

STONES IN THE ROUGH

OR

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS A STUDY OF THEOLOGY
APPROACHED FROM THE HEATHEN SIDE
OF THE FENCE

That gospel which I preach among the gentiles—Gal. ii : 2

PART I.

The Method of Study

WILLIAM ASHMORE

PRICE . . . 25 CENTS

Book will be sent postpaid on receipt of price, by the publishers,
A. M. SKINNER & CO., 655 ATLANTIC AVENUE, BOSTON

BL
2775
.A8
v.1

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by *President Patton.*

Division:

BL 2775 .A8 v.1
Ashmore, William, 1824-1909
Stones in the rough, or,
Contributions towards a

STONES IN THE ROUGH

OR

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS A STUDY OF THEOLOGY
APPROACHED FROM THE HEATHEN SIDE
OF THE FENCE

That gospel which I preach among the gentiles—Gal. ii : 2

WILLIAM [✓]ASHMORE

PUBLISHER'S CARD

WILL BE IN FOUR PARTS WHEN COMPLETED

I. THE METHOD OF STUDY, AND THE REASON THEREFOR	40	Pages
II. THE THEOLOGY OF NATURE	60	“
III. THE THEOLOGY OF REVELATION . Probably about	150	“
IV. RELATED SUBJECTS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS “	80	“

Respectfully Dedicated

TO

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

OF

THE AMERICAN BAPTIST MISSIONARY UNION

As Illustrative of the Gospel They Send Out Their Missionaries
to Preach, as Apprehended by One of Their Number

WILLIAM ASHMORE

THEOLOGY IS THE SCIENCE OF GOD

By a “science” we mean a classified presentation of all the facts we can ascertain about God; about him personally; the mode of his being; the nature of his attributes; the creations of his hand; the administration of his government; the relations he sustains to the universe he has made—and to the creatures that are in it; together with his plans and purposes so far as it is possible or proper for us to know them; and, as a consequential result, a classified statement of the attitudes, feelings and actions due to himself as God over all blessed forever more; towards spiritual beings, who, though we have nothing to do consciously with them, have much to do with us—and towards our fellow human creatures as being made of one blood with us to dwell on all the face of the earth.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE BASAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN RELIGION AND MORALITY .	11
THE FOUR PARTS	
PART I. The mode of approach	14
II. The Theology of Nature	14
III. The Theology of Revelation	15
IV. Summarized Statements	15
PREFATORY	16
THE STARTING POINT OF ALL INQUIRY	21
THE VISIBLE UNIVERSE	22
MY PERSONAL SELF	23
INQUIRIES NOW FORCED UPON ME	24
WHENCE? HOW? WHY? WHITHER?	
THREE DOMAINS OF INQUIRY	25
That of a Scientist	25
That of a Philosopher	25
That of a Theologian	26
THE LATTER FIELD WE NOW ENTER	27
The Knowable about God	27
Tested by a Heathen Scholar	27
CONTINUED ENUMERATION OF OUR NEEDS	29
THE SEARCH FOR LIGHT	30
WHAT ANSWERS DOES ANCIENT HEATHENISM GIVE?	31
WHAT ANSWERS DOES HINDUISM GIVE?	33
WHAT ANSWERS DOES BUDDHISM GIVE?	33
WHAT ANSWERS DOES CONFUCIANISM GIVE?	36
WHAT ANSWERS DOES PHILOSOPHY GIVE?	38
WHAT ANSWERS DOES SCIENCE GIVE?	40
WHAT ANSWERS DO THE SCRIPTURES GIVE?	42

THE BASAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN RELIGION AND MORALITY.

In the minds of not a few, when speaking or writing on ethical subjects, there is manifest and continuous confusion of thought about the respective domains of religion and morality. While the two are closely related and continually overlap in their operations, there is a distinct line of demarkation between them.

Religion has to do with the duties and requirements of the First Table of the Law, while Morality has to do with the duties and requirements of the Second Table.

Religion, as the very etymology of the word indicates, is that which binds the creature to his Creator, or to the being who stands to him in place of a Creator, according to his own way of reckoning. Morality is that which is concerned with the relation of man to his fellow man. A glance at the decalogue will sustain this view.

While religion and morality are co-ordinated and ought always to work together in due relationship and proportion, yet the two are separable and are continually being separated to the detriment of them both.

Thus a man may have much religion and little or no morality, or he may have much morality and little or no religion. The Hindus, for example, abound in religion—they make it the base of all social distinction; they worship gods by the million, but they are liars, they cheat, and they are disgustingly immoral and obscene. In our own civilized communities here at home we have men who abound in morality—they are honest, they are truthful, they are upright in all their dealings with their fellow men, but they have not a particle of religion. They don't worship God, and they don't thank him for anything; they

STONES IN THE ROUGH

never go to a meeting devoted to his service; they never recognize his authority or even his existence. Such men can be appealed to from the human side but not from the divine side, that is, the class of motives from the human side may move them, but the class of motive from the divine side are unheeded.

The reason for this difference in treatment, given in the words of Scripture, is that men "are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of—(not the head, as our philosophers would insist on putting it)—but of the blindness of the heart, which is God's way of striking at the root of the matter.

It is to be always understood that the law written on the table of the human heart—the law as contained in the ten commandments, and the law as summed up in two precepts by the Lord Jesus, are identically the same. The heathen all know, before any missionary comes among them that (I) Men ought to worship God as supreme, and (II) They ought to treat their neighbors as they would have their neighbors treat them. There is no tribe on the face of the earth which does not know, by the light of nature, these two things. They will differ as to who is God, but they do not differ as to the conviction that whoever he is he is entitled to the supreme homage of the human heart. The controversy of Elijah with the Priests of Baal was not over an issue as to whether God ought to be worshipped, but it was on the question, Who is God, Baal or Jehovah? The determination of that point determined the duty to worship—and so they said "Jehovah he is the God," and adherence was given to him at once.

Correct understanding on these points will be determinative of those questions arising between different religionists about the possibility of co-operation. They say they cannot co-operate. Christians who worship Jehovah say they cannot co-operate with the worshipper of Siva, or of Buddha, and recognize them as religious equals. Christians who hold Christ is divine, cannot co-operate in religious matters with those who deny his divinity. Roman Catholics refuse to recog-

STONES IN THE ROUGH

nize those who will not admit the supreme headship of the Pope, nor will any part of the Christian Church enter into arrangements to worship with Mormons or Spiritualists, or with rejectors of *The Word of God* only as their rule of faith and practise. It is useless therefore to seek a fusion which ends only in a confusion. There can be no compromise between the worshipper of the Living God and the worshipper of false gods. What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? What communion hath light with darkness? What concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? That is Paul's answer to the tenders of what is now called "liberalism." When the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin came with the offer, "Let us build with you, for we seek your God as you do"—the answer was, "Ye have nothing to do with us to build a house unto our God, but we ourselves will build together unto the Lord God of Israel."

But when it comes to the moralities of life between man and man, the conditions are different. Every form of Christianity, whether Greek Church, Roman Catholic or Protestant or the Hebrew body—and even the heathen—the Confucianist, the Buddhist, together with the irreligious as well as the religious of our own land, all profess a common morality. Thou shalt not lie; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not bear false witness; thou shalt not covet. In the enforcement of these moralities all have a common conviction and a common interest. There are no *two* "conscientious convictions" in one and the same mind on the same subject among any people under the sun; therefore co-operation is possible and feasible and ought to be entered into and sought for.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

IN FOUR PARTS.

PART FIRST.

THE MODE OF APPROACH TO THIS WHOLE SUBJECT FROM THE HEATHEN
RATHER THAN FROM THE CHRISTIAN SIDE OF THE FENCE,
AND THE REASON THEREFOR.

It is more natural to the heathen mind. Whatever is gained in the way of conviction is more likely to have a hospitable reception. It is the better, and indeed the only true way of clearing the ground of the heathen debris which cumpers it, while the new structure is having its foundation laid at the same time. The approach from the purely Christian side, while more readily apprehended by ourselves here at home, is apt to be attended with some misconceptions by the heathen from their point of view.

PART SECOND.

THE THEOLOGY OF NATURE,

as taught by a more enlightened study than has ever been given to it by the heathen sages themselves, aided as it will be, by the side lights thrown upon all the ramifications of the subject by the Scriptures incidentally, come in at this point for consideration, and before we enter upon the theology of the Scriptures themselves. There is a vast deal of light emanating from the theology of nature which many of our writers fail to take into account. There is a Law of Nature, which Paul speaks of in the 2d of Romans. To match this is a Gospel of Nature, gleams of which appear all through the Scriptures, but which is distinctly declared in the 14th of Acts in Paul's sermon at Lystra. A study of the theology of nature is an indispensable pre-requisite to the study of the theology of revelation.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

PART THIRD.

THE THEOLOGY OF REVELATION.

In this we shall confine ourselves very closely to the Theology found in the Scriptures as enunciated by the writers of the Scriptures themselves. This will account for the absence of great names of great theologians, such as Augustin, Athanasius, Luther, Calvin, and a hundred others of later time, whose matured and profound thought enter so largely into the Theological conceptions of our generation. We are not contemplating work on so ambitious a scale. This will be criticised as a great shortage, but it will be remembered we are writing in the interest of a special class, to help them get a start. The study of all these great writers will come later in a department by itself.

PART FOURTH.

SUMMARIZED STATEMENTS AND BRIEF DISCUSSIONS OF VARIOUS THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS—NOT ESSENTIAL IN A CONCATENATED AND DIRECT PRESENTATION OF THE “THEOLOGY OF REVELATION,” BUT WHICH ARE RELATED TO IT OR SUGGESTED BY IT, AND WHICH MUST HAVE CONSIDERATION AT SOME TIME OR OTHER.

A usual method is to introduce these features along in the course of the main investigation; and this may be the better way to the home-drilled minds of western men, but as the Eastern mind is trained differently, and as it is more consonant with their educational methods to treat a theme homogeneously apart from its indirect bearings, leaving these latter to be disposed of afterwards, therefore we adopt the method which carries the heaviest emphasis from their point of view. There is almost no end to the secondary questions that may be included in such a list.

PREFATORY.

These elementary studies, as will be seen at a glance, are not cast in the form which gains acceptance among us here at home. The reason is that they follow lines of treatment made use of and found serviceable in a Foreign Missionary Class room, among students now Christian but originally heathen. Experience in teaching them evinces the wisdom of approaching the whole subject in a different way, and of viewing the new Christianity which has appeared among them from a different angle of vision than we usually occupy here at home.

Even after they become Christians their old faith has still many an old entrenchment left. To put it in another form, the tree is cut down but the old roots remain with a deal of sap in them, and withal, danger sometimes of sprouting again. Grubbing out old roots is often hard work and long continued work. We find it advantageous to go with them over their old deserted vineyards and note the very best they have to offer, and then follow it up by showing them what Christianity has to offer. Then they are more ready to part company with heathen remnants of beliefs,—are confirmed in their Christian beliefs, and say, with Jethro of old, “Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods, for in the thing wherein they dealt proudly he was above them.”

An illustration may be taken from a comparison of antiquities of the heathen and the Christian systems. The Chinese are fond of parading the antiquity of their Confucian teachings. Wherein they deal proudly we are above them. I have seen a look of awe and reverence steal over the faces of our students when their attention was called to a comparison of antiquities. Your Confucius, we say to them, lived about twenty-four hundred years ago, and wrote these precepts you have been taught so much to admire. This great sage Isaiah, that I have been telling you about, and who wrote such wonderful things,

STONES IN THE ROUGH

lived two hundred years before Confucius was born. The vast collection of Proverbs embodying the wisdom of all mankind, and which were put in order by Solomon, were collected five hundred years before he was born. Many of the great teachings of Confucius, as he says himself, were drawn from writers who lived twelve hundred years before himself, but these writers did not go so far back as our teacher Moses by at least two hundred years. So that long before the Chinese had any system and form of religion or of civil government whatever, this book of ours tells all about a well developed religion and a well organized government. Nor is that all. Your own historical records do not go back with any reliability to beyond sixteen and possibly only fifteen hundred years anterior to Confucius. But our book has a vast history running a thousand and fifteen years back of that again, and before your people had any existence whatever. So here again when the heathen religions did proudly, we are above them. Among the Chinese, so proud of the ancient, the antiquity of the Bible in the hands of the missionary is handled like a sledge hammer and yet antiquity is a minor thing after all.

Now then, the work that used to be done in an elementary way in a heathen classroom is here written out in English with more of completeness, not adequate completeness, but enough to show what kind of a gospel we preach among the heathen, and which bringeth forth fruit among them, as it doth in all the world. And because it is a transcript not only of the work but also of the method found most available in a missionary class room, therefore those who glance at these pages will please kindly remember this fact, as it will serve to elucidate both matter and method, and furnish an apology, if apology is needed, for the divergencies from home styles which appear herein.

Here at home we systematize our theology, as we call it, in a way and manner not so good for Oriental minds. Thus we have a chapter on "Election," on "Predestination" and on other things. We cull out all the passages which bear on the particular subject in hand and mass

STONES IN THE ROUGH

them together. So that when it is election it is all "Election," and nothing else. We take the subject out of its setting and its relationship and then present it in a lop-sided way. When stated in connection with its antecedents and consequents, teachings and bearings, meanings are modified and made to be symmetrical and to harmonize with the system of truth as a whole. But when we separate them from their contexts we are apt to distort them. It is as if—because there is some iron in the blood, therefore we soak a lot of tacks, and give the student a decoction of iron rust;—and because there is some lime needed in the human system, therefore at the next meal we give him a glass full of lime water, and because there is some starch, therefore we prepare him a good feed of starch.

The Creator who prepares food convenient for us does not do that way. In the bread and meat and vegetables we eat, the iron, the lime, the starch and other ingredients of nourishment are combined in due proportions, and so we have a "wholesome diet." In the Bible spiritual aliment is served up the same way. History, doctrine, exhortation and warning are all presented in connection and relation. Take the Epistle to the Hebrews, as an illustration. The writer renounces some great truth, and at once applies it, before he comes to the next one. "Therefore we ought to give the more correct heed"; "Wherefore truly, brethren . . . consider," etc. "Let us therefore," etc. "Therefore leaving the principles," etc. Argument and exhortation are wonderfully blended. If the Apostle had followed our modern methods of summarizing he would have had all his exhortation packed at the end instead of being distributed along between, suggestive of the booth behind an old Concord stage coach.

In teaching theology to Chinese we are persuaded the newer Biblical method of incorporating theology in with history, and in getting much of its theology out of its history is better than what we boastfully call our modern, up-to-date pedagogy and our over-systematizing of everything.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

We do not say we can or ought to do differently here at home, but we can do differently abroad; and consequently the study of the Bible records, of the histories of the Bible, of the incidents of the Bible with interpretations and applications as we go along, enter largely into our teaching of Theology.

In another respect, greatly to our advantage, too, we think, teaching in the Theological class room abroad may differ from the same kind of work at home. The vastness of the critical apparatus at home and the minuteness of detail considered necessary to the ascertainment of truth leads to such differentiation of work that a survey of one book of the Bible or one part of the Bible is regarded as much as can be reasonably expected from any one man; consequently there is often seen an ill adjustment of parts and a disproportioned estimate of the Bible scheme as a whole, and therefore the value of the whole as a whole fails to be apprehended. It is as if a score of men, say, set out to furnish a model and a description of Antwerp Cathedral, for example. One comes with an exhaustive account of a *door*, another of a *pillar*, another of a *tower*, another of a *window*, but none of them giving anyone a conception of the stupendous building as a whole. The ancient Greeks had their jokers as well as moderns. One tells of a certain *skolastikos* (or simpleton) who, having a house to sell, brought a brick to show what kind of a house it was. With not a few people now-a-days the book of Jonah is the brick they bring to show what the Bible is.

In a missionary class room it is found better to begin by giving a compendious, all-inclusive survey of the Bible as a whole, and of the entire comprehensive plan of salvation as a whole, and take up details later. The evidential value of the manifest unity of purpose, unity of conception, unity of authorship, unity of architectural design and unity of execution which they are taught at every step carry with them a convincing power which is unanswerable and overwhelming. It is not so when an inverse method is pursued in such a way as to confuse

STONES IN THE ROUGH

and bewilder. This peculiarity of method is to be taken into account in what is to appear in the pages ahead. The desultory method of skipping about here and there, now and then, with its attendant lack of continuity, may do at home (if indeed it does do here at home), in Sunday school and other lessons, but it will not do the best there for the people out there.

And one more fact in connection with teaching Theology in a heathen class room is that we are largely shut up to one book—the Bible itself. Our biblical literature is meagre. We greatly need some helps, such as concordances, Bible dictionaries, Bible maps, simple introductory histories, and, to a limited extent, brief compendious commentaries by men skilled in the art of their preparation, and we are providing ourselves with these helps as fast as we can, but we have no such stream of books as is continually issuing from the press at home. This, in our present condition, is not without its advantages. As just said, we are shut up to the Bible, and we get on that way with as little dilution as possible. Our theological vestment is made largely out of one kind of goods, and ought not to resemble so much a patchwork quilt as does many a man's theology here at home, who thinks that he must read a new book on theology about every month. The consequence is that like those of the day of Jannes and Jambres of old, he is ever learning and never able to come to a settled knowledge of the truth. Because he believes a thing to-day it does not follow that he will be believing that same thing to-morrow. When a ship drags its anchor it drags along with itself a thousand persons who may be on board. It is bad enough for the captain, but it is worse for the passengers when the captain doesn't know how to moor a ship.

And lastly, we can arrange our theological material in simple and more compact form than is practicable at home, for the reason that we are not compelled to be controversial. It requires a deal more space when one has to dispute the track with a dozen disputants in order to make room for his own views. As yet we do not have this work to do.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

It will not always be so. The various varieties of the West will come along in due time, and then the clash of opinion will be heard in the far East as it is now in the far West. That is to be regretted, but there is no help for it. Meanwhile we take advantage of the state of things now existing to lessen the bulk of our matter.

While this is an extended preface, it is needed to account for peculiarities of method which will appear in the coming pages. Our native converts are in mind in all that is presented.

THE STARTING POINT OF INQUIRY IN ALL THEOLOGY, AS IN ALL PHILOSOPHY.

The starting point of inquiry in all theology, as in all philosophy, is one and the same. We naturally start, in both cases, from what we see around us, and what we find within us. The philosopher loves to call it the *Ego* and the *Non-Ego*—the “Self” and the “Not-Self.”

I start from the standpoint of my personal self, and from what I see in the visible universe around me. The reach of my thought is upward and outward and downward—what is above me, what is around me, what is below me, what is behind me and what is before me. From the visible I am forced to reason to the invisible; from the known to the unknown; from the tangible to the intangible; from that which is to that which has been and that which may be; from the material to the immaterial; and from causes to effects and from effects to causes. I am forced thus to reason; it is a tendency of my nature; it is a law of my being—that is, if I think at all it must be along the lines indicated, and in consonance with certain established categories of thought and feeling. I first observe and take cognizance, then I reason, and then I form conclusions. As just indicated above my perceptions and conceptions all group themselves in two classes—those which pertain to things outside of my personal self, and those which pertain to the inside of my personal self, or to my neighbors who are of the same kind of nature as myself.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

THE VISIBLE CREATION.

Above me, around me, under me, is a universe of matter. There are the heavens, the sun and the moon and stars. Their existence and their purpose are to be accounted for. The infinity of them all impress me—their number, their magnitude, their distance, their movements, the tremendous force that dominates them. The more I look the more I wonder. When it comes to the earth on which I live and move and have my being I am impressed still more deeply, because my discernments can now take in a greater number of minutiae. Here are marvellous organizations of matter and life that fill the air, the sea and the dry land. Then marvellous interorganizations run through them again. They are strongly linked and interlinked; they cross and recross lines of demarkation; they fade out of themselves and reappear in something else; they come and they go; they increase and they diminish; they are in a perpetual quiver with the phenomena of incessantly acting and incomprehensible law. Then there are elemental substances out of which the air, the land and the water are made—solid substances, liquids and gases. These disintegrate and combine; they attract and repel; the energy with which they sometimes do these things is positively fearful in the manifestation; and the velocity of movement, as in electricity, for example, is astounding and but for the verification of demonstration would be declared unthinkable. And then here is the light of day and the darkness of night; and here is heat and cold; and here is drought and here is moisture; and here is the continuous round of the seasons, coming and going forever, seed time and harvest, subject always to the same general laws, and yet always marked by variations which stamp each season with an individuality of its own. And then here are countless phenomena of all kinds all around me always happening and yet even now perpetually arresting my attention.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

MY PERSONAL SELF.

Even more perplexing and wonderful in some respects are the things which strike me when I come to the contemplation of my personal self. I am a part of that visible creation which has already profoundly moved me. Obviously I belong to the very highest grade. I can see plainly that I consist of a body and a soul. In my body of flesh and bones I am kindred to the beasts that perish. Yet in purely natural traits these very beasts are, many of them, in single particulars, far ahead of me. They can see further away than I can; can see into the nature of things by their natural senses as I cannot; they can see in the dark as I cannot; they have a power of endurance, a swiftness of motion, and a might of strength which I would give all I have to possess. But then I have an intellect of such vast and varied capacity that my reason is better than all their instincts. I am placed immeasurably above the whole of them, and am easily their lord and master. I am fitted for a more lofty position than I now hold. At some time or other my ancestors must have stood higher than I do now. To be sure I am advancing, but all around me and in me, are the evidences of a lapse at some time or other in the indefinite past. The strangest of all things about me—the most painful and inexplicable—is my consciousness of sin. I have sin and am a sinner. There is a double nature within me; there is a lordly power which accuses me when I do some things and commends me when I do others; the rewarding and the lashing power of this inner monitor are both of them exquisite. Why I should be so manifestly designed for a state of blessedness, and yet be so enthralled with a curse and be so continuously the victim of baffled expectations and blasted hopes is beyond my comprehension.

Nor am I alone in these things. I am only one of myriads in the same condition. In our aggregate totality we are moved and swayed by all sorts of social and intellectual movements that are race-wide in

STONES IN THE ROUGH

their dimensions. We have our own aims and our own plans and our own methods, yet it is apparent that there are other aims, and other plans and other methods of colossal sweep, over which we have no control. We are perfectly free, so far as we can see; and yet, with all our independence, we are all being borne along, constituents of that supreme plan, as the separate planks and timbers that form a drift are borne along on the flood of a swollen river.

INQUIRIES NOW FORCED UPON ME.

They all concern the universe that I see; they concern our common humanity; they concern myself personally and they concern me intensely; they are speculative and they are practical; they spring from the head and they spring from the heart. Though inclusive of many variations they are all reducible to four:—

Whence?

How?

Why?

Whither?

Whence came all these things as I see them—this sun, moon, and stars, and dry land standing out of the water and all that in and on them is? How is this universe put together? How are the parts framed and dove-tailed into each other? By what force are they made to cohere and to consist and to keep on their perpetual way? Why and for what purpose do they exist as they are? What are the immediate, what the remote, and what are the final ends to be subserved by continuance? Whither do they all tend? What is to be the final outcome of this complicated and unlimited mechanism? More than all that is outward, *Whence* came I myself? *How* do I exist? *Why* am I what I am? *Whither* do I go? And what is to become of me at the last? Will I die like a brute or will I live forever? Will I ever be rid of sin and suffering? Will I ever achieve a complete moral

STONES IN THE ROUGH

mastery of self? And will I ever attain to supreme and everlasting blessedness? If so, Where? When? and How?

THREE DOMAINS OF INQUIRY.

According as I devote myself to the elucidation of these inquiries, will I find myself in the domain of the Theologian, the Philosopher and the Scientist respectively, more or less.

A SCIENTIST PURE AND SIMPLE.

If I limit myself and profess to disclaim all regard for Archæological or Teleological origins and ends and am to be taken up merely with the mechanical and chemical How of all things, and to decline to make it much of a personal matter, then do I largely limit myself to the sphere of the Scientist.

AN ATHEISTICAL SCIENTIST.

If I start out with some sort of a set purpose against the supernatural, a disinclination to trace things up to a possible personality, and avow a purpose to confine myself to the mere linking together of physical causations alone, I have joined the ranks of atheistical Scientists.

A THEISTICAL SCIENTIST.

But if I am willing to recognize the existence of some infinite energy, somewhere or other, of a personal nature, and of some dominant and universal will power, then I am to be enrolled among theistical Scientists.

A PHILOSOPHER PURE AND SIMPLE.

If, after having collated a vast number of facts, I set out to account for them and to combine them into a coherent system, reducing

STONES IN THE ROUGH

many plans to one plan, many forces to one force, and many laws to one law, or to one law and a few cognates, then am I in the domain of the Philosopher.

AN ATHEISTIC PHILOSOPHER.

Here again, if in my search for a rational explanation I make up my mind before I start that I will steer clear of the necessity of recognizing a personal origin, and if I manage to keep clear of it by declaring it impossible to find out so remote and recondite a causation, then I am to be classed with atheistic, or agnostic philosophers, as the case may be.

A THEISTIC PHILOSOPHER.

But if I am willing to accept the deductions of logic and the evidences of intelligent purpose wherever I find them, and to follow them to where they may lead me, even if it be to the foot-stool of a personal God, then I am to be reckoned among devout and theistic philosophers. Yet so long as I leave out these personal considerations concerning sin and deliverance, and my personal relation to what may be superior and invisible intelligences around me, so long as I do this, I am a philosopher only.

A THEOLOGIAN.

When I make the whole subject supremely personal; when I subordinate all inquiries into the mere whence, how, why and whither of the material universe; and when I make dominant over all an inquiry into the ethics of existence, into the character of such superior beings as I am constrained to postulate, and of my relation to them, into the facts of my sinful nature, accompanied with a heart-rending desire to get rid of them, then am I in the domain of theology.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

THE FIELD OF THE LATTER WE NOW ENTER.

The latter is the field we are now proposing to enter. For the purpose of the present research we shall have but little occasion to touch upon purely philosophical grounds, and still less to deal with purely scientific issues, though, as we advance more deeply into the subject, we shall find ourselves supported by a more scientific view of science and a more profoundly philosophical view of philosophy than the non-theistic among themselves have yet been able to present.

WHAT WE KNOW AND WHAT WE NEED TO ASCERTAIN AS TO FURTHER CONDITIONS OF THE PROBLEM.

Relegating minor questions and subordinate issues to the background, and applying ourselves to theological and anthropological lines, we may summarize our needs as follows:

We need to know something about some adequate cause for what we see around us. Our observations lead us to conclude that that cause must be a unit, and all comprehensive; that it must involve a personality; and that personality must be living; must be omniscient; must be omnipresent; must be omnipotent; must be omniparient; and must be omniprevalent. The existence of such a being is demanded by all the elements of knowledge.

THE KNOWABLE ABOUT GOD.

Let us look into these affirmations, right at this point, and before we summarize our other needs. To anticipate a little; it is said that that which "may be known—is known;" the unknown can, to a certain extent, be learned from the known.

TESTED BY A HEATHEN SCHOLAR.

I once sat down to test the matter in a practical manner with a good Chinese reasoner and scholar. My point was to ascertain what

STONES IN THE ROUGH

can be learned from the light of nature about a supreme first cause. The lines of inquiry were indicated by the following questions:

I. As you look out on the things of the world around,—the things that are made, the order of occurrence,—the changes of seasons—and other things, Is it all mere hodge-podge and uncertainty? or is there order, and method, and system, and indication of adaptations of means to ends such as characterize intelligence and purpose.

II. Can you conceive of intelligence and intelligent purpose—inherent in senseless objects which can neither see nor hear—nor think—nor change, nor modify, or, must the intelligence you see imply a personality of some kind or other?

III. From all that you can see and learn, and from all that science teaches, would you infer that there are several different systems of law (of gravitation or of motion, or of light, for example), thus employing several different administrations, and several different administrators; or would you conclude that there is but one system of laws with but one administration and one administrator, and but one dominant purpose apparent in the universe?

IV. Would you conclude that this great world as you see it is fully run by itself without the slightest variation of any kind, at any time, in any place; or, are there so many variations that they involve the necessity of being looked after, by some one capable of it? Thus, for example, though a shower of rain, needful for the growth of a crop, is the resultant of certain established laws—yet there is an immense diversity in the times and modes of action of those laws. A typhoon which may be very destructive of life and property is also a product of fixed laws. Yet who knows when it is going to rain? Who knows where there is going to be a typhoon, how violent it will be, and which course it will take? And so with the working of a hundred other “fixed laws.” Is it necessary that there should be some intelligent and capable supervision of them all?

V. How much power must be possessed by the administrative

STONES IN THE ROUGH

intelligence which directs so many and such tremendous forces as are called into action, or retired from action, or reversed in operation, in such an amazingly complex machine as this world, and still more this almost infinite Kosmos, must be?

VI. How much wisdom must he be called upon to exercise in this same administrative work, to see that everything takes place in due order, that there be no collision, nor wreckages, nor disturbance of equilibrium, that would lead to confusion and to ruinous disaster? The question is not as to whether he may not have to exercise some wisdom, but is any very great wisdom essential?

VII. There arises another question. If human affairs require supervision, it might happen that while attention is needed in one place, some other place as far distant as America is from China might demand attention at the same moment of time. How could this living and intelligent personality act efficiently in both places at the same moment?

We were several hours on several different days working over these problems. We took plenty of time to think, and reasoned to and fro cautiously and carefully. The results were that this Chinese thinker reasoned out for himself as the first and the greatest of all our human needs exactly the things stated above, about a first cause, about a personality, about omnipotence, about omnipresence and about omniscience. Or, to borrow in advance of its proper place, the sublime, the profoundly philosophical and thoroughly scientific designation of the Apostle, "Eternal Power and Godhead," though as yet nothing conclusive beyond that, without some other and higher sources of enlightenment.

CONTINUED ENUMERATION OF OUR NEEDS.

And now further:

We need to have a rational explanation, at least in a general way, of the coming into existence of this present Kosmos and of the manner

STONES IN THE ROUGH

in which it is sustained; of the secret of its administration in a way which will satisfy us that order and not confusion, improvement and not destruction, will be the final outcome.

We need to have some clearly defined conception of our relation to the spiritual being whom we have already been forced to conclude must be in existence and is affecting us for weal or woe.

We need some satisfactory way of accounting for the existence of moral evil, and we need some assured hope of deliverance from it. We are appalled at this persistence of disease and death and at the spread of the perpetual curse. We want to be rid of the sin and the disorder which cause them all. We want hope, hope that will lift us out of this pit of despair.

We need a reinforcement of moral power, some infusion or transference of moral energy that will help us to do right and triumph over the debasement which continually works us into the quicksand. We want to be able to reach lofty ideals and not be grovelling and falling back forever.

In a word, we need life—the highest form of life—a life that shall satisfy our natures and fill all our mental, moral and spiritual receptivities as our present environment does not fill them now; and we need life more abundantly, some development or impartation of life that shall allow full scope to these god-like capabilities that we find to be in us.

THE SEARCH FOR LIGHT.

Where shall we go for light? In the olden times of Greek philosophy great students and thinkers were accustomed to go travelling abroad from city to city and from country to country seeking the acquaintance of men who might have anything new to offer. Girding themselves about, with drinking cup by their side and staff in hand the pilgrim searcher for truth set forth on his wanderings. In this we are ready to imitate him. We will interrogate those who profess to be

STONES IN THE ROUGH

guides to the blind, a light to them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish and a teacher of babes. We are willing to take pilgrimages to every shrine of knowledge, to every cave of the recluse heathen sage, to every academic hall of the philosopher, to every laboratory of the scientist. We will seek out the great teachers of religion, the great leaders in philosophy, the great discoverers in science, and will sit at their feet while we put to them the great questions of the human intellect and the human heart. *The When, the How, the Why and the Whither*—we will give them all a full and candid hearing. We will consider all their elucidations and ponder all their hypotheses. If they can answer all our questions satisfactorily then our pilgrimage will be ended. If not we shall have to resume our wanderings or throw down our pilgrim staff in hopeless despair.

WHAT ANSWERS DOES ANCIENT HEATHENISM GIVE?

What is known in our day as heathenism or paganism—the worship of the heather people or the peasant people—was in the earliest times of the Bible history known as “Serving other Gods.” It was God himself who framed that description. “Thus saith the Lord God of Israel; Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood, in old times, even Tarah the father of Abraham and the father of Nahor, and they served other Gods.” This designation is repeated so often as to make it generic. There was the worship of Jehovah—of the Almighty on the one hand, and of “other Gods” on the other, also called “strange Gods” by way of variation. The most ancient forms of heathenism known to us were the Babylonian and the Egyptian.

Among all the varieties of heathenism the Babylonian are the very earliest—was the least corrupted and the most lofty and dignified. They worshipped the sun, moon and stars—“the host of heaven.” They were the sources of light and heat and life itself, according to

STONES IN THE ROUGH

human estimate at that day. So they had the Sun God and the Moon God and various Star Gods, that ruled over human destiny, and brought around fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness as they arrived, and were worshipped accordingly. Bel or Baal stood for their primitive Sun God and was found in other ancient religions round about. The general name of Sabeism stood for the whole system of the worship of the Hosts of heaven, and gave rise to the science of Astrology, as it was afterwards called, and of some derivative kinds of heathenism which linger until this day.

Egyptian heathenism had in common with Babylonian heathenism "the Host of Heaven" as its foundation. The rising sun, the mid-day sun and the setting sun were separate manifestations of the same divine central energy. There were not a few great truths and great principles shadowed forth and held with less or more clearness. They held to a future state—they believed in a return of the departed spirit to the body it had forsaken—they believed in future rewards and punishments, and they had a surprisingly lofty code of ethics. Some surprise is expressed that in so early and primitive an age the ethical conception should have been so lofty. There is no justification for any surprise. The light of the primal knowledge of God had not all departed. It was rapidly deteriorating, but it was not so dull and tarnished as it afterwards became.

But though there is a twilight of comparative brightness, yet on the questions we have in hand, the *Whence*, the *How*, the *Why*, and the *Whither*, they furnish no satisfaction whatever. Their conception of God being wrong all else would be wrong. The conception of origins was confused and mythical. Their conception of the *How* was nebulous and irrational; their conception of the *Whither* vague and inconclusive; and as for the *Why* or the ultimate purpose of all these things it does not seem to have entered into their thought to ask about it. So they have handed us down nothing that we care to keep. There is no answer to the pilgrim's inquiries here; so he must move on to the next teacher.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

WHAT ANSWERS DOES HINDUISM GIVE?

In that ancient land of middle Asia called India, there is likewise a very ancient form of religion, united to a very ancient form of philosophy. The origin of this religion is far back in the depths of the remotest antiquity. Indeed, it connects with that still more ancient form of religion spoken of above, called Sabeism, or the worship of "the host of heaven." Its basal conception was of an original supreme essence called Brahm—from which was afterwards elaborated a trinity called Brahma, Vishnu and Sira, the Creator, the Preserver and the Destroyer, because to the minds of the men of that day all the phenomena of nature were comprised in consecutive administration of these three kinds in one continuous round—creation, preservation and destruction, and then again creation, preservation and destruction. They had what are called the Vedic hymns; and they had what they called the vedantic philosophy. The vedic hymns are permeated with a more theistic apprehension already degenerating into a polytheistic differentiation. The hymns mark the fading out of the primitive revelation; and the philosophy marks the coming in of human wisdom to explain the problems of being, now becoming an enigma.

We will go to this ancient land; we will visit the teachers and the anchorites of this ancient religion; we will walk through its sacred cities. We find that so far as the problems which concern us are involved, they have them, too. Whence came all things? Whence came we ourselves? and whither do we tend, and whither do all things tend? And sin! sin!! sin and suffering, are we ever to get rid of them? If so, when and where and how. If light is to come from a human source surely it must be from these acute Indian intellects.

We listen, we look; we ask questions, but alas, alas, what do we get? With some of them matter is eternal; with some there is a God, but he is forced to create. Their ideas of creation are a hopeless tangle and a nonsensical jumble. We hear of the world resting on the back

STONES IN THE ROUGH

of a tortoise—of an earth floating in a sea of milk. Those beings that they call gods roll up in number till they exceed three hundred millions; every rock and tree and river may have its god. These gods themselves fear death; some of them have a human ancestry; their habits are low; their practices are debasing; their occupations are sordid—grovelling appetites and carnal passions are characteristic of them all. A truly high souled, immaculate person does not exist among them. They have gods and goddesses that are monsters in form and structure, and unutterably vile in their conduct. They have deities that delight in bloodshed, deities that delight in drinking the blood of infants and that are painted as wearing a necklace of infants' skulls. They have Kali and Juggernaut, and they have the Thugs who worship with murder. Their social system is hateful and horrible. They have the awful tyranny of caste; they seek deliverance by self-torture, they have hook swinging and widow burning, and they throw infants to crocodiles. How is it possible that from such teaching there can come a ray of hope. They worship cows, and hope to attain deliverance by dying with a calf's tail in their mouths. Their kind of morality is disgusting and execrable; their sacred cities are cesspools of nastiness. As for hope there is none, as for redemption there is none; as for a redeemer there is none. They cannot tell me whence I came nor whither I go, nor how I can get rid of my burden of sin and suffering. Let me get out of their presence; give me my staff and let me move on.

WHAT ANSWERS DOES BUDDHISM GIVE?

But there is another great religion in India. It has become an international religion in Asia; it has hundreds of millions of followers. Surely a religion which has ruled for so long a time, and has held sway over so many unreckoned millions must have something that will afford us satisfaction. This religion was founded about two thousand four hundred years ago. It is in reality a recoil from the harsh deduc-

tions of Hinduism, and the clouds of despair which attended them. Sakya-muni, the founder, was a prince in a regal house, but of a gentle and kindly disposition, whose heart really ached at the helplessness of human misery around him. He retired from the world and gave himself up to abstraction and meditation. He professed to have found the source of all sorrow and the secret of all deliverance—all sorrow comes from unsatisfied desire, and the remedy for it is the total extinction of human desire, the absolute tramping down and smothering out of human affection.

In Sakya's rebound from the callousness and heartlessness of Hinduism, he went over to the opposite extreme and became silly in what men call humanitarianism. If a man's religion may be adjudged harsh in one direction, it may, with equal propriety, be adjudged flabby in another. Sakya deplored the sufferings of human kind, and on that account would not kill a flea; he preferred to let him bite him. There are men who criticise others for regarding God as one who hates and will punish iniquity, transgression and sin and themselves represent him as having the weakness of a granny.

Sakya Muni recognized the existence of sin as a fearful moral evil, but he could not tell how it came, nor how to get rid of it. With him also there was no God, no overruling Providence, no wise and able administrator of human affairs. With him also there was no explanation of the riddle of the universe—no solution of the problems of life and being; there was no redemption and there was no redeemer. There was blind fate and inexorable destiny. There was emphasized more fully than it had ever been before the old doctrine of transmigration, or of births and re-births innumerable. A man would die and might be born a bug or a monkey or a horse or an ass or an elephant, and then by some unforeseen mishap might lose all he had gained and be born next time a toad or an ant, and so on for untold millions of years.

To gain the mastery over sin and suffering he retired from the

STONES IN THE ROUGH

world and gave himself up to asceticism and meditation. At last under the Bo tree—which has ever since been esteemed by the Buddhists a sacred tree, he attained what he called Enlightenment, that is, he saw that by the extinction of all desires spoken of above he would accomplish his wish. When a man got to that state and had no more desire, but had turned himself into a fossil then had he reached Nirvana, or the extinction of all human feeling. So there he is made to sit—with his legs crossed, his eyes bent down on his stomach in a dull stupor of thought and feeling. It is of no use to pray to him, for though he has ears, and long ones, too, he does not hear; though he has feet he does not walk, and though he has eyes he does not see; and though he has hands he does not do anything,—never helps anybody, never cheers anybody. If the roof leaks over his head he can't move along to get out of the dripping water; if the white ants make a nest in his stomach he cannot get rid of them; he has got to let them stay.

What is there here that the pilgrim wants? Nothing whatever. Then again let him fill his gourd with water, and his haversack with dried provisions. Let him gird himself up afresh, take his staff in hand, and resume his tiresome tramp.

WHAT ANSWERS DOES CONFUCIANISM GIVE?

The pilgrim now finds in northern and eastern Asia a third religion. It is called Confucianism. The great expounder of this wisdom of his day lived about twenty-four hundred years ago, not far from the time of Sakya Muni. It was a great age of the world for the rising up of reformers. Confucius, though, was not primarily a religious teacher, as was Sakya Muni. He was a statesman, and his aim was to lay the foundation for a firm and wise administration of civil government. In doing this he saw that it was necessary to enunciate distinctly the ethical relations that should obtain among the different branches of the human family, as the prince and the people, husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbors and friends. His ideal

STONES IN THE ROUGH

state, therefore, is built on a moral basis, and on that account it takes the place of a religion and is commonly spoken of as such.

A peculiarity of the Confucian system is that it recognizes all the requirements of the second table of the Law as written on the natural conscience of men, but it totally ignores the requirements of the first table. Therefore Confucius pressed on the observance of men all the moral obligations due between man and man, but never pressed the obligation due from man to God.

He anticipated by more than two thousand years those of our day who teach what is called "humanitarianism," and that if we do the best we can in this world we can afford to let the next world take care of itself. He taught a morality without Godliness, and he has raised up a generation which has demonstrated to the rest of humanity that a morality of conscience alone, and which has no holy God behind it to enforce it, becomes nerveless and powerless.

Confucianism has another striking peculiarity. He constructed for the instruction and stimulus of his followers what may be called an "Ideal Man." He himself could point to no ideal man in any one personality, but he took the various excellencies of many men, each one of whom excelled in some one particular thing, and combined them in a personality which he called "the accomplished man" or "the perfect man," or, as we would say, the "ideal man." It was a masterpiece of pedagogy.

But when it came to the attainment of this ideal manhood, and which was the only way to get rid of sin and its attendant suffering, then help there was none. Each man who aspired to rise above the common herd must take hold of his boot tops and lift himself by the sheer power of his own will and the goodness conceived to be lodged in himself. Failing in that he must remain the opposite of the ideal man—a mean man, or a low grade man, or a "groveller" forever.

And with these things Confucius stopped. As for throwing any light on the great questions up before us, the Whence, the Why, the

STONES IN THE ROUGH

How and the Whither of all things, and of myself in particular, he did not do it. Indeed, he discouraged the search. If you do not know time, how can you know eternity? As for the Gods, the way to deal with them is to treat them respectfully and hold them at a distance.

Here it is again,—the same gross materialism; the same dire helplessness, the same crass ignorance, the same feeding on ashes. No personal God—no creator—no beginning of things—no ending of things—no redeemer of men.

Not yet, weary pilgrim with the worn and withered staff; not yet are you to make the gladsome cry—Peace and rest at last!

WHAT ANSWERS DOES PHILOSOPHY GIVE?

For the purpose of our present inquiry, philosophy may be defined the endeavor to find out the origin, the methods and the purpose of all things—the facts and the phenomena of all existence by the use of human wisdom alone. For some hundreds of years after Noah's day there was no human philosophy in this sense, for there was as yet no need of any. Men all knew whence all things had come—the knowledge of God had not yet departed. But as soon as the light of the original revelation had faded away, and men found themselves in darkness, then the search for a primal cause began.

The Greek philosopher, Thales, instituted a search for the "Arkee," or the first and essential element of all things. He declared that it was water, because he found water entering so largely into created substances. In prosecuting the search this was found not to explain all the phenomena of being, and thereupon another school of teaching arose, which declared it was "air." But this, too, failed, and then arose system after system of explanation. Before long men began to discover their own mental limitations, or, in other words, the inadequacy of their apparatus. Since that time philosophy has been busy alternately studying the nature of the human understanding (as did Locke), or the limitation of religious thought (as did Man-

STONES IN THE ROUGH

sel), or metaphysics as distinguished from physics (as did Sir William Hamilton), or the categories of pure reason (as did Kant) between that on the one hand, and applying their new conclusions to the elucidation of the great questions, Whence, Why, How and Whither on the other.

In some directions philosophy has rendered excellent service. In another it has signally failed. There are defects in its hypotheses—defects in its instrument of discovery, defects in its methods, and consequent defects in its conclusions. The subject is as broad as the field of human thought. With these aspects we, here, have nothing to do. We are only concerned to know how far it deals with our own great problems. It is enough to say of it that while it has had a period of over three thousand years in which to exercise its powers, and has had some of the most capacious intellects the world has ever had to work at its furnaces and its forges, yet it has furnished nothing which promises to be satisfactory. It does not know whence we came; it does not know whither we tend; above all things it has no clear knowledge of a living God; it has no remedy for sin; it has no cure for the ills of human life; and it has no redeemer.

The most conspicuous figure in its entire history is its restless, unsatisfied longing. It is by turns, one after another, an Epicurean; a Stoic; it ridicules with Democritus; it despairs with Zeno; it is semi-theist, it is an atheist; it is an agnostic; it is a sophist; it is an oracle; it is a teacher of babes; it wears a fool's cap. In its ranks brainy men and brainless fools are classmates; know nothings and know everythings are bed-fellows. Its votaries ask for bread and it gives them a stone; they ask for fish and it gives them a serpent; it asks for an egg and it offers them a scorpion. Poor, miserable, discontented beggars, what business have they to ask for what is not in the larder!

It is plain there is nothing to satisfy the pilgrim here. By the time he is almost around the globe—the way he long has sought he has found it not. Not yet, not yet, can be heard the voice, "Hie thee to thy quiet home."

STONES IN THE ROUGH

WHAT ANSWERS DOES SCIENCE GIVE?

Now we go to Western lands. It is there that modern science has achieved its highest development; and it is there that it appears with its own most highly lauded fruitage. Science to-day is confident and boastful. It does not claim to have got there yet, but it claims to be able to see through and to discern the coming end and finalities of things.

Science claims to be exact, therefore it professes not to build on hypotheses but on ascertained facts and unquestionable phenomena of nature. It claims also to have discovered the mode of creation, which it says is by a continuous and unbroken evolution of one thing out of another, by some sort of a force resident in the evolving substance itself. It claims also to have discovered that all this evolution takes place in accordance with certain fixed and unchangeable laws. Things always have evolved in this way; they always will evolve in this way. Science deals with causations and effects as it professes to see them in the physical world. It seeks to deal with all things and to describe the phenomena of nature all sufficiently, in terms of matter, force and motion.

But now while we are struck with how much science knows, we are impressed far more with the vast amount that it does not know; as their field of discovery widens, their field of the unknown doubly widens. They burrow in the narrow spaces of the finite; beyond them, out of reach of their investigating apparatus, of their microscopes, their telescopes, their scales and measures, their crucibles and their retorts,—all around them, above, below, to the right and to the left, is the infinite, the unknown, and so far as they can give us any assurance to the contrary, the unknowable. Yet here they are, speaking too often and too many of them with puffed-up dogmatism, not having probed to the bottom of any one of the small mysteries within their reach, and yet presumptuously pronouncing on the profound mysteries beyond their reach, and to be known only to faith through some divine revelation, if such a thing there is to be.

STONES IN THE ROUGH

In consequence of the narrowness of the method, and the still greater narrowness of their lines of vision, men who ought to be the wisest of mankind are in certain respects the most ignorant, and do well to call themselves agnostics, as it is in the Greek language, and ignoramus in the Latin. As for that great primal, intelligent, omnipotent, omniscient cause which I have postulated must exist somewhere, they can tell me nothing about him and know nothing about him. So they cannot answer my inquiry as to the Whence of all things or the whence of anything primal, save that it originated from something still more primal. All they know about is a sort of jelly called protoplasm—but where did this protoplasm come from? Did it come from star mist? and how did it come to possess such marvellous capacity to develop all things from its own lordly jellyship? As to the How, science, as we have just said, has discovered some things, and it will discover more, but while it has discovered a little something of many things, it has not discovered all of anything. As to the Whither of this universe it knows nothing, nor can it tell Why and for what great and ultimate purpose it all exists. But most of all, sin! sin!! again sin and death, the infinite beyond and the infinite forever. Am I to escape, and if so, how, when and where? Science does not know; science does not want to know; science takes no interest in such things. Science studies hard to eat, drink, and be merry in this world of confusion. Science wants to pose as a scientist only, not as a theologian, not as an ethicist, not as a sinner seeking salvation. Science, according to its recent advanced teachers, is coming to be a pantheist along with the Hindus. So, pilgrim, get thee gone.

We have completed our long and weary round of travel. Our search has ended in nothing. We are no better off than when we began. Physicians of no value are they all. Ashes of Sodom are in what they claimed to be apples of gold. Footsore and weary we come back. Our pilgrim staff and pouch we toss on the ground, and throw ourselves down beside them in despair. We repeat the everlasting

STONES IN THE ROUGH

question of old,—Whence then cometh wisdom and where shall the place of understanding be found?

“But where shall wisdom be found and where is the place of understanding? Man knoweth not the price thereof, neither is it found in the land of the living. The depths say it is not in me, and the sea saith it is not with me. It cannot be gotten for gold, neither shall silver be weighed for the price thereof. It cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir, with the precious onyx or the sapphire; the gold and the crystal cannot equal it, and the exchange of it shall not be for jewels or fine gold. No mention shall be made of coral or of pearls, for the price of wisdom is above rubies. The topaz of Ethiopia shall not equal it, neither shall it be valued with pure gold. Whence then cometh wisdom and where is the place of understanding. Seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living and kept close from the fowls of the air. Destruction and death say we have heard the fame thereof with our ears.”

The case is not hopeless; there is one teacher more.

WHAT ANSWERS DO THE SCRIPTURES GIVE?

We turn away from Vedic hymns, from Shasters and Upanishads and Cataneæ, and Analects, for one and the same reason that, while they contain much that is good, yet for the purposes of our present inquiry, they present not the order and fruitfulness of a well cultivated garden but the wildness and barrenness of a dreary desert with nothing but its crop of sage bushes to tantalize the anxious eye and intensify the gnawing hunger.

We turn to the book called the Bible. The earlier parts of it are ancient, more ancient than any of the hymns of the Vedas, and than any of the Chinese classics. It does reply to these great questions one and all. With scientific details and philosophical formulas it does not deal. They enter not into its supreme and majestic purpose. These are left for men of wisdom to “search out and set in order” for

STONES IN THE ROUGH

themselves; but in all that relates to an all-sufficient primal cause, to intelligent ends and purposes in creation, to an accounting for the origin of sin, to a way of escape from it all, to a hope of final restitution and eternal redemption, it is as full and explicit as any reasonable being can ask for.

Its first opening sentence is a blaze of sunlight, "In the beginning (was) God." From that on the whole pathway of the race is lit up at every stage. The book tells us about just such a Being as we have been forced to postulate, just such a self-contained and all sufficient Being, himself the only self existent, as we have been inquiring about; the life giving and the all mighty, whose "kingdom ruleth over all." It tells us that by the word of this all mighty being the worlds were framed so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear. It accounts for the origin of sin. There were angelic beings of lofty dignity and amazing power. They were created pure and holy; they were overcome with a sense of their own greatness; they toppled over into self-confidence and fell. When the new race was created, the leader of this fallen host succeeded in inoculating it with his own diabolism, and the reign of sin on earth began. But from it all a ransom has been found and a deliverer to be testified in due time. In the end righteousneses will triumph, moral energy will be imparted from a new life-giving source, sin will come to a finish, there shall be no more death and there will be new heavens and a new earth. This strangely compounded book called the Bible, starts out with man in the garden of God; then a sinner; then an outcast; then a wanderer down into and over across an awful valley of the shadow of death; then upward again, until finally the regenerated part of the race is anew introduced into the garden, where flows forever the river of the water of life, and on the banks of which grows the tree whose leaves are for the healing of the nations.

All this is something tangible. So far as our own personal requirements are concerned it does furnish answers to the questions,

STONES IN THE ROUGH

Whence, How, Wherefore and Whither; and incidentally it does throw incontrovertible light on these same questions as applied to the universe at large. It is the only positive answer that has ever been given. "For of Him and through Him, and to Him are all things."

Having thus come to this book, we now propose to enter upon the study of it, and to examine it through and through; to begin at the beginning and to follow its development as one would follow the course of a river from a bubbling spring in the distant mountains down to the coast where its gathered flood of waters debouch into the illimitable ocean. We shall study its doctrine of God, its doctrine of angels, its doctrine of man, its doctrine of sin, its doctrine of redemption, and its doctrine of rehabilitation and of "all things new." This is the starting point of our Theology; and these are the lines along which the structure is to be built. If, in it, we find a complete and consistent unity of plan worthy of the greatness of the demand, and of the High and Lofty One who is said to inhabit eternity, and if we find that it meets the needs of the human intellect, the human conscience, and the human heart, we shall accept it as the verifying test of ultimate and eternal truth.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01251 6029

“STONES IN THE ROUGH”

IN FOUR PARTS

PART I. The Mode of Approach and the Reason Therefor.

PART II. The Theology of Nature.

PART III. The Theology of Revelation.

The Theology of Revelation In Sixteen Courses of Thought

- I. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Themselves.
 - II. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning God.
 - III. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Angelic Beings.
 - IV. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning the Material Universe with Man Over it All.
 - V. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Government, Physical and Moral.
 - VI. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Sin and the Curse.
 - VII. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning God the Father, Preparing the Way for Redemption.
 - VIII. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Christ the Son Achieving Redemption.
 - IX. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning the Holy Spirit Administering Redemption.
 - X. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning the Church of Christ Proclaiming Redemption.
 - XI. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Evidences to Go Upon.
 - XII. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Spiritual Pedagogy.
 - XIII. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Divine Providences.
 - XIV. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning the New and Divine Life in Man.
 - XV. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning Last Days and Last Things.
 - XVI. The Doctrine of these Scriptures Concerning the Ultimate Universe.
- PART IV. Related Subjects and Issues.