastor and church. But for the highest efficiency, details should be entrusted to him as the executive officer. A wise superintendent will secure good order, will protect his teachers in their class

teaching as the chief feature of the school, will supply vacancies and adopt all practicable means of promoting thorough instruction in the Word, and will so conduct the general exercises of the school as to illustrate and impress the lesson of the day and to enhance as far as possible spiritual efficiency and power.

1. **QUALIFICATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENT.**—Great care and judgment should be exercised in the selection of the man to fill this important office. The superintendent should be—(a.) If practicable, an elder or officer in the church. (b.) He should be a symmetrical, spiritually-minded man. (c.) He should possess governing tact. Order is heaven's first law. A school cannot be effective in which good order is not preserved. (d.) He should have executive ability, should know how to set others at work and to work easily and smoothly with them. (e.) He should be a worker. No superintendent can be highly successful who does not devote time and strength and persistent labor to the interests of the school. In a word, the superintendent should be the best man available. If he does not now possess the above qualifications, if he is a growthful Christian man, by the grace of God and the cordial support of the school and the church he may attain to them, measurably at least.

2. **THE QUALIFICATIONS OF TEACHERS.**—The standard should not be so high as to be impracticable of attainment. In the very general absence of training classes for teachers, selections must be made in most cases from among people of moderate qualifications, and from the ranks of the busy, hard-worked men and women.

3. **SECURE THE BEST.**—For the sake of Efficiency the very best within reach should by some means be secured. Aptness to teach, love for and sympathy with children, are prime requisites; culture and education are desirable, but earnest piety, love for the work and an absorbing desire to be useful are more important still. Pastor and

church officers and superintendent should compare notes and use all practicable methods to enlist the maturest and best for this most important service.

4. **THE OFFICE SHOULD BE MAGNIFIED.**—The office of the teacher should be invested with the dignity and importance which inherently belong to it. It is directly recognized in the Scriptures. It should be in the church. Teachers should be made to feel that their duties are vastly important and responsible. We suggest the fitness and propriety—(1.) Of careful and formal election to the office by some competent authority, such as nomination by superintendent and approval of teachers, and (2.) Some simple but fitting ceremony of induction into the office. This may consist only of prayer, a few appropriate words from the pastor, with public assent to a pledge of fidelity on the part of the candidate. See Appendix.

5. **THE SESSION.**—One session, as a rule, taking all interests into account, is probably better than two. The time should be so arranged as best to accommodate the greatest number, and best to help and not hinder attendance of teachers and scholars on the preaching services.

6. **THE LESSON.**—Obviously, the whole school should have the same lesson. Without uniformity there can be little unity. With different lessons in the several classes, teachers' meetings and general reviews will be of course impracticable. No well-ordered school can afford to do without either the one or the other.

The international series of uniform lessons is commending itself to the almost universal favor of the schools of our own and other countries. The movement has probably already done more to stimulate Bible study than any one event which has occurred in the history of the Sabbath-school.

LASTLY.—The management of the school should as far as possible stimulate and promote the most thorough class

teaching of the Scriptures, give the most direct and positive spiritual tone and direction to all the exercises, and all this in a form at once attractive and impressive and in the closest harmony with the church, from which the school should always be inseparable.

LESSON III.

THE TEACHER'S OFFICE.—ITS SACREDNESS AND POWER.

I. THE SANCTITY OF THE OFFICE.

OBSERVE, 1. ITS DIVINE APPOINTMENT.—The office is clearly recognized in the word of God. Teachers as well as apostles and prophets were specially set apart in the early Church: "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers." 1 Cor. xii. 28. Aptness in teaching is one of the essential qualifications of a bishop or minister. In the olden times the parent was the one authorized teacher of his household and his children. "Thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children" is one of the earliest of divine enactments. The most thorough and systematic household instruction was repeatedly and solemnly enjoined upon God's ancient people.

2. THE PRACTICE of the early Church gives additional sanctity to the teacher's office. There were schools of the prophets at a very early age. Classes for instruction in the word, organized and taught in the synagogues by teachers skilled in the laws, were common, if not universal, among the Jews, before the Christian era. The early Christian Church doubtless followed closely the example of the Jewish in this respect.* The preaching of the apostles and min-

* Lightfoot says there were four kinds of schools of the law among the Jews. (1.) In every city and town there was a school

isters of the early Church is thought by many to have accorded more with the right idea of teaching than with the modern style of preaching. It is undoubtedly true that simple exposition of the Scriptures, house-to-house teaching, familiar conversation on the word and face-to-face question and answer engrossed very largely the attention of the ministers of the early Church. Philip's preaching Jesus to the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 27-35) was obviously more a catechetical teaching exercise than the modern sermon.

Peter's message to Cornelius and the "many that were come together" (Acts x. 27) was largely conversational. Peter was probably the chief speaker or teacher. But "they of the circumcision" doubtless expressed their astonishment, while the Gentiles magnified God. "A certain disciple at Damascus" was sent to give sight and instruction to the great apostle of the Gentiles. Acts ix. 10. Apollos sat at the feet of Aquila and Priscilla, and no small part of Timothy's training was the early instruction of his mother and grandmother.

3. OUR LORD'S EXAMPLE.—Jesus took our nature fully. In his humiliation, he touched our humanity at all conceivable points, yet without sin. His example sheds lustre on the learner. His practice adds tenfold sacredness to the teacher's office. At twelve years of age he joined the class in the synagogue at Jerusalem, and sat in the midst of where children were taught to read the law. If any town neglected to provide such a school, the men of the town were excommunicated till the school was established. (2.) There were fixed and settled preachers and teachers of the law in their synagogues. (3.) There were "divinity schools." Of such a one Gamaliel was professor. (4.) The Sanhedrium was not only a judicatory, but a school, and its exposition of the law was final and conclusive. It is alleged in the Jerusalem Talmud that there were at one time in Jerusalem four hundred and sixty synagogues, each of which contained an apartment for reading the law and another for inquiry and study.

the doctors, "both hearing them and asking them questions." Luke ii. 46. In his ministry he went forth "to teach and to preach in their cities." "He opened his mouth and taught" the multitudes by the sea and in desert places, the group gathered in the publican's house, his disciples by the wayside, the lone sinful woman at the well in Samaria.

II. THE TEACHER'S POWER.

The power of the teacher's office is derived, like its salu-
tity—

1. FROM ITS DIVINE SOURCE.—God in his wisdom never institutes a line of human duty or privilege without conferring at the same time the requisite power as well as authority to carry it forward. Our Lord sent forth as his first apostles unlettered fishermen. They had to cope with bigotry and intolerance. They were to set themselves in opposition to their countrymen, to wealth and learning, and to customs which in that changeless Oriental atmosphere had gathered strength for centuries. They were charged with the difficult task of overturning the old and venerable, and of superseding the rites and ceremonies of the ancient and honored Jewish Church, by the new and simple religion of the despised Nazarene. But our Lord did not leave them to their own unaided resources. Before sending them forth he "first gave them power." He conferred upon them all needed help—precisely that which was necessary for their difficult work.

Having commissioned the army of Sunday-school teachers going forth in these latter days in his name, the Master stands ready to impart all requisite grace and power. Does any lack wisdom? Let him ask of God, "that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not," and *it shall be given him*. Do any lack strength? The strength of the praying, trusting soul shall be "*made perfect in weakness*." Do any lack heart and hope? Let such cry continually, "Lord, increase

our faith," and they shall possess at length a *faith that overcomes all obstacles*. It is the teacher's glad privilege to say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."

2. FROM THE NATURE OF THE TRUTH TAUGHT.—God's truth is mighty, and must prevail. It is the good seed of the kingdom of heaven, and has innate vitality. Sown by the wayside, among thorns, in stony places, it will not be utterly lost. Sown in good ground, carefully watched and cultivated—sown amid tears and prayers—it will certainly spring up and bear fruit, some thirty, some sixty and some an hundred fold.

The Sunday-school teacher seeks not merely to interest or amuse for a passing hour—not simply to instruct the intellect with curious and valuable lore; he deals in truths of grave import that have to do with eternal interests. The truth he teaches is the revelation of God to man. It is a divine message, and is fraught with inherent authority. "It is mighty through God," and carries with it a power more than human. It is the grand instrument of the world's deliverance and salvation. The teacher should rest upon the word as the warrior relies on his well-tried weapon. The word of God is the sword of the Spirit. Let him who wields it know that he is armed with a weapon of tremendous power. Panoplied with the complete armor, with the breast-plate of faith and with the helmet of salvation, he may have all necessary and requisite power.

3. FROM THE MANNER OF THE PRESENTATION.—There is no such effective method of presenting truth as this face-to-face teaching. Teacher and taught are brought into actual contact. The smile of recognition and approval, the glow of sympathy, the power of personal magnetism, so subtle and influential in generous, sympathetic souls, are brought into free exercise. The address, the bearing, the character, of the teacher, the little arts by which in close and intimate intercourse we learn to please, become import-

ant elements of strength. More than this, the familiar conversation in which pupils join, the question and answer, illustrate and impress truth beyond all other known methods of presentation. One may doze listlessly or wander in thought to the ends of the earth during sermon or lecture, but when he joins in the discussion, and gives expression to his ideas on the subject in his own language, he cannot well fail to carry something of the subject away with him.

4. FROM ITS GRATUITOUS CHARACTER.—Not least among the sources of the Sunday-school teacher's influence is the fact that his labor is gratuitous. A wise and competent secular teacher may, and often does, have a potential and far-reaching influence over his pupils. By virtue of superior knowledge, of wholesome discipline, by tact and gentleness and obliging good humor, such a teacher may secure a lasting hold on his scholars. But the duties of the secular teacher are more or less perfunctory, and his relations to the scholar assume, to a certain extent, a professional character.

On the other hand, the faithful Sabbath-school teacher's sole spring of action inheres in his Christian love. He sees in his pupil a young immortal—one for whom Christ died, one on whom his image is written; that image may be marred, defaced and almost blotted out, but still it is there. He sees in every neglected child a possible disciple and heir of heaven—one whom the Father would not willingly leave to perish. He sees in the truth the instrument of life and salvation. He sees in the Sunday-school a convenient and efficient means of bringing the neglected, the lost and wayward into direct and vital contact with the saving power of the truth. This Christian love, akin to that which the all-Father exercises toward his creatures, is not only a powerfully impelling force, but when it finds warm and persistent voluntary expression, it commends itself to the confidence of the scholar, and becomes a source of vast and extended influence.

5. FROM THE SUSCEPTIBILITY OF THE TAUGHT.—Childhood and youth are everywhere accessible. The avenues to the heart of the child are not yet choked by pet dogmas or preconceived and perhaps dangerous error; not yet double barred by prejudice or pride of opinion. They are to a great extent open and unguarded. Children have an intuitive reverence for sacred things, and are never skeptical till the poison is sown in their hearts by older sinners. The years of cool suspicion and calculating criticism have not yet come. Habit has not yet taken hold of the embryo man with its giant grasp. Seed sown in love, and tenderness, and fidelity, finds in young hearts a soil comparatively good and fruitful.

6. FROM THE CONFIDENCE SO EASILY WON.—Confidence is a fruitful source of influence. Where this is lacking there is an utter want of moral power. One may gain the confidence of adults, but it is a slow and tedious process. It is accomplished by months and years of toilsome effort. You are admitted within the sacred portals step by step, and often under protest and with all sorts of reservations. But not so with the young. Where motives are apparently pure and where love is manifest the task is easy. A little cheap attention, smiles and pleasant words, and a succession of nameless small courtesies, and you have conquered.

Confidence once won and securely held, your power is almost limitless. Once thoroughly established, the wise and faithful teacher may by the divine blessing easily and naturally transfer it to Jesus, the better and truer Friend.

Far be it from us to assume that the teacher should have to do with children only. While youth and children may predominate, we trust the time is not distant when the Bible school will also embrace parents and adults.

LESSON IV.

HOW TO STUDY A LESSON.

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF PREPARATION.

WE approach this subject as one of gravest import. Nothing in the whole range of the teacher's effort is so absolutely essential to success as right preparation of mind, and heart, and life. The necessity of regular and thorough study is universally conceded in theory, and yet by no means sufficiently recognized in practice.

Let us consider for a moment some of the reasons why thorough preparation is imperative.

Notice, 1. We are called to teach wide-awake boys and girls fresh from public and private schools. In many of these schools are first-class instructors—teachers trained for their special work, and in the great improvements which of late years have been introduced into educational methods.

2. We teach the most important of all truths—truths without a knowledge of which all other truths are utterly valueless.

3. Teaching is an art—an art by no means easily acquired. A few rare women, and a lesser number of men, are born teachers. Their love for children, their knowledge of child nature and the avenues to the child heart, lead them sometimes, with little or no technical knowledge of the art of teaching, naturally to follow its rules and intuitively to teach well. But with the great majority the case is widely different. If we would do the best work, the art must, as a rule, be acquired by patient and persistent, and often by long-continued, effort.

4. Teaching these sublime truths of the Bible—this science of salvation—is a work of great dignity and importance. It is a work which should enlist the energies of the most exalted talent and most devoted piety in the Church.

And yet it is a field in which humble, earnest, lowly souls may find acceptable and successful employment for the one or two or five talents committed to their charge.

One feels like taking off one's hat to the humblest and obscurest teacher who is honestly and earnestly trying to lead young souls into the knowledge of divine truth.

A reverend doctor of divinity asserts that the time is not distant when S.S.T.—Sabbath-school Teacher—will be considered a title of greater dignity and honor than that of D.D. or LL.D.

II. HOW TO STUDY A GIVEN LESSON.

OBSERVE, 1. ADEQUATE PREPARATION INVOLVES WORK.—Successful teaching in our Sabbath-schools, where there can be no compulsory attendance or discipline, means earnest work, especially in way of preparation.

In fact, nothing worth doing at all is ever successfully accomplished without regular, persistent labor. The matter of preparation for teaching is certainly no exception. Very many teachers make a fatal mistake right here. They seem to imagine that teaching a class for a half hour a week can somehow be gotten through with respectably, and the requirements of the occasion tolerably met, with very little thought or study. The error is as vital as it is disastrous and lamentable. Success in teaching is not so much a matter of leisure or talent or education as of earnest purpose and persistent work.

2. IT INVOLVES KEEPING AHEAD OF WORK.—Good business-men drive their business, instead of allowing their business continually to drive and worry them. Good housewives do not delay the sweeping and dusting and baking till the week is ended or the guests have arrived.

Teachers who mean to do good work will not put off till Saturday night or Sabbath morning the study of the lesson of the coming Sabbath.

It is of great advantage to look over the lessons weeks in advance. Obscure passages will become clear by continuous attention, hidden beauty will be revealed, points will attract the mind around which to cluster thoughts and illustrations.

3. IT INVOLVES EARLY STUDY OF THE CURRENT LESSON.—Let us suggest some successive steps which may be profitably followed :

Take up the word of God without note or comment. Commence at once. It is Sabbath afternoon. You are through with the teaching of the day. You are weary, and strongly tempted to lounge or sleep. We beg you not to yield till the lesson has been looked over and over again. Take it up next morning. Have an open Bible on your dressing-case. Look over the text while at your toilet. Get full of it. Drink in something of its wondrous wealth of meaning. It may seem obscure or tame at first, but as you revolve it in your mind you will see in it a marvelous beauty and significance.

In the diary of Mrs. Kitty Trevylyan the maid Betty is one of the prominent characters. She was a model of an English serving-woman in fidelity and attachment to the family, but of a fretful disposition. She was accustomed to attend the preaching services of John Wesley ; and having found the new life, she became a pattern of patience and sweetness of Christian disposition. Her mistress was a member of the Church of England, and in great affliction. Betty, after her conversion, became after a manner her religious teacher.

Striving one day in her simple way to console her afflicted mistress, she addressed her on this wise :

“Now, Mistress Kitty my dear”—for this was the way she addressed her mistress—“you should remember that the promises of God always mean *more than they say—never less.*”

The maid Betty is made unconsciously and aptly to state a great truth. These grand revelations in the inspired word mean always infinitely more than the words express. Human language is too poor and weak and lame to give adequate expression to the wealth of meaning and significance revealed as in a glass darkly in the words of Scripture. Every teacher should cultivate the habit of independent thought and study of the sacred text. Study of this kind will soon become a joy as well as a means of moral and mental discipline.

4. ARRANGE A PLAN OF THE LESSON.—Throw each lesson into a series of topics. Seek out the points which seem most important, and cluster your preparation around them.

They will serve as pins to hang your knowledge on. You have a place for hat and coat and dress. Business papers are filed and arranged in convenient form for ready use and reference. Order is heaven's first law in this as in other things. It simplifies and makes easy our mental processes as well as our business and household affairs.

This logical or orderly method of study makes it easier to teach and less difficult to remember.

Better still, it leads the teacher almost intuitively to select the portion or portions of the lesson best adapted to the particular class to be taught. It enables one more intelligently to teach its pith and marrow. An outline something like this will sometimes be helpful :

Inquire—(a.) Who wrote the passage? When, and for what purpose?

(b.) What is its scope or drift? What object had the writer in view?

(c.) What other passages throw light on this?

(d.) What words, manners and customs, or difficulties, need explanation and illustration?

(e.) What spiritual truth or doctrine is here taught? What for me and my class?

5. **EXAMINE LESSON NOTES AND COMMENTARIES.**—Having studied carefully the bare text, take up such commentaries and lesson notes and helps to preparation as are within reach. Compare carefully, modify plans, correct erroneous or imperfect conclusions, enlarge ideas and supplement by all sources of information. Use the aids available freely, but do not lean too heavily upon them. They are designed to stimulate, to suggest and help, but not to support; to aid in surmounting difficulties, not to carry one easily and smoothly over them; to supplement the teacher's preparation, not to take the place of careful and independent study and thought.

An extensive assortment of helps* is by no means necessary. One may be well equipped for a small sum of money. In fact, with one set of lesson notes like the Westminster Lessons, with a good reference Bible, concordance, Bible dictionary, atlas, pencil and note-book, and you are fairly equipped for Bible study.

A thorough study of a few helps is far better than a hasty, cursory running over of a large amount of material. Large use should be made of pencil and note-book for jotting down thoughts and illustrations as they occur in reading and observation.

6. **WE SHOULD LEARN TO UTILIZE WHAT WE KNOW.**—Knowledge is often practically useless because it is not classified and made available. We are not likely to know too much about any given subject. But we may often acquire more than we know how to use. The knowledge of some people seems a confused mass, without definite shape or arrangement. It sometimes runs in ruts and grooves, and sets back in stagnant pools. Some speakers are learned and profound, and yet have no knack of selecting and arranging their musty lore, and so fail to interest and instruct.

How often do we listen to a foreign missionary who is full

* For fuller lists of appropriate helps for teachers, see Appendix.

of facts of the most interesting character, about which everybody is anxious to know, and yet you listen to him by the hour with disappointment, because he has no skill in communicating the important facts of which he is so full.

Let us study to see clearly, to know something of each lesson fully and thoroughly, and to communicate readily what is most important.

7. IMPROVE THE ODDS AND ENDS OF TIME.—A wondrous gain is made by improving odd moments. Have a Bible on the dressing-case and in the desk, at store or shop. Carry note-book and lesson notes in the pocket. Wise improvement of little fragments of time while waiting at railroad dépôts and for those excellent people who are always late, and using odd minutes that occur in every one's daily life, will enable the busy teacher to secure an amount of preparation that would be out of the question without systematic improvement of fugitive moments. A friend who is among the busiest of railroad men is one of the best prepared of teachers, and his preparation is made almost entirely by this study while on the wing. Give time and thought and study even though the subject seems familiar. Both subject and object are worthy of your best thoughts and noblest efforts.

Dr. Arnold of Rugby was once asked why he gave so much time to the study of familiar subjects. He replied, "I wish my pupils to drink from a running brook rather than from a stagnant pool."

Take time for preparation. Some of your best moments are never too precious for this great work. Forego stories and something of polite literature. Else do not complain of want of leisure. You are in earnest. You want to do good work—to interest, to reach, to save. The field is wide and beautiful, and hopeful withal, and the Master is waiting to bless.

One teacher—a busy merchant, now gone to his rest—be-

fore the days of uniform lessons used to prepare two lessons each week and teach two classes in different schools. He taught and labored and prayed as faithfully as he studied. Sixteen out of eighteen, from one of his classes, were hopefully converted in a single winter.

8. STUDY THE WORD AS A MEANS OF GRACE.—The teacher who is not a growing Christian can hardly be expected to accomplish the best results. One who is not in actual living sympathy with the truth, and who does not feel its power, will not be likely to make it felt by others. The word of God is the only source of spiritual life and growth. It is the bread of life, our spiritual food.

The study of the divine oracles is no less a necessary means of grace than is prayer or attendance on the ordinances of the house of God.

Lastly, WE SHOULD STUDY PRAYERFULLY.—God is his own interpreter. The Spirit will take of the things of God, and will show them to us in something of their intrinsic beauty. He alone can so light up the sacred page that we shall understand its meaning and feel its power. He will sanctify the truth to the teacher, and make it the power of God to the salvation of the taught. His special presence may be had for the asking. There is a preparation, a teaching power, that comes only in answer to prayer. True success in this, as in other departments of Christian work, is largely a matter of spiritual life.

LESSON V.

HOW TO TEACH A LESSON.

STRIVE, 1. TO INTEREST, 2. TO INSTRUCT, 3. TO IMPRESS.

GOOD teaching implies thorough preparation. The lesson needs to be studied not only in the light of what is

likely to be taught, but also with careful reference to emergencies likely to arise in teaching. To teach thoroughly and efficiently, one needs to know vastly more on any given subject than can possibly be taught at a single session. An unexpected question of a bright pupil often leads the poorly prepared teacher to feel most keenly the need of having studied all phases of the subject. Above all should the teacher endeavor earnestly to obtain clear and distinct views of the precise truth to be taught. It will be well to keep in mind the fact that good teaching is not an easy task. Let no one delude himself with the idea that the art is easily acquired. Appreciating the difficulties of the case, and firmly and squarely meeting them, is the first step in overcoming them.

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

While methods must always vary with circumstances and be adapted to the diverse needs and capacities of teacher and taught, certain principles which underlie all methods are ever the same. It is important to keep some of these in view.

1. **SIMPLICITY.**—Simplicity in language should be carefully sought. It is a prime requisite in writing and speaking, and is not less important in teaching. Whilst we should never be senseless or childish or indulge in baby-talk in our teaching, we shall never go amiss in the use of short Saxon words. We should also carefully avoid the use of words which we do not ourselves fully understand.

2. **CLEARNESS.**—Not only should choice be made of such words and phrases as will clearly convey our meaning, but we should strive so to teach that we cannot be misunderstood. A short word is always better than a long one. Words in common use among those we teach are better than such as to us may seem more choice or elegant. Call a spade a spade rather an elongated implement of husbandry.

Call home home rather than a place of residence. Call a blacksmith a blacksmith rather than an artisan in iron. While we often underrate the capacity and intelligence of children, we are apt to forget that their vocabulary is limited and that they often get very imperfect and erroneous views of the meaning of words, and confound words of similar sound or construction, but with widely distinct meanings. Mr. Groser very appropriately says: "Never use a hard word when an easier one will answer the purpose." Using long, hard words is a very common fault—one that needs to be constantly guarded against. We should study the language in which our pupils think and talk.

3. **AMBIGUITY.**—It is often necessary to use words which have more than one meaning. Such words, when used in teaching or when they occur in the Scriptures, should be carefully explained. "Tares among wheat" will sometimes suggest to the child rents in the garment rather than the true meaning.

4. **ACCURACY.**—Language is at best an imperfect medium of thought. It is often difficult to make our thoughts so clear as to be perfectly understood even by intelligent adults. The difficulty is more apparent in our intercourse with children. The language of the Bible is often highly figurative, and our ideas of God, of infinitude and eternity, are only imperfectly conceived through types, metaphors, analogies and adaptation of thought and language to our limited capacities.

Great care should be had in the use and explanation of figurative language. The child who ran home crying, after hearing a noted Sunday-school talker discourse on the fire and hammer that breaks the flinty rock in pieces, and for a long time after avoided the neighboring marble-yard, fearing that she would somehow be subjected to the hammering process, was a fair representative of a large class of children who, through the careless use of figurative lan-

guage often entirely misconceive the real scope and meaning of what they hear.

EXAMPLE.—In teaching the general truth that God created all things, it is well always to explain the difference between creation and manufacture. While God is the absolute and only Creator, man has a wondrous power of putting the raw material together in all beautiful and useful forms. Yet man creates absolutely nothing.

5. STYLE.—Teachers do not need to be rhetoricians in any technical sense, but the power of clear and concise statement, and the proper construction of sentences, should be constantly studied. Explanations are often muddy and unintelligible from lack of careful attention to this matter. So of questions asked. An explanation should be so stated as to bring out not only the significance of the obscure word or passage, but also the exact meaning of him who explains it. Questions should be so constructed that the pupil may know precisely what the questioner is driving at. Blind, vague questions are very common.

(a.) While we should aim to be concise in statement, too great terseness should be avoided in teaching young children. Little details are with them essential, not only in order to secure interest and attention, but also to make them fully understand what is taught. The same idea should be repeated in different language and brought out in various aspects.

(b.) While style should often be somewhat diffuse, it should never be discursive. Young teachers should especially guard against wandering from the subject. Attention should be confined strictly to the lesson in hand. Otherwise our teaching will be likely to degenerate into vague and pointless platitudes.

(c.) To be highly effective our style must have vividness and point. True teaching has always a direct and positive purpose. We should aim not only to feel the truth in some-

thing of its real intensity and force, but to bring it out clearly and accurately, and with such graphic vividness of voice and manner and real hearty earnestness as to make it seen and felt by our scholars. We should aim at such directness of style as will bring the truth home to the heart and conscience of our pupils. The truth of God has always a personal bearing on each and every one. It is the teacher's work to bring out this special significance of the truth he teaches.

This style of teaching will enable us to bring the lesson down to every-day duties and trials and temptations. The vices condemned and the virtues commended should not be the far off, the imaginary, the impossible, but the actual and real, and such as pertain to the homely work-a-day life of average boys and girls. Short, pointed questions, or or a remark abruptly uttered, will often prove a great source of power in this direction.

EXAMPLE.—If you neglect to obey Christ now, will you be likely to do so when engaged in business? When you are old or sick?

Joseph was a Christian and a prophet at seventeen, Samuel from his infancy. What should this teach you?

The price of our salvation was the sacrifice of our Lord on Calvary. How great must be the love that prompted it!

We have somewhere met with something like this statement:—

The conditions of effective teaching consist—

1. In a thorough knowledge of the subject to be taught.
2. In ability to set it forth in natural logical order and to bring it to the plane of the pupil's thought, and within the range of his vocabulary and mental vision, so that it will be measurably understood and seen and felt.
3. In quick perception of the pupil's progress and patient waiting for its further development.
4. In the attention and interest of the scholar.

The first three may be called the laws of the profession of teaching. The fourth will almost certainly follow the skillful handling of those laws.

II. MANNER IN TEACHING.

Manner is very important with adults. It is almost everything to a child. The influence of many a good man is almost frittered away by mere faults of manner. We have space only to mention a few points to which special attention should be directed.

1. The teacher's manner should be very patient. If we are physically weak or weary or irritable, we should study not to show it. Our scholars are, perchance, restless and inattentive. Let us remember that we were once young and restive, and maybe wild and thoughtless. How very patient somebody must needs have been with us—with our restless inattention, and perhaps wild and willful neglect!

Moreover, much of the restlessness of childhood is the mere overflow of excessive animal life. Let us by no means seek to crush it, but rather patiently to give it proper tone and direction.

2. We should be always and uniformly polite. None are more sensitive to little cheap attentions than the young. The smallest child has rights and sensibilities which older persons are bound sacredly to respect. A nod, a smile, a pleasant word on the street, and little attentions to personal ease and comfort, are never lost or thrown away. "The small, sweet courtesies of life" are doubly dear to the young people.

3. Our manner should be encouraging. Nothing so repels and depresses as continual faultfinding. On the other hand, a word or look of commendation is joy and sunshine to many a child, faint gleams of which, perchance, but seldom light up their sombre and cloudy life. Seek for something to commend. "I am glad you are early, John." "Susie,

a little more study, and you will have your lesson perfectly." Generous, encouraging words such as these sometimes work wonders with a certain class of pupils. Parents as well as teachers make a fearful mistake in neglecting to encourage well-doing on the part of their children. Benjamin West says, "My mother's kiss made me a painter." The sympathetic hand on the shoulder and the encouraging words spoken many years ago to John B. Gough still thrill and re-echo round the world.

4. Our manner should be affectionate. It is not enough to love our scholars; we must show our love. Some people have undoubted love somewhere about them, but you would not suspect it on a casual acquaintance. Cold and icy and heartless as they seem, they may prove, after a five or ten years' acquaintance, to be kind and lovable people. But the children can't wait so long. They are hungry for a love that sparkles and shines—for a love that lights up the face and tingles along the finger-ends, that finds expression in pleasant words, and in numberless little acts of kindness and courtesy that young people are so quick to see and so eager to appreciate. A manner that is unmistakably affectionate is everywhere a most potential force. It is emphatically a power with children. A timid rap was heard at the door of a lady friend. The door was opened, and a little child came toddling in. She climbed up upon her auntie's lap, and then two white arms were wound around her neck. "I always loves you, auntie," said the child. "Why, daughter?" "Oh, 'cause, Auntie Hattie, I always knows that you loves me." Make the children know that you love them, and you may mould them as you will.

Methods of teaching will be more particularly discussed in the next chapter.

LESSON VI.

HOW TO TEACH A LESSON.—CONTINUED.

I. METHODS.

WE have treated of some general principles in the preceding lesson. Method may be said to be the practical application of these principles.

Certain successive steps in teaching a class may be stated as follows :

1. IT IS WELL TO HAVE A PLAN.—In teaching as in preparing a lesson, it is well to have a distinct outline or plan. Let it be simple, in natural order, and usually in the order presented in the lesson. It is by no means necessary or wise to parade one's plan in a fussy manner from firstly to sixteenthly. But if the lesson is methodically arranged, it will be more easily taught, better remembered and more readily and closely adapted to the class and the occasion. Natural and logical arrangement is far better than such devices as the five P's and the three S's, for it is always available, and its force is inherent in the nature of things. A poor plan is better than none, and one's own is often better than another's, provided it is thoughtfully and carefully digested.

2. REVIEW.—The first step in class teaching should always be a brief review of the preceding lesson. Three to five minutes of careful and judicious review of the last week's lesson will often do more toward fixing it in the memory than the half hour's teaching.

Detached, isolated knowledge, like single, separate links in a chain, is of little use, and is usually soon forgotten ; welded to what is already known, and to that which is afterward acquired, it becomes a connected chain of ever-increasing strength and utility. Besides, recalling what has

gone before often throws necessary and essential light on what is now to be studied. We cannot achieve the best success in teaching without regular and frequent reviews.

3. RECITATION.—We take it for granted that a good teacher will insist on a certain amount of memorizing of the Scriptures. Memorizing, to a certain extent, is absolutely essential to correct knowledge, and it is sadly neglected. While hearing a recitation by no means constitutes the whole of teaching, we have yet to learn if there be any better foundation of knowledge than committing to memory first principles. Some at least of the precious gems of Bible truth should be securely fastened in the memory. Nothing can possibly compensate for the loss—for sore and grievous loss it is—if in childhood some portions of the word of God are not committed to memory. The memory should not be crammed with whole chapters, nor the time given up to mere recitation, but selected portions of Scripture should be thoroughly and accurately learned, and time enough given to recitation to test the pupil's knowledge.

4. SIMULTANEOUS TEACHING.—We should avoid teaching pupils separately, one by one, but should rather teach the whole class simultaneously. If one scholar recites, let the whole class look over and note errors. If the class is questioned, avoid regular rotation, and quickly and adroitly skip from one to another, so as to engage the attention of all.

We lately listened in a large teachers' meeting to a discussion on this subject, during which a considerable number of the teachers stated that they taught the lesson over several times, taking, perchance, first one end of the class, then the middle and then the farther portion, with no attempt to teach the whole class at once.

Such a method involves a fearful waste of time and strength, and is utterly subversive of good order and discipline. While one portion of the class is being taught, the

other is in disorder, and maybe disturbing the whole school.

5. GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.—While great care should be had lest too much time be devoted to unimportant themes, it is sometimes wise, especially with restless boys of a certain age, to devote considerable attention to sacred geography, historical characters and the manners and customs of Bible times. There is no easier or surer way to interest some pupils than to enlist them in the study of the geography of Palestine. The same may be said of the grand historical personages of the olden time and the unchanging customs of the Orientals. It is not uncommon for masters of ancient and modern literature to devote considerable space to detailed descriptions of places that have become historic. So, in Sunday-school teaching, Nazareth and Bethlehem and Tiberias and the mountains of Galilee may be ever associated with, and serve to fasten in the mind, the precious words of our Lord. They may often furnish a beautiful and varied setting for the Pearl of great price.

6. PICTORIAL TEACHING.—There is great power in a neat and graphic word-picture. It should enter more or less into all our teaching. The picture should be vivid, brief and sprightly, and should embody facts unknown or imperfectly understood by the class.

Take, for example, the lesson in Matt. ii. 1-19: "The child Jesus." After questioning the class on such points in the lesson as Bethlehem, Herod, the prophecy concerning the birth of the Messiah and the visit of the wise men, describe briefly and forcibly these wise men of the East—how the magi of the Greeks, as mentioned by Matthew, were entirely different and distinct from the magi of the Romans, as described by Luke. They were originally from the far, far East, from beyond the Tigris, hundreds of leagues away, and latterly native to Babylonia. They were rich and good and learned. They in the early centuries were

acquainted with astrology, and this was the parent of the science of astronomy. They belonged to the royal line, and their order ran back to the days of the prophet Daniel, who in his time was "chief of the magicians," and the men now on a long and weary pilgrimage to do homage at the cradle of the infant Jesus perhaps derived their knowledge of his coming from the sacred books left by Daniel in the capital of their far-off country.

7. **TEACH THE EXACT LESSON.**—The true teacher should be animated by a single purpose. He should aim to teach, as God shall give strength and grace, the appointed lesson of the day, and not some other, however good. It may suit the fancy of the hour or be deemed easier to teach something else, to allow one's self to be diverted into some other train of thought, to indulge in pious harangue or cheap exhortation on some topic suggested at the moment. But such so-called teaching is subversive of good order, of the unity of thought and purpose that should obtain in every well-ordered school, is demoralizing to the teacher, and usually sooner or later brings him into contempt with the class. No teaching is so effective as that which comes spontaneously out of the lesson or text itself, and none so likely to prove abortive as discursive talk and what seems like preaching on unfit occasions.

We are often impressed most deeply when we are least conscious of the process by which we are affected. Nathan had a solemn and direct message to David, yet he presented it most effectively by draping it in a story through which the king was made to condemn himself most emphatically and severely. The lesson came spontaneously out of the truth presented in the illustration, and thus the way was prepared for a most pointed application. "Thou art the man" came home to the king's conscience with resistless power after his self-condemnation had come spontaneously from the truth so skillfully yet indirectly presented by the prophet.

We should aim to reach the heart and conscience most certainly and by all means possible. But let us remember that the truth is the only sword of the Spirit. Let us search prayerfully for its edge and point, its personal bearing and import. Then will our teaching commend itself to the respect and confidence of the scholar.

8. **TEACH SOMETHING WELL.**—There may be danger, in the multiplicity of helps and lesson notes, of relying too much upon them, of hasty and crude preparation, of teaching a great deal superficially—nothing well. A single point thoroughly taught, illustrated, fastened in the memory, is much better than a whole lesson vaguely and superficially gone over. No teacher should rest satisfied with a given lesson till at least some portion of it is thoroughly known and comprehended by each pupil in the class.

9. **ILLUSTRATIVE TEACHING.**—Great value should be attached to this method. Illustrations, if well chosen and judiciously used, serve the double purpose of making the truth clear and of fastening it in the mind. A teacher is but poorly equipped who does not pay special attention to the gathering and study of apt and pertinent illustrations of the truths he attempts to teach. See lesson on the “Power and Method of Illustration.”

10. **AVOID LECTURING.**—Preaching or lecturing is most excellent in its place. The preacher’s office and functions are divinely appointed. But preaching in its ordinary exercise is not always teaching in its best sense. The two are entirely distinct and dissimilar. The preacher’s distinctive office, according to modern usage, is to move men’s hearts by the presentation of the living word in the popular assembly. The teacher’s special mission is to bring the truth into personal, familiar contact with the class, so that it may be seen and felt by each individual soul.

While some few do good work in lecturing classes on the Bible lesson, the practice cannot be recommended for aver-

age teachers. With most it must prove a wretched failure, for sooner or later it degenerates into driveling verbiage and pointless exhortation. Besides, a teacher may lecture for an hour, and yet not be certain that a single item of knowledge has been imparted or impression fastened.

11. THE CATECHETICAL METHOD.—No better method of teaching is as yet known than that of question and answer. It awakens curiosity, stimulates thought, tests knowledge, and impresses the memory by the expectation of being tested and by the mental effort of expressing the acquired knowledge in the pupil's own language.

Moreover, it is the method most easily available. While very few can hope to attain excellence in lecturing, ordinary minds can learn to do good work with the catechetical method.

We cannot too much insist on attention to this matter on the part of all who would perfect themselves as teachers. It is the mode in universal use in all good secular schools. It has the highest possible sanction. It was largely practiced by the great Teacher himself.

12. BRING OUT THE SPIRITUAL IMPORT.—While a certain amount of time must be given to history and chronology, to seemingly unimportant themes, great care should be had that the vital truths and their personal application be not crowded out. Minor truths are pure gold, but they are only the setting. Let them serve only to bring out the precious gem of spiritual and heavenly beauty. The subordinate portions of the lesson may be full of instruction, but let us ever inquire earnestly how they may illustrate Christ and salvation.

13. TEACH JESUS ONLY.—We may find in every lesson truths pointing directly to the cross. Christ is the central figure in the Old and New Testaments—of all truth, human and divine.

Whether it be the Christ of prophecy or of history,

“there is none other name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved.”

The venerable Dr. Archibald Alexander, for sixty years a distinguished preacher and for forty years a professor of divinity, was heard to say on his death-bed, “All my theology is reduced to this narrow compass: ‘Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.’”

Christ and his cross should be the central thought deeply underlying all our teaching. Our fallen state and salvation by atoning blood should enter into every lesson.

14. APPLICATION.—It is not wise to leave the practical lessons to be derived from the truth taught till the close of the hour. They will be in danger of being crowded out altogether. It is better to make the application on all fit opportunities during the progress of the lesson. In preparation and in teaching our uppermost thought should be, What in this lesson can I find with which to *reach, impress* and *save* my pupils?

While the practical should not be overlooked, there may be danger of overmuch application. Like too big a sinker on the fishing-line, it may swamp the whole lesson. While great emphasis should be laid on the faithful and wise presentation of the truth in the class, we should remember that this is by no means the whole of effective teaching.

We should seek frequent opportunities to speak to each scholar by himself alone, to visit at his home, and, above and over all, we should exemplify the truth by our lives. We teach not alone by our words in the class, but by our manner and spirit; by what we do more than by what we say; by what we are more than by what we profess.

Lastly, Observe WHAT IS THE TRUE CONCEPTION OF TEACHING.—Let us ever remember that true teaching consists not alone in pouring knowledge into pupils' minds as into an open vessel. Imparting instruction is indeed a part of the teacher's work, but his higher and more important

duty consists in awakening thought, in arousing the more or less dormant desire for knowledge of spiritual things, in stimulating and helping the pupil in the pursuit, in quickening the conscience and in reaching the heart.

In concluding this subject, let us note a few of the more

COMMON ERRORS IN TEACHING.

Teachers should carefully study to avoid—

1. Attempting to teach without careful and prayerful preparation.

2. Taking lesson notes into the class. Study them, as well as the text of the lesson, at home never so faithfully, but do not take them into the class.

3. The routine use of printed questions. These are designed to be suggestive and helpful, *not* to be slavishly followed.

4. Taking things for granted. Be sure that the pupil clearly sees what is taught. This must be tested by repeated questions.

5. The common neglect of memorizing the Scriptures on the part of teachers and scholars.

6. The failure carefully to cultivate the art of communicating knowledge.

7. The common yet fatal neglect to commend and encourage pupils when they do well.

8. The failure to give expression to the love and interest you really feel.

9. Impatience in word or manner.

10. Above all should we avoid the all too common neglect to aim at direct and immediate spiritual impressions.

LESSON VII.

HOW TO WIN AND HOLD ATTENTION.

IN considering this subject, it may not be amiss to remember that strict and undivided attention is not an easy thing to give even on the part of adults.

It often requires a strong effort of the will to fix the mind continuously on any given subject, though it may be of intrinsic interest. How often do we lose a word or sentence of a speaker, or find our eyes listlessly and mechanically following the printed page! How often are we obliged to summon our drowsy energies and arouse all our will-power in order to bring back and fix our wandering thoughts! On the part of children it is harder still. Their blood flows in more rapid channels. They abound in animal life. Change and restlessness and motion are its legitimate expression. They are extremely susceptible to outward impressions and surroundings. They are creatures of impulse and circumstance. Childhood and youth is the formative period, the season of sensation and emotion rather than of reason and fixedness of thought and purpose.

Appreciating the real difficulties of the case, we shall be better prepared to meet and overcome them.

I. THE NECESSITY OF ATTENTION.

Though strict attention is not an easy thing to give, it is not too much to ask. It is absolutely essential to any considerable success in teaching. It is idle to attempt to teach amid disorder and turbulence. If boys are tossing hats or climbing benches or slyly teasing each other, if girls are whispering or making fun in the class or gossiping about bonnets and ribbons and fashion, the teacher's efforts are of little avail. The truth must be heard and attended to in order to be effective.

Note, 1. ATTENTION MUST BE WON.—It is idle to expect attention simply because it is desired or commanded. The power of giving attention on the part of young children is not largely under the control of the will. It must depend, to a great extent, on the interest felt. The remedy, then, for restlessness and inattention is not scolding or entreaty or command, but the presentation of what will attract and interest. It is not difficult to engage the attention and interest of a group of young people in stories or tableaux or games of ball or croquet. Attention in the class must, in the main, be gained by so presenting the subject taught as to enlist the interest of the pupil.

2. *EXTERNAL SURROUNDINGS ARE IMPORTANT.*—Regard to bodily comfort should not be overlooked. In training the moral and intellectual it is not safe or wise to ignore the physical nature. Bodily discomfort is often inseparable from listlessness and inattention. Light, pleasant rooms, cheerful arrangement, comfortable seats and good ventilation go a great way in the right direction. Youthful errors are often set down to the account of total depravity when in a large measure they should be charged to parental folly or neglect. So restlessness and turbulence in schools are sometimes more the fault of cheerless rooms, bad ventilation and hard, uncomfortable seats than of either teachers or scholars.

3. *CHANGE OF POSTURE.*—Fixed position soon becomes painful even to grown persons. No school should be kept long in any one fixed position. This is especially important with classes of young children. Sitting bolt upright on hard, high seats, with dangling feet, for a long time, is simply torture to little children.

II. HOW TO WIN ATTENTION.

1. *BY QUIET DETERMINATION.*—While it is of no use to expect attention simply because it is wanted or demanded,

and irrespective of the quality of the teaching, very much is gained by a determined will. The boy who has greatest force of will-power is leader among his comrades. The man of indomitable and persistent determination is, in the long run, the successful man. Firm, persistent will-power, a quiet determination to have attention, is a most decided help to a teacher in winning and holding it.

2. BY A QUICK EYE AND EAR.—Your pupils are quick in perception and movement, sometimes sly and secretive. A teacher who is quick to see and hear and prompt to arrest incipient disorder has a most decided advantage. Some teachers seem not to see inattention, or hear the noise of disturbance till it runs into riot and turbulence.

An educated eye, ready tact and prompt action will do most effective service in nipping the evil in the bud.

3. BY SIMPLE DEVICES.—A little ingenuity will often secure the object sought. A few simple, easy questions addressed to each member of the class in rapid succession often answers a good purpose. A brief, apt story is sometimes useful in arresting such as are not easily reached. These should, however, be held in reserve, used with care, and generally only in emergencies.

Better still, and more easily utilized, is a note-book or slate. Rough maps or diagrams can be readily and quickly sketched in illustration of geographical or other points of the lesson. These will often excite curiosity and arrest attention at once. Curiosity is said to be the parent of attention. It is readily excited by simple devices. Once excited, it is not difficult to awaken an eager interest in the lesson itself.

A young teacher of our acquaintance was once placed in charge of a large class of undisciplined mission boys. They were bright and intelligent, but wild and thoughtless, and somewhat demoralized by unfortunate teaching. The new teacher found it very difficult to hold them even for a

moment. The lesson on a certain Sunday chanced to be "Moses' choice." Its keynote was embodied in these words: "Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." The note-book was taken out, and the teacher quickly yet roughly sketched a pair of scales. Moses was thus represented as balancing the matter in his mind. He put in the one scale riches, honor, position—maybe a kingship, all that a son of royalty in that proud empire could inherit or a Pharaoh could bestow; in the other, poverty, oppression, toil, perhaps continual bondage, with the favor of God and consciousness of rectitude. The last was shown in Moses' estimation far to outweigh the other.

It was a simple device, but it proved effectual in winning the attention of those boys when other means had failed. It proved the key which unlocked the secret of very great success in teaching.

4. BY AVOIDING MONOTONY.—Stereotyped methods, doing always the same thing and in the same order, is apt to be distasteful to young people. Variety always adds spice and zest. So it is not best always first to hear the recitation of the boy at your right, or to question the class uniformly in the same order and in the same monotonous tone of voice. A little thought and ingenuity will enable the wise teacher to avoid a certain dull routine which is always more or less disrelished.

III. HOW TO HOLD ATTENTION.

1. BY EXCITING GENUINE INTEREST.—We cannot reasonably expect to hold pupils without thoroughly interesting them. Real and continued interest must have some substantial basis. If the teacher would obtain a strong hold upon his class, he must be thoroughly interested himself. If the teacher is full of enthusiasm, the pupil will catch the contagion. If we wish to raise wheat, we sow wheat.

If we wish a crop of corn, we plant, not rye or oats, but maize. If we wish to instill enthusiasm into the minds of our scholars, we must get full of it ourselves. Men do not gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. Like produces like, the world over. In order to be enthusiastic and highly interesting on any given subject, one must be thoroughly familiar with it—not only with its outlines, but with its details and collateral topics.

In this connection, allow us again to emphasize the importance and necessity of the most thorough preparation. If the teacher would be sure most fully to win and hold attention, he should study his subject from all points. He should look into it and all around it, and be able to select from the whole range of his knowledge the parts most interesting and profitable to the particular class taught.

In short, other things being equal, that teacher will, by the blessing of God, best interest and hold his scholars who is most thoroughly familiar with his subject.

2. BY ADAPTATION.—A class of little children require a style of teaching differing essentially from a class just coming into stove-pipe hats and long coats. Mission scholars need treatment that differs widely from that which would be adapted to the children of educated, religious families.

Such topics of the lesson should be taken and such a style of teaching chosen, as are most likely to interest the particular class taught.

Attention to points like the following may often aid in holding the flagging interest of restless scholars:

If the lesson is a narrative, take up the story somewhat in detail. Bring out as graphically as possible its features of beauty and interest. Have the pupils turn to other parallel or analogous narratives. Call attention to points of difference or resemblance.

If the lesson is historical, study up this phase of the subject and emphasize the items of interest.

If geographical, elicit the pupils' knowledge of the subject. Draw outline maps and diagrams. Get pupils to locate the different places mentioned in this and preceding lessons. Bring out incidents connected with them. Recall characters in Bible history that may be associated with the different localities, not forgetting to lead on naturally but surely to the spiritual bearing and significance of the truth taught.

Slate and note-book have already been alluded to as a wise means of arresting attention. If judiciously used, this method of illustration may be made a valuable means of permanent and continued interest.

3. BY FREQUENT RECAPITULATION.—Frequent going over and recalling what has been taught is an essential element of good teaching. It is also a valuable means of holding attention. If pupils are led to expect that their knowledge of what has been taught will be regularly tested, this very fact will tend strongly to ensure a certain amount of attention. Besides, an idea fairly grasped and clearly understood is a source of pleasure, and consequent interest. Young people relish very keenly the clear grasping of a new idea. Very few adults pursue knowledge for its own sake alone. The idea of utility is uppermost. Hence we give the closest attention to that which we expect in some way to use. We pay the best attention to the acquisition of that knowledge which we expect to have tested. The candidate for college masters the studies on which he expects to be examined, the artisan, subjects which relate to his work, the public speaker, that which will be brought into requisition in public address. So our pupils will acquire the habit of attending to the lesson in hand if they expect regular examination upon it.

4. BY JUDICIOUS QUESTIONING.—Questions put in a clear, vivacious, sprightly manner, avoiding vagueness and regular rotation, constitute an admirable way of holding

scholars who are inclined to be restive. A question rightly adapted and unexpectedly put to a listless scholar will often arouse anew his flagging interest as well as stimulate the whole class.

5. BY PICTORIAL TEACHING.—A class is often greatly interested by throwing in an occasional brief word-picture. In order to do this successfully, get the subject vividly before the mind. Recall the little details and some of the probable incidents not mentioned in the text. Give such study to the matter as to be able to picture it so graphically that your pupils will see the whole scene distinctly with the mind's eye. Three to five minutes of occasional pictorial teaching of this kind will prove interesting and profitable. Care should be exercised, however, that too much time is not taken from the more important method of catechetical instruction.

6. BY TEACHING SCHOLARS HOW TO STUDY.—It is important to aid pupils to some extent in the preparation of their lessons. Teach them how to help themselves. Study may thus be made a continual delight. Seek so to inspire and help them that they shall love to master their lessons.

Suppose the lesson for the coming Sabbath to be "the flight into Egypt." Ask John to bring some written questions and his own answers about the journey. Ask Frank to learn all he can about the kings of Egypt in the time of Jacob and Joseph, and also at the time of our Saviour's birth, James to bring a rough map of the journey and Peter a summary of the last lesson.

Treat these efforts generously. Make as much as possible of them. Approve all appreciable points of excellence, and little by little you will have infused into your pupils a love for study as well as some knowledge of how to do it.

7. BY WINNING LOVE.—Teach never so well, exhaust time and resources in preparation and ingenuity, in devices

and methods, you will yet come short of high success if you fail to win love and confidence. If the scholar feels and knows you to be a real friend, if he has confidence to go to you in trouble, in trial and temptation, if you have so won regard as to be able to guide and influence for good, with diligence and fidelity, by the Master's blessing, you will have little difficulty to win and hold and lead to a new and better life. The teacher who is fully worthy of respect and love will be tolerably sure, in the long run, to reach the hearts of his scholars.

It may be well, in conclusion, to call attention to the following maxims, deduced, in part, from what has preceded :

1. Attention is an act of the will. It is born of respect and love rather than of mere discipline.

2. It is a habit, and one of most potential influence, and a matter of cultivation.

3. Teachers have much to do with forming and developing the habit in their pupils.

4. It is won and held largely by thorough preparation, by firmness and patience, by a kind and affectionate manner, rather than by a multiplication of rules and a great show of authority.

LESSON VIII.

THE PLACE AND MANNER OF QUESTIONING.

THE right method of questioning is an art which has an important relation to all good teaching. Like all other arts, it is well learned only by practice. Yet there are certain underlying principles which should receive careful attention. There are certain substantial reasons why one way of asking questions is better than another. It is well worth the Sunday-school teacher's while to inquire how best

to conduct this method of teaching, and why one mode is to be preferred above another.

I. THE PLACE OF QUESTIONING.

The Socratic or catechetical mode of teaching is in almost universal use among the best secular teachers. It will be ever likely to enter largely into all good methods of teaching. It should take precedence in Sunday-school instruction. A distinguished professor was once heard to remark that he had measurably lost many years of his teaching life through inattention to and neglect of the art of questioning. An eminent Brooklyn preacher is in the habit of carefully writing out a series of questions on his subject before preparing his sermon. After the sermon is prepared he compares it with the questions, in order to be sure that he is bringing out the salient points.

We notice that this method of teaching is specially useful—

1. IN GAINING ATTENTION.—We spoke of it in the last chapter as a device to check restlessness and arrest flagging interest. Judiciously employed, it has more substantial uses. One may state a truth never so clearly and fluently, and yet the scholar may be inappreciative and wandering. Put to him a direct question, and his attention is enlisted by an almost involuntary effort to attempt the answer. The more apt and pertinent the question, the more perfect the success.

2. IT ELICITS THOUGHT.—A pertinent question stimulates mental activity. The mind becomes curious and alert by the mere effort to understand and answer. A correct answer, or one that is nearly so, arouses still further the mental processes, and in the class pupils react on each other by a certain subtle inspiration which one mind, even partially aroused, imparts to another.

Example.—Suppose the teacher states to the pupil that

Jesus went at the age of thirty to the river Jordan ; that he was there baptized by John in Jordan ; that the Holy Spirit descended like a dove upon him, and a voice was heard affirming that he was the Son of God. You are by no means sure that the scholar has received a correct idea of the facts presented, or that he has really grasped any correct idea of the subject. But suppose the following questions are asked in quick succession: Who went to the river Jordan? For what purpose? By whom was Jesus baptized? In what river? What remarkable thing happened as he came from the water? What voice was heard? Whence did it come? If these or similar questions are answered correctly, you may be tolerably certain that the pupil has some correct knowledge of the subject, and that the pupil's mental activities have been to some extent stimulated.

3. IT FASTENS TRUTH IN THE MEMORY.—Truth may be clearly stated and apparently apprehended ; the pupil may assent to each proposition and claim fully to understand the whole subject ; but if his idea or understanding of each particular point is expressed in his own language in answer to questions, it is certain to be more fully understood and remembered. The mere effort which the mind puts forth to put one's knowledge into words helps materially to fasten it in the memory. Some educators go so far as to claim that a proposition is never clearly known till it has found expression in the pupil's own language verbally or in writing. There can be no doubt that the mental effort required to frame one's ideas of a given subject in words helps very materially in fastening that subject in mind as well as in more fully understanding it.

4. IT IS ADAPTED TO AVERAGE TEACHERS.—The lecturing or talking method of teaching, or that in which the teacher simply expounds the lesson or makes a running commentary upon it, is undoubtedly sometimes successful on the part of a few gifted teachers. But this mode is

hazardous and uncertain. It is an endeavor to pour knowledge into the pupil's mind rather than a wise effort to stimulate and aid him in gaining knowledge for himself. Besides, a half hour's weekly lecture, to be interesting, instructive and profitable, involves mental furnishing and study vastly beyond the reach of ordinary minds. On the other hand, tolerable proficiency in the questioning method is within the grasp of ordinary teachers. Moreover, lecturing, however admirable, is not teaching in its true technical sense.

II. THE MODE OF QUESTIONING.

In pursuing this subject it will be well to keep in mind a few general principles.

We should study to use as the base or groundwork of our questions—

1. THE PUPIL'S ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE.—The foundation of true teaching must usually be what the pupil already knows. From actual knowledge the wise teacher will lead naturally and logically on to what he knows imperfectly or not at all. Suppose you wish to explain the nature and uses of the telegraph. The pupil has seen the poles and wires, and has some crude and imperfect notions concerning the subject.

We remember once to have heard of a countryman who fancied that telegraphic messages were sent by miniature coaches over the wires. So, having a message to send, he handed it to the operator, and sat down to see him start the coach. He was, however, summarily corrected by his wife, who told him that the letter was not sent at all—nothing but the writing.

A pupil of this sort would have but few correct notions, but there would remain in almost any case some actual knowledge of the subject. With such a one the teacher will commence, not by asking about the battery and the electric current, but will proceed to sound his actual

knowledge by asking about the poles and wires, and about the fact that messages are somehow swiftly transmitted. Little by little he will be led on to the unknown and delicate processes by which the subtle unseen electric current is made with the speed of light to transmit our thoughts over the continent and under the sea.

We should study carefully—

2. TO LINK THE KNOWN TO WHAT WE TEACH.—Detached knowledge is of little value. But if you connect it naturally with what is taught, you make it available and by law of association fasten both in the memory.

Example.—Suppose you describe to a child a little hamlet on the banks of the Delaware. Very likely he will feel little or no interest in the matter. Proceed to question him on his knowledge of the history of the country. Perhaps he will remember that Washington crossed the Delaware with his army during the dark days of the Revolution. Question him further, and you may find that he remembers his grandsire fought with Washington. Attention will be by this time arrested and interest fully aroused. If you now tell the pupil that this hamlet marks the spot where Washington crossed, and that his grandsire was one of that immortal army, you will have supplied the links that connect the known to what you have taught, and you have fastened both indelibly in the mind.

III. CLASSIFICATION.

Questions are classified by Fitch substantially as follows: 1. Introductory or Preliminary. 2. Instructive. 3. Review or Test Questions.

To the first named belong questions of general review by which the previous lesson is recalled. Also questions by which the teacher approaches the pupil and scuds his actual knowledge. Also such as relate to the writer or speaker or actors in the lesson, and to time, place and occasion.

To the second belong such questions as stimulate the thought and lead on to the discovery of new truth, connecting it in logical order with what is previously known.

To the third belong those which test the work that has been done, which call back in the pupil's own language what has been learned and recapitulate the whole.

While it is important to note this classification, it is not best rigidly to adhere to it in the order named. The different kinds of questions will in practice be interspersed through the various stages of the lesson at the teacher's discretion. It is important to inject questions of personal application and review as the lesson proceeds, lest these most important parts be crowded out.

NEGATIVELY, 1. We should as far as possible avoid vague, indefinite questions. The teacher should have the idea he wishes to bring out very distinctly in his own mind, and the question should be so stated that the pupil can see clearly what is intended.

This point should receive our most careful and studious attention. While random questions and such as admit of a variety of answers are by no means difficult, it is not so easy to frame questions which clearly and concisely express the idea intended in a form intelligible to the scholar.

2. We should not ask questions which pupils cannot be reasonably expected to answer, or on subjects on which the pupil is not likely to have some knowledge. It would be absurd to question young children on problems in algebra or on abstruse and metaphysical theology.

3. It will be well to avoid such as indicate the answer in the form of the question or in the tone of the voice. If the question is put in the language of the text, too much is usually told, as is the case in the yes-and-no style. In a word, rote-questions—questions which can be answered by yes and no—should be avoided, and we should aim usually to get answers in the pupil's own language.

Example.—Suppose the lesson to be The Gracious Call. Matt. xi. 25–30. Questions of this sort are not uncommon: Whom does Jesus thank? By what name does he address God? To whom has the Father revealed these things? Questions of this kind are each answered by a word or two of the text, and would bring out the facts of the lesson, but would hardly get beyond the bare facts.

Questions like these would better subserve the purpose of good teaching: How was Jesus engaged? v. 25. For what does he thank his Father in heaven? What things does he speak of as hidden? Who are meant by the wise and prudent? Who by babes?

Such questions stimulate the pupil's thought, and tend to bring out the spiritual significance of the lesson as well as the mere facts.

4. Scholars should not be rebuffed, however wide of the mark in their answers. Make something of each answer, and as much as possible. Magnanimous encouragement in word and manner in this as in other matters is a potent agent for good, and constitutes an important element in all good teaching.

POSITIVELY.—In class teaching or in reviews of the whole school from the desk, we notice—

1. THE SIMULTANEOUS METHOD.—Questions may be profitably propounded to the whole, allowing class or school to answer simultaneously to a limited extent. The sympathy of numbers and the enthusiasm generated by the participation of the whole should be taken advantage of. But this mode should never be made exclusive. Rigid and regular questioning of individuals is the only certain method of knowing that the subject is clearly apprehended, especially by the dull scholars. But in questioning individuals care should be had that the whole class is attentive and interested. If a question is addressed to A, B and C should be kept on the alert and invited to correct errors or

omissions. In a word, while the teacher addresses himself mainly to *individuals*, he will really interest and attract the whole class simultaneously.

2. AIM AT DIRECTNESS.—We should cultivate great simplicity and directness in thought and language. Great pains should be taken to adapt the language and style of questions to the age and capacity of the pupils, and to clothe them in the language in common use among them. This will be an important aid in making our meaning clear. Questions are often unanswered because not understood. They are frequently not understood because they travel all round the point, instead of driving directly at it in the fewest and simplest words.

We should not only be direct in style, but in striving to reach the spiritual import of the truth and its bearing on the scholar. There is no such method of bringing out the relations of truth to the human soul as by adroit questioning.

3. WE SHOULD AIM TO FOLLOW LOGICAL ORDER.—Logic is another name for natural order and fitness. Questions should be so arranged as, 1st, to open or develop the exact subject in hand, and no other; and 2nd, so that one part leads naturally on by successive steps to another.

Attention to this kind of naturalness greatly aids the teacher in teaching and the pupil in remembering. Keeping this matter in mind will also greatly aid in that clearness and directness which are so essential in judicious questioning.

A writer in the *National Teacher* suggests substantially the following questions as profitable for teachers to propound to themselves:

- Inquire*, 1. What is known on this subject by my class?
 2. What of all they know shall I select as a foundation upon which to build what I wish to teach?
 3. What pointed questions shall I ask which shall not

by inflection or language tell the scholars what should be drawn from them?

4. In how many ways can these questions be answered? If in many, reject them.

5. Have I these questions in logical order, so that one is based upon another?

6. How can I illustrate this lesson?

7. Do I so fully understand and believe this truth as to teach with enthusiasm?

RECAPITULATION AND REVIEW.—No lesson is complete till its main points have been recalled in questions of examination. What has been taught should be recalled in the pupil's own language, and the lesson as a whole should be always as thoroughly recapitulated as possible. This should, of course, not be mere repetition of questions already asked. It should consist rather in bringing out the main points, and in such manner as to give some correct idea of the lesson in its entirety. Questions of this kind should be thrown in, in ever-varying form, all through the lesson. Truth is only really taught by constant repetition. *Simplify and repeat, simplify and repeat*, in multiform and various ways, should be the motto adopted by every teacher. The matter of reviews has not heretofore attracted the attention which its importance deserves. Regular and systematic review during the progress of each lesson is inseparable from all good teaching. A rapid calling back of some points in the previous lesson should also precede the teaching of the lesson in hand. In addition to these, general reviews from the desk by pastor or superintendent should be introduced regularly and as often as is practicable.

The quarterly review provided for in the International Series is a step in the right direction, but it should by no means supersede weekly or monthly reviews in class and from the desk. The limited time allotted to the Sunday-school will not allow thorough and critical exercises of this

kind, but we should remember that a crude and impartial review is better than none, and that calling back a few points of lessons already studied will often form a link that will connect them together, and greatly aid in remembering and in making the whole available.

The scope and object of this exercise should be kept distinctly in mind.

We lately stood on the adjacent bluffs which entirely overlook a beautiful and substantial Western city. The entire city, the hills on the opposite shore, glimpses of the intervening river, bits of landscape in the distance, all distinctly in view, formed a most beautiful and enchanting scene. But if one would fully take in its points of interest and beauty, and fix the whole on the tablets of the memory, he needs to look at it again and again. New features of the landscape, fresh beauties, domes and spires and landmarks before unnoticed, all attract the eye and challenge admiration, and the scene will be taken in fully only when viewed from different standpoints and in the ever-varying light of sunshine and shadow.

A review, as the form of the word indicates, is re-viewing, looking again at the subject. It is not a study in detail so much as a look at the whole subject from different standpoints and in its various aspects. Thus new beauty and significance is seen, as well as the proper relations of the several parts to one grand whole.

LESSON IX.

POWER AND METHODS OF ILLUSTRATION.

I. ITS IMPORTANCE AND VALUE.

APT and pertinent illustration is a most potential force in teaching or in speaking—a force the importance of which is not likely to be overestimated. Other things being equal,

that speaker or teacher who most wisely selects and most skillfully uses illustrations has greatest power over the minds and hearts of average hearers and pupils. Abstract truth is not seldom dry and unintelligible even to adults. It is often all Greek to a child, however fluently and clearly presented.

True teaching means more than hearing a routine recitation or the mere utterance of naked truth. The pupil is only really taught when he is made to see and remember something of the import of what is taught—only when truth is brought within the range of his mental vision. Divine truth, the message of the Infinite, should be made plain by all pertinent illustrations within reach—by all means rightly adapted to make it plain to finite minds. The rarest gem needs the golden setting. The true teacher should aim to bring out the truth in bold and distinct relief, so that it shall be fastened in the memory—so that it shall reach the heart and conscience.

Memorizing, recitation and statement of truth by the teacher are only initial steps in the right direction. Well-chosen illustrations are greatly helpful in bringing the truth within the comprehension of the scholar. They often serve a double purpose: not only do they aid in making truth clear, but also in arresting attention and enkindling interest. How often dull eyes light up, and restless, roving minds become alert, at the introduction of simile or story!

This method has a peculiar charm for young children. Fancy and metaphor enter very largely into the everyday lives of the little people. Their fund of words is small, and so it is intuitively supplemented by infantile drama and pantomime. Their very sports are representations of the outside world, or what they fancy it to be. The toy-house, the miniature crockery, the doll and rocking-horse, are emblems of their notions of life above and around them—a life to them as yet a strange medley of fact and fancy.

Example.—Suppose you wish to give a young child some correct idea of the omniscience of God. Calling attention to the vain attempt of the gold-fish to hide out of sight in the globular glass tank will be very likely to give an idea of the subject more nearly correct than a long statement of the abstract truth.

Judicious illustration has a peculiar fascination as well as special value for young children.

II. METHODS OF ILLUSTRATION.

The manner of using illustrations will be as various as is their endless variety. But it will be helpful and suggestive to give careful attention to their selection and adaptation.

1. SELECTION.—Illustrations divide naturally into two kinds: 1st, such as help to explain general truths; and 2d, such as throw light on obscure statements.

Those designed to illustrate principles or general truths should be selected from things familiar to the pupil. In teaching a class of city boys, familiar only with shops and artisans and city life in its more common phases, it will not be wise to draw illustrations from objects known only to dwellers in rural districts. A dark corner cannot be illuminated by a dark lantern, or an obscure subject by an illustration of which the pupil has no knowledge. Greek and Latin quotations and classical allusions may be apt and forcible with cultivated hearers, but they are unintelligible to the uneducated. The motion of the starry worlds and the vastness and magnificence of the planetary system may be made useful illustrations among advanced pupils, but they would be worse than useless with a class of pupils who had no correct notions of astronomy.

2. ADAPTATION.—The wise adaptation of illustrations should receive careful attention. It is not enough that the fact or figure is familiar. The teacher should inquire—1st,

What is the exact point to be made clear? 2d, What familiar fact or comparison or other truth will really help to make it plain?

We lately listened to a speaker who, in endeavoring to elucidate the idea of consecration, introduced the organ with its pipes and keys, its wondrous harmony and countless variations of sound, as manipulated by human fingers. He then rattled on, as fancy seemed to dictate, to locomotives and coal and iron fields, for a quarter of an hour. He spoke gracefully and earnestly, but his subject was muddled rather than made clear from utter lack of adaptation in his illustrations; in fact, as used by the speaker, they seemed to have no relation whatever to his subject. Teachers and speakers often fail utterly at this point. A story is told which perchance swallows up the truth instead of illustrating and fastening it. A figure or simile is introduced which has little or nothing to do with the subject in hand.

III. CLASSIFICATION.

Illustrations are divided naturally by Rev. J. M. Freeman into two great classes—the *verbal* and the *visible*.

1. VERBAL ILLUSTRATIONS.

Under the first head we notice—

1. THE FIGURATIVE.—Many teachers adopt this style intuitively and unconsciously. Its value can be greatly enhanced by careful study.

Example.—Suppose the lesson of the day to be the “Two Foundations,” Matt. vii. 21–29. The lesson is in itself a most beautiful example of figurative illustration. To the inhabitants of Palestine—a country of hills and mountains and deep valleys, subject to periodical and violent rains that swelled the mountain rivulets into torrents that often flooded the valleys and swept away everything which was

not on a sure foundation—the house on the rock and the house on the sand were fit and striking illustrations of the truth taught. If we further suppose that our Lord, while uttering the parable, may have pointed to the *débris* of a recent freshet, and to the scattered unburnt bricks that had lately composed in part the house of some easy-going Oriental who had actually built his house on the sand, only to be swept away by the first torrent, the force and beauty of the teaching is still more apparent. But to a class of young scholars who had been all their lives shut up within the substantial brick walls of a great city, where buildings stand for ages, or who had always lived in a level country, where freshets never occur, the beauty of the parable would not be so readily seen. Bring out the facts of time and place and circumstance under which the words were spoken, and the wondrous significance of the lesson stands revealed.

One phase only of the subject has thus far been developed. The moral import of the truth taught will be brought out by illustrations of a different character and from every-day life.

2. THE NARRATIVE.—A good story well told always finds ready listeners. If it is brief and adapted to the subject in hand, it can often be made to serve the threefold purpose of awakening interest, making plain the truth and fastening it in the mind. Spare use, however, should be made of stories. The right kind are not easy to obtain in large supply, and they sometimes excite an appetite which is only appeased by a constant diet of the same sort. Bible stories should take precedence, for they serve to familiarize with the Scriptures as well as to illustrate them.

Example.—In the lesson “Teaching to Pray,” Matt. vi. 3–15, what more admirable illustration of a forgiving spirit than that of Joseph? The ten brethren who had conspired against his life and sold him into slavery are completely in

his power, but he nobly leads them forth out of prison and addresses to them the magnanimous words: "This do and live; for I fear God." And so he sent them away with corn for their famine-stricken households, while he plans a still greater deliverance for them and for all his father's house.

Eastern manners and customs, Bible geography and history, afford a wide field for selection.

Example.—"The Flight into Egypt," Matt. ii. 13-23. Opportunity is here offered for investing the lesson with the added interest that centres in a land once the most powerful among the nations, the home of culture, art and learning, once the theatre of the career of the unrivaled Joseph, the deliverer of God's ancient people, now the asylum of the Christ-child, who is so soon to accomplish a greater and more wonderful deliverance for all nations and peoples. The modes of travel then in use, compared with those of the present day, and the ministry of the angels, afford still wider field for illustrative teaching.

Nature, art and daily life, newspapers and the whole circuit of literature, should also be laid under contribution for constant additions to the teacher's stock of illustrations.

2. VISIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS.

The eye is said to be the king of the senses. What is seen by the eye of sense is always more vivid and real than what is discerned by mental processes; hence the peculiar value of visible illustrations. A skillful word-picture can be made vivid and real if the pupil has some knowledge of the subject, but without this the mental image is likely to be unreal and distorted if perchance any distinct impression has been made.

A minute description of a locomotive would ordinarily be of little interest to a child who had never seen one and who knew nothing of its wonderful capabilities; but show him a picture of the machine; explain its uses, its beauty,

its marvelous utility; better still, place him beside the iron horse, let him see its sinews of steel, its breath of fire, its wondrous speed and power and tireless strength. The child will have obtained in a few moments more correct knowledge of the locomotive by this visible illustration than by any amount of tedious verbal description.

Among forms of visible illustration we notice—

1. **THE BLACKBOARD.**—While artists may do special and valuable service with chalk and colored crayons, we suggest that elaborate and complicated exercises should not, as a rule, be attempted by ordinary teachers. The blackboard has, however, numerous plain uses. Texts, catch-words, points of an address, initial letters, notices, diagrams, outline maps and a variety of simple devices can be written in bold characters, so as to catch the eye and be thus more readily impressed on the mind. It can be made greatly useful with primary scholars. Perhaps its greatest value inheres in the underlying principle that makes it available in class teaching, in form of slate and note-book. Its use in this form cannot be too strongly commended.

2. **MAPS.**—No schoolroom or teacher's study is complete without a supply of good maps. Pointing out the exact spot where a given event occurred not only adds to the store of valuable knowledge, but greatly enhances interest in the subject. Rough outline maps on note-book or slate may be made a fruitful source of illustration.

3. **PICTURES.**—Good pictures, such as correctly depict Bible scenes, have an unending charm, and are especially adapted to primary classes. They should, however, only be shown when they are used; if left to hang in constant sight, they lose their freshness and interest.

4. **OBJECTS.**—These can be made of great interest and value. Mementoes of the Holy Land have always a new interest, and so far as they illustrate Eastern manners and

customs and throw light on the Scriptures, they have the highest value. Objects in art and nature—fruit, flowers, vines, faded leaves and growing grain—may sometimes subserve a good purpose.

Object illustration has many important uses, but object teaching should hardly find prominent place in the Sunday-school. Object illustration even should be introduced with great care and discrimination, else the object may run away with the attention sought to be directed to the subject. A distinguished personage was lately called upon to address a large school in a neighboring city. He chose the resurrection for his subject. In his well-meant zeal to illustrate it he took into the school a live chicken. He had obtained something to represent an artificial shell, and the chicken was made to appear to have broken the shell and to seem to be just coming out of it. A decided sensation was produced. The chicken demonstrated long and loud. But the chicken swallowed the subject, and left an impression on the school which the judicious superintendent will not care to have reproduced. The performance was worse than a failure; it was a farce.

Illustrative teaching has the highest possible sanction. It was pre-eminently the method of the great Teacher. The grass, the flowers, the husbandman scattering the seed broadcast on his native hills, the fig tree by the wayside, parable and story, metaphor, events of history and homely facts of every-day life furnished him most beautiful and impressive illustrations of his mighty themes.

LESSON X.

THE TEACHER'S WEEK-DAY WORK.

THE hour on the Sabbath is by no means the whole of the successful teacher's work. He may prepare never so well and teach never so faithfully, and fail signally so far as the highest good of the pupil is concerned. We seek not only to instruct in the word, but to impress the heart and mould the character. Very much therefore remains to be done outside of the schoolroom. Of the week-day work of careful study and preparation we have already spoken; concerning the remaining features of this work we notice—

1. THE TEACHER SHOULD KNOW HIS PUPILS INDIVIDUALLY.—The class affords very limited opportunity for personal acquaintance. The teacher needs to know the habits, peculiarities, manner of life and home surroundings of the scholar. He needs to be brought into familiar and unofficial relations with them, where the teacher's garb is laid aside and the scholar assumes his natural and every-day manner and bearing. Such opportunities are only afforded during the week.

2. CONFIDENCE MUST BE WON.—This is best accomplished by little acts of kindness and courtesy. Scholars should not only be cordially recognized in the class, but on the street. A pause, a nod, a smile that fairly lights up the face, a hearty hand-shake on the street or in shop or store, is always a great pleasure to a child. Young people, and even little children, are keenly appreciative of true politeness, and often as keenly feel its neglect, shy and awkward as they sometimes seem. The Sunday-school teacher cannot afford often to be in so much haste as to neglect to cross the street if necessary in order to speak to one of his scholars. This should be a part, and no small part, of his week-day work.

3. **THE TEACHER SHOULD BE A REAL FRIEND.**—Nothing so takes hold of young natures as that love which is manifested by outward acts such as one friend unconsciously shows to another. One of the simplest and commonest of these is an informal call at the home. This is always a palpable evidence of friendly interest. Besides, it gives opportunity to know the pupil's home associations, employments and habits. It gives insight into real needs and trials and temptations, and vastly aids the teacher in intelligent efforts to reach and benefit. It also enables the teacher to know the parents, assists to gain their confidence and, what is more important still, their co-operation.

Numberless opportunities will occur in which the faithful sympathetic teacher can prove a trusted and valued friend. Is the pupil sick? The teacher may minister to his comfort. Is he out of employment? The teacher may vouch for character and help him to a place. Is he out of town? The teacher can write a friendly letter. Is the scholar tempted to go astray? If confidence exists, the teacher may provide the exact safeguard needed to save from wreck and ruin. Your sympathy and help in time of affliction and trouble will bind teacher and scholar together in ties stronger than hooks of steel.

4. **CHOOSE FIT TIMES AND OCCASIONS FOR THIS WEEK-DAY WORK.**—It will not be best to visit the homes of the poor on washing days, or at an hour when the father is usually away and the young people at school, nor the parlors of the rich when the house is likely to be full of company. Visits should not be stiff and stately, not of the full dress, kids and silk and satin order, not of the formal and official kind alone. They should not be for looking after delinquents only. They should not be always solely religious. The matter of delinquency and personal religion should by all means receive faithful attention at all proper seasons. But these personal matters should not

be lugged in at all times, and furnish the only occasions of calling. Visits from the teacher should be informal and social, and expressive in the best sense of genuine friendly feeling. Social visits of this kind are hailed with delight, and independent of the added knowledge of the scholars' peculiar circumstances and special needs, often afford very great aid in acquiring an influence for good—a help that is not understood by those who have not faithfully tried it.

A teacher once visited a scholar who had been absent several Sabbaths, and found him taking care of a sick sister. He expressed his pleasure at finding the boy thus engaged, and with wise tact said nothing about absences. When about to leave, the lad looked up and said pleasantly, "I am coming to school again, teacher." The point was gained, and in the right way. The boy came back in due time, was brought to Christ, and went in after years to Africa as a missionary catechist. He once acknowledged to his teacher that he had made up his mind to leave the school. That visit and the teacher's "kind way of speaking" touched his heart and, it may be, saved him from ruin. How small a thing sometimes changes the entire current of a life!

5. AVOID PERPETUAL FAULTFINDING.—Find something to commend, if nothing better than a clean floor, or a well-blackened stove, or an apparent effort of Susie or John to master the lesson. If possible, find some encouraging word to say to the parents concerning their children. An ounce of encouragement is better than a pound of scolding. A slight commendation will often prove more efficient for good than any amount of faultfinding.

6. INVITE SCHOLARS TO YOUR HOUSE.—Polite attention of this kind is often very potential in its influence. No matter if the boys are uncouth in appearance and rough in manner, or if the girls are awkward or unfashionably dressed. Go with them into kitchen or bath-room if necessary, and all have a good wash, not forgetting the ceremony

yourself. Entertain them with music, pictures and innocent games. Serve some slight refreshments or seat them at the tea-table with the family. At the close of the appointed time (invite only for a specified time) have a little earnest talk on personal bearing and conduct, suggest how they may be helpful to you and to each other, and then, maybe, unite in prayer for a blessing on the class, on each member and on each home.

By such cheap and simple means you may give your class a happy hour. You may perchance introduce them to a new world and a new atmosphere, and throw around them softening and refining influences. More than this, you may make a decided advance in winning the love and confidence which are largely the source of your power, which you so highly prize, and chiefly that you may transfer it to the Master whose you are and whom you serve.

If scholars are grown boys or young men, these social influences are all the more important. Ladies of intelligence, tact and social position who are willing to consecrate their powers to the Master can often, by a judicious and self-denying use of those social amenities which they so well know how to wield, do the highest and noblest work in the way of holding and saving these young men, just at the critical age when so many are closely verging on destruction.

5. WRITE LETTERS TO YOUR SCHOLARS.—These are often productive of great good. A letter written and directed all to one's self is an immense pleasure to a child. It is an event. It is next to a visit. Besides, it gives opportunity to say privately and directly on the matter of personal feeling and experience what could not be well said in the class, and which one cannot always find fit opportunity to say privately in person. Many of the best teachers practice this method of week-day letter-writing, and with the best results.

LASTLY, FREQUENT OPPORTUNITY SHOULD BE SOUGHT TO SPEAK WITH EACH SCHOLAR ALONE.—Class teaching must be more or less of a general nature. It is not always best to speak pointedly to a scholar of his own feelings and hopes, his temptations and trials, in the presence of the class. Hence opportunity should be regularly sought for speaking to each alone. No sense of delicacy is then offended, and a frank expression is much more likely to be made. The teacher who does not speak privately to individual pupils on the matter of personal faith in Christ loses the most precious and hopeful occasions for accomplishing the work in hand.

Let us be mindful that, while the teaching of the word is the great instrument on which we must rely for the salvation of our scholars, its effectual presentation, so far as we are concerned, must depend to a great extent on the personal influence which we may acquire over them. Our object is not alone to instruct. It is to win these young people to Christ, to train and develop them for his service. It is, by the divine blessing, to influence and mould and guide them into a true and noble manhood and womanhood. This personal influence is won or lost very largely by the teacher's week-day work.

LESSON XI.

JESUS THE MODEL TEACHER.

OUR Lord, in order to accomplish his finished work, took our nature and humbled himself to become the man Christ Jesus. He took our infirmities and was tempted in all things like as we are. He touched our humanity at all possible points, save that of sinfulness, that he might be our pattern, guide and teacher.

The really successful teacher teaches not by formal inculcation of the truth alone. His life, his spirit, his character, are to the child far better exponents of the truth than his half hours in the class, and far more potent in results.

He who would become a wise master-builder should not only study architecture and its rules; he should study the methods of those who have most excelled, and also the men themselves. He who would perfect himself in art should study the best masters—the methods, the habits and lines of thought of the men who have immortalized their names as well as their ideals on the canvas and in the marble.

Whoever would excel as a Christian teacher should study the work and methods of the great Teacher. Not less should he study the Teacher himself—his spirit, his character and manner of life. All other models are full of imperfections. Christ alone should be studied constantly and followed fully, keeping in mind always that he was God as well as man, Prophet and revealer of new truth as well as Teacher, and that he mainly taught men and women, and not children, and by “authority, and not as the scribes.”

We have space only to note a few of those human characteristics to which perchance our attention most needs to be directed.

Observe, 1. HIS LOWLY LOT.—He chose a life of poverty, isolation and toil. He was a child of peasant parentage, and no doubt toiled as a dutiful son at his father's trade. Entering on his public ministry, he affected no pomp or circumstance. He traveled on foot over the dusty plains and over the bleak mountain-tops. He ate with publicans and sinners. He chose illiterate fishermen for his confidential witnesses and friends. He was the friend and physician of the poor and lame and blind, and of the little children. He entered Jerusalem in triumph, in the fulfillment of prophecy spoken ages before, amid emblems

of victory scattered along his way, but seated on an ass-colt. He had no words of commendation for the shouts of the populace, but he recognized the hosannas of the children as acceptable praise. He paused in the court of the temple to heal the lame and blind who came with the surging throng to do him homage.

Amid the wild pursuit of happiness and personal ease, in our hot haste to be rich and what the world calls great, may we not profitably pause to consider the lowly lot of our Lord?

2. HIS SELF-ABNEGATION.—Consider the glory of the heavenly kingdom, the abdicated throne, the humbling of the Infinite to take on the finite, the long years of isolation and toil in obscure Nazareth. Think of the long weary pilgrimages during his ministry, his daily and almost hourly contact with suffering and disease and death in all hideous and repulsive forms.

His countrymen would at one time have made him king, but he spurned the purple and pomp of royalty. He counted no act menial that was done for weak, suffering humanity. He ministered without recompense to the friendless and the poor. He fed the hungry throng, lest they should be weary and faint in the way. He washed the disciples' feet; he broiled the fish on which on a time they dined.

3. HIS TIRELESS ZEAL.—Restive of the slow flight of years before, according to Jewish custom, he could enter on his public ministry, he disputed, at twelve years of age, with the doctors in the synagogue, because he must be about his Father's business. Worn with incessant toil, he stopped not for rest while invalid throngs pressed upon him for healing, and while mothers waited for a blessing on their little ones. Though the night watches were devoted to prayer, the gray dawn found him walking on the boisterous sea, to rescue and comfort the disciples who were wearily buffeting the storm.

4. HIS EXHAUSTLESS PATIENCE.—Crowds thronged him at all hours. Women pressed to touch his garments. Peasant children were brought to him, perhaps unwashed and unkempt. His disciples strove among themselves about precedence. Judas basely betrayed and Peter ignobly denied him. Scribes and elders sought his life; proud Pharisees mocked and insulted. The rabble shouted hosannas, and anon cried, "Crucify him! crucify him!" Yet he uttered no angry, impatient words, he bandied no epithets, he hurled no threats or taunts or stinging rebukes. He kindly and patiently taught scoffing lawyers and fickle multitudes, and was rejected by the mass of his countrymen. He sowed the precious seed through long patient years, but left the glory of the harvest to be gathered by his followers.

5. HIS KINDNESS TO THE ERRING.—How tenderly he treated the erring woman! Self-righteous Jews would have stoned. Our Lord has no words of harsh upbraiding; but while her self-condemned accusers are shrinking silently away, he says, with looks of pity and words of tenderness, "Go, sin no more." He wept tears of sympathy over the rebellious holy city. He condemned the profane and cowardly Peter only by a look of grief and pity. He not only welcomes the returning prodigal, but pictures the father as running to meet him afar off in his rags and degradation. To the three who slept while on guard in the night of his agony he spoke in tones of commiseration rather than of blame: "What, could ye not watch with me one hour? The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."

6. HIS AFFECTIONATE MANNER.—We do not propose to dwell on the infinite love of our adorable Lord—a love evidenced by a life of toil and privation and a death of agony—but simply to call attention to the manner of its manifestation. This is a matter which should engage the careful attention of all teachers of the young. His love

was not only deep and unremitting, but it found constant and unmistakable expression.

Note his affectionate manner in his familiar intercourse with Martha and Mary at the grave of Lazarus, and at the gates of the city whence was carried out the dead boy, the only son of his widowed mother. He said to the repentant profligate, sick of the palsy, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." He soothed with touch and word of sympathy the disciples affrighted at the glimpse of the divine glory on the mount of transfiguration; he "came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid." To the toiling mariners on stormy Tiberias he goes in the early dawn with like affectionate words: "Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid."

7. HIS EXALTATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.—Our Lord everywhere magnified the written word. To the tempter he said, "It is written." To the young ruler's weighty question he replied, "Keep the commandments." He answered envious scribes and Pharisees by appealing to the law and the prophets.

For his own he prays, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." We have in his teachings and in his example the highest authority and sanction for the greatest possible exaltation of the living word, pure and simple. It is the only instrument of salvation and Christian growth, the alone sword of the Spirit. It is the power of God unto salvation.

THE GREAT TEACHER'S METHODS.

It is not our purpose to speak in detail of our Lord's methods in teaching—of his simplicity of thought and language—of the entire absence of the artificial and the sensational—of his marvelous tact and unerring wisdom—of his conversational and catechetical modes of conveying instruction—of his wondrous word-pictures and his illustrative

methods—we can only here notice that in these, as in all other things, Jesus is the only model whom we may ever wholly and entirely follow. His methods, no less than his character and manner of life, should be our constant and life-long study. So aptly did he catechise that crafty enemies were confounded and self-condemned, while humble learners were led quickly into the clear light of truth. So skillfully did he utilize the common things of life in illustration of the weighty truths he taught that the very drapery of the flowers is made constantly to remind us of God's pledge of needed raiment, and the chirp of the sparrow of his promise of daily food.

LESSON XII.

THE HOLY SPIRIT THE TEACHER'S GUIDE AND HELPER.

I. MENTAL CULTURE MUST NOT BE IGNORED.

WE have treated in the preceding chapters mainly of the teacher's mental furnishing. We are not likely to overestimate its importance. A certain amount of mental culture is essential. Let us recall a few of the teacher's more imperative intellectual needs.

1. The teacher needs all educational helps within reach ; knowledge is power always, and mental discipline is invaluable. We do not, however, wish to be understood as meaning only the education of the schools. The true idea of education involves a life process, a culture and discipline of mind and heart, that is more or less successfully pursued amid the busy avocations of ordinary life.

2. The teacher needs some knowledge of and sympathy with childhood. The man who has forgotten that he was once a boy, or the woman who does not remember that she

was once a gay and maybe frivolous girl, is ill fitted to be a successful teacher.

3. The teacher imperatively needs some knowledge of methods, of the few simple principles that underlie all good teaching. He should know that the bare presentation of truth is not teaching. True teaching brings the truth within the plane of the pupil's thought, within range of his mental vision. It involves the seeing and measurable understanding of truth on the part of the taught.

4. The teacher should know something of the power and method of illustration if he would teach divine truth effectually. It should be the great aim of the teacher so to bring out the truth that it may be fastened in the memory, and thus reach the conscience and influence the life.

5. Most of all does the teacher need that mental and moral discipline that comes of regular and persistent study of the word of God. He may get on with little education and few helps, but without constant and devout study of the sacred text as a preparation for teaching, and as a means of grace to himself, he must fail of the best success.

Richard Hampton—better known in England as Foolish Dick—was not only very illiterate, but he was counted almost an idiot. Yet he became a very useful minister of the gospel among his class. He owed his success in great measure to the fact that he was a most earnest and prayerful student of the word of God.

While, then, intellectual furnishing is important, and in a measure essential, it is of little worth unless supplemented by the spiritual and divine. There is such a thing as spiritual power, and it constitutes the most important part of the teacher's preparation.

II. THE AID OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ESSENTIAL.

A professor in one of our theological seminaries once said to his graduating class, "Young gentlemen, you are com-

paratively few in numbers; but if you will double your spirituality, you will double your numbers." Let us here and now say to the teachers of the schools, If you will double your spirituality, you will quadruple your power. We have a deep and abiding conviction that it is the high privilege of all teachers and Christian workers so to increase their spiritual forcefulness as to add many fold to their usefulness, as well as to the joy of their Christian experience. Would God we could persuade all Sunday-school teachers earnestly to seek and confidently to expect such large manifestations of divine grace and power as our gracious Lord delights to bestow!

After our Lord had risen, he commanded the disciples to wait till they should be endued with power from on high. The Church was weak, the enemy apparently triumphant, the world was perishing, yet they waited patiently for the robing. Let us look for a moment at the nature of this power. Evidently it was not conversion. The twelve and the seventy were no doubt true disciples, and had been commissioned to preach and teach by Christ himself. It was not ordinary sanctifying grace. James and John and Philip and Bartholomew and the Marys no doubt were decent Christians before the waiting in the upper room. It was not miraculous power. The disciples had worked miracles not a few before our Lord's passion.

Positively, 1. It was more and better than miraculous power. First, apostles, second, prophets, third, teachers, *after that miracles*, is the scriptural order. The one was temporary and incidental, the other essential and in perpetuity.

2. It was better than the personal presence of Christ himself. He declared it expedient that he should go away that the Comforter might come.

3. It was a mysterious, unseen, intangible, yet potential

force. It conveyed unwonted aptness of speech and of teaching, a clearer and more perfect understanding of truth, and a certain wondrous power over the hearts and consciences of men. Peter was the same unlettered Galilean at Pentecost as when, in the porch of the palace of the high priest, he acted the coward and the craven.

4. This power, then and now, is conferred on all who seek it aright. It was not given at first to the twelve to be by them transmitted to the others. The tongue of fire—apt emblem to Jewish minds of the divine presence—descended and sat on each of the one hundred and twenty, on apostles and laymen and on the women.

5. This divine presence confers a direct and positive teaching power: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things."

There seems a vast amount of practical skepticism concerning the personal presence and teaching power of the Holy Spirit. We may not understand the mysterious and delicate process, but we cannot deny the facts. Mind acts on mind. Dull eyes light up to the gleam of sympathy. Smile responds to smile, and heart pulsates responsively to the generous beating of other hearts; and often an electric thrill of sympathy goes through an entire audience, struck out by one earnest magnetic nature. Why should it be thought a thing incredible that the divine should act on the human, the Creator on the creature? Water at a low temperature is hard and brittle. Add a few degrees of heat, and it becomes liquid, yet inert and tame. Superheated and confined, it evolves a power that has revolutionized continents and to-day controls the commerce of the nations. Yet power is in itself an absolute mystery. We cannot understand or describe it. Its source and mysterious secrets are beyond our ken. "God has spoken once, yea, twice have I heard this, that power belongeth unto God."

Let us now inquire what special helps and aptitudes this spiritual power affords the teacher.

1. **IT GIVES COMFORT.**—The teacher's work is no sinecure. It is not a position of ease or luxury. The majority of Sabbath-school teachers are busy men and women, sometimes sadly overworked, often snatching moments from needed rest or recreation for preparation for the work and for the work itself. Mental acquirements and resources are not always abundant. Helps are few, and there is not seldom a lack of skill in using them. Children are restless and inattentive to divine things. Human nature is perverse. The enemy is ever sowing tares. Strength and patience sometimes give way. The teacher needs such comfort and encouragement as human help and sympathy can never give. How sweet at such times the still small voice of the Spirit speaking to weary workers in tones and words of infinite tenderness!

2. **IT GIVES JOY.**—The teacher needs a cheerful, joyful experience. Long-faced, sombre, disconsolate Christians must have rare tact and grace if they do not absolutely repel the young. A cheerful type of piety is ever attractive and doubly useful, especially to children. The Spirit gives joy as well as consolation. "These things have I spoken to you that in me ye might have peace." "Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." How expressive the language! The Master would have us full of joy as the brimming goblet is filled with the limpid water.

3. **IT PROMOTES CHRISTIAN GROWTH.**—Teachers should be growthful Christians. They should steadily advance in love and patience and self-control, and in all such elements as constitute symmetrical Christian character, and especially in that faith without which it is impossible to please God—without which in active exercise the real source of growth and power must be perpetually ignored.

"We teach and we are taught by something about us

that never enters into language at all." We teach not so much by what we say as by what we do—not so much by what we profess as by what we are. The teacher's life is the great object illustration of the truth, the exponent of what he teaches for better or for worse. A quaint old writer says it is of no use to teach cream and live skim-milk. The commonest and homeliest truths become radiant in pristine beauty if translated into beneficent action, if fairly and fully illustrated in the life.

4. IT QUICKENS THE INTELLECT.—The Spirit of God not only lights up the sacred page with wondrous beauty and significance. It arouses dormant energies, quickens moral perceptions, clears up our notions of right and wrong, and so lets in the hidden light of divine truth. "Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."

If we would see clearly and understand fully the beauty and significance of what we teach, we must seek help and light from the divine Messenger, who will teach us all things and bring all things to our remembrance. The telegraph performs its wondrous work rapidly and well when the electric current is full and strong, when connection and insulation are perfect, when the operator is alert and competent. The Spirit of God supplies the subtle current of our power, inspires the agencies, perfects all mediums and applies and renders effective the great instrument. Let us remember that the highest function of the teacher is not so much to impart knowledge as to stimulate the pupil in its love and pursuit. The Spirit of God is our best teacher, because he arouses and stimulates the dead dormant powers within us.

5. THIS SPIRITUAL POWER IS ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL TO HIGH SUCCESS IN TEACHING.—The most careful study of lessons and methods is important and in a sense essential. We are not likely to attach too much importance to these matters. But mental furnishing alone is of small value

unless vitalized by the spiritual and the divine. One may be orthodox in doctrine, outwardly correct in life, complete in mental culture, and yet "faultily faultless, icily regular, splendidly null." We aim at spiritual results, to reach the heart and influence the life. Spiritual power is absolutely essential to this end. We may pile coal and wood on the grate and adjust with all nice propriety, but without the glow of fire all will be cold and drear. We may set candles on a hundred silver candlesticks, and turn the gas on a thousand jets in "golden chandeliers," but without the touch of flame all will be dark and desolate.

Lastly, WE NEED IT IN LARGE MEASURE. — The teacher needs not only ordinary grace, but to be robed with the Holy Spirit as with a garment. We need the tongue of fire, power to understand the truth, to feel its force and beauty, so that it may be felt by other hearts and consciences, so that it shall not be fruitless and void. "He will dwell with you, and be in you." Let us seek this indwelling presence, not as a stranger tarrying for a night, but as an almighty Friend and Helper taking up his abode with us. Large measure of this divine presence is essential to great success. It is like the full stream of water to the mill, like the full pressure of steam to the boiler, like the healthy vital current to the heart's pulsations. With small measure of grace, our experience is sad and dejected, and our work is fitful and discordant. Filled with the divine, our experience shall be full of joy, our lives of healthful vigor and our work abundant in its fruitage.

APPENDIX.

A SUNDAY-SCHOOL

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.

WE hereby associate ourselves together under the care and supervision of our church and session for Bible study and religious services. That our object may be carried out in a business-like and orderly manner, we do now adopt the following Constitution and By-Laws.

ART. I. This Association shall be called the Sabbath-school of the _____ Church of _____, and shall embrace such adults and youth as shall from time to time join us in the study of the Scriptures, and such officers and teachers as shall be duly appointed.

ART. II. The officers shall consist of a superintendent, assistant-superintendent, secretary, librarian and treasurer, with such assistants as may be needed.

ART. III. The pastor of the church is *ex-officio* pastor of the school.

ART. IV. The school, being a part of the church, is subject to its affectionate care and control.

ART. V. The superintendent shall be appointed by and with the consent of the pastor and session. It shall be the privilege of the teachers to nominate, but their choice shall be subject to the approval of the session.

ART. VI. Other officers shall be appointed by the superintendent, subject to the approval of the teachers' meeting.

ART. VII. The teachers shall be selected by the pastor

and superintendent, and approved by the teachers in regular session. After four weeks' probation, assent shall be required, publicly or otherwise, to the teachers' pledge herewith appended, copies of which will be furnished to each teacher.

ART. VIII. The officers shall be appointed annually, and shall hold their offices for one year or until others are appointed.

ART. IX. The annual meeting shall be held on the —— day of January in each year, at which time the officers shall be appointed.

ART. X. This Constitution may be altered or amended at any annual meeting by a two-thirds vote of those present, subject to the approval of the session of the church.

The By-Laws should determine the hour of holding the school, time of teachers' meeting, anniversaries, missionary meetings, and contain the teacher's pledge, together with such other matters as are deemed important. Care should be had not to multiply rules ; they should be few and simple, and such as can be clearly understood and faithfully carried out.

THE TEACHER'S PLEDGE.

I hereby pledge myself by God's help—

1. To be loyal to this church, to the superintendent of this school and to its rules.

2. To use all prayerful diligence in the study and preparation of the lesson.

3. To be in my place regularly and punctually. If not practicable to be present, to use my best endeavors to procure a suitable substitute.

4. To attend the teachers' meeting.

5. To visit and know my scholars at their homes, and to encourage them to visit me.

6. To labor and pray earnestly and expectantly for the

immediate conversion and constant religious growth of my pupils.

TEACHERS' HELPS.

LIST No. 1.—Containing a few essential Helps which every teacher should own.

May be ordered from the PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, 1334 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

	PRICE
✓ A good Reference Bible, from \$6 down to.....	90
✓ Superb edition of the Bible, Maps, Index, etc., \$10 to.....	\$3.00
✓ Brown's Concordance.....	50
✓ Webster's Dictionary, from \$12 down to.....	75
✓ Phillips' Scripture Atlas.....	25
✓ The Bible Text-Book.....	40
✓ Mimpriss' Gospel Treasury and Harmony of the Gospels.....	2.50
The Art of Questioning and Art of Securing Attention.....	50
✓ Lesson Leaf, per annum.....	9
✓ Westminster Question-Book.....	
Preparing to Teach.....	1.75
The Presbyterian at Work, with Lesson Notes, per annum....	60
Normal Class Series, Nos. 1 to 4, per hundred.....	37
Illustrative Teaching.....	25
How to Teach.....	10
A Church Catechism.....	3
A Catechism on the Government and Discipline of the Pres- byterian Church.....	5
Good Words for Sunday-School Teachers.....	5
Chart of Scripture Offerings	10
The Comprehensive Commentary.....	20.00
Cruden's Concordance (Abridged), \$2 and.....	2.50
Robinson's Harmony of the Gospels.....	1.25
Ayres' Treasury of Bible Knowledge (Dictionary).....	3.00
Biblical Antiquities (Nevins).....	1.50
Hand-Book of Bible Geography (Whitney).....	2.50
Coleman's Historical Text-Book and Atlas.....	2.00
Simmons' Scripture Manual.....	1.75
Hand-Book of Bible Manners and Customs (Freeman).....	2.50

