

ARTICLE VIII.

ILLUSTRATED SERMONS, OR TRUTH ADDRESSED TO
THE EYE.

BY REV. W. B. BROWN, D.D., NEWARK, N. J.

WHILE conceding that the Lockean philosophy, which claims that knowledge is communicated to the mind only through the senses, is unfounded in fact, we must yet concede that very much of what impresses our mental faculties comes to us from sensation. And we must further concede that the eye and the ear are the most important of all the avenues to the soul. Through these gateways a vast proportion of what we learn and feel, of what moves and moulds us, finds entrance. It is not necessary that we should put the eye and ear into comparison for the purpose of deciding their relative importance; for both are well nigh indispensable. Take either from society, and civilization could not survive. Yet if one or the other must be dispensed with, it were better that we should be deprived of hearing than of sight.

I have felt for years, and more and more as the years have passed on, that it was not only possible, but most desirable, that the eye should be addressed more directly and extensively than it has been in the preaching of the gospel. We have contented ourselves with speaking to the ear alone, when we should have addressed the eye as well. We know how much of interest is imparted to a discourse from seeing the speaker and noting his attitude and gesture. Half the effect, sometimes more, comes of this. If, now, the very truth that is spoken to the ears of men could, at the same time, be represented with equal or greater clearness to their natural vision, an impression of double intensity would be produced. The attention would be riveted, and the truth, seen with a twofold vividness, would be impressed on the

mind with a twofold power. Two reflectors, having a common focus, intensify the light.

Almost any subject suitable for popular pulpit discourse is susceptible of definite and forcible pictorial illustration; so that the field, instead of being narrowed to a few special topics, is as broad as the world. Even the abstract problems of mathematics and of astronomy are made clear to the mind by means of linear drawing. No professor would undertake to teach these sciences without his diagrams and charts. Indeed, without these he could not comprehend the subject himself, much less teach others. In geography maps are indispensable, and in all the natural sciences pictures of various sorts are of great advantage. Indeed, printing itself and all written language are no more than visible symbols addressed to the eye. If, now, in physical and mathematical science, and in the science of language, pictorial representation is of such conceded value, we should reasonably infer that in the department of moral truth it should hold an equally conspicuous place; especially, when we reflect that of the two fields moral truth is the more susceptible of elaborate and impressive illustration.

To make preaching to the eye effective, it is, of course, necessary that the views presented shall be large enough to be distinctly seen by the audience, and sufficiently artistic to be attractive to the eye. But most of all, they must have such clearness and boldness of outline and such detail that the common observer shall be as able to read and realize their meaning as he is to understand the accompanying discourse. A picture, like a sermon or a book, is of no value except for what it teaches or impresses. If a discourse is confused, showing confusedness in the mind of the speaker, it is nearly or quite worthless. So of a picture; its creator must be able to see the end from the beginning. His work of art must tell plainly its own story, or it is not worth looking at. A picture that requires a written explanation, or that when the subject is known does not explain itself, or which cannot be read as we read the printed page, is a failure.

The subjects that are most easily represented to the eye, and that require to produce them less of artistic skill than do others, are those that have a distinct geographical or topographical or historic basis. For example, illustrated sermons on such topics as Christ at the Sea of Galilee, Christ weeping over Jerusalem, Paul's shipwreck, Abraham and Lot separating, Gideon and the Midianites at Esdraelon, Elijah on Carmel, and hundreds more of their class, are so easily represented on canvas, and furnish such ready material for impressive discourse, that they had probably best be selected at first by those who have had little or no experience in this method of preaching. Afterwards it will be found easy to take up ideal topics for the presentation of more abstract themes; such, for example, as on the rock and on the sand, the two paths, Sinai and Calvary, the parables of our Lord, the underlying ideas of our popular pictorial hymns, or the various pen-pictures of the Bible.

But the purpose of this paper is not so much to explain how the pictorial presentation of truth is to be accomplished as it is to unfold the underlying basis on which it rests, and which commends it as an important and impressive method of preaching the gospel.

1. There is a foundation and demand, and so a philosophic basis, in the constitution of the human soul, for pictorial representation. And this statement is applicable to art generally, whether it be in the department of sculpture, architecture, or painting. These all are addressed to the eye, and they all speak a universal language that is understood and enjoyed by universal man. The architect who built, and the artist who adorned, St. Peter's Church address and impress alike, through the eye, every beholder. Sculpture is not less instructive and impressive than painting. I would as soon use for the preaching of a sermon Thorwaldsen's group of Christ and the apostles as I would Raphael's Transfiguration or his Judgment Scene. But for obvious reasons, and chiefly those of convenience and cost, if preaching to the eye is to become general, pictures, rather than sculpture

or architecture, must be used. Let us see how these fit into the constitutional needs of the soul.

Take the little child, before he is able to read, or, except in small part, understand ordinary discourse, and he loves his picture-book and appreciates its meaning. He sees and enjoys the idea of a dog, cow, pig, or horse long before he is able to read the letterpress description. And this liking for pictures is never outgrown. With adults the well-drawn likeness of some strange animal, or of some striking scene in nature, or the portrait of some unknown person often gives in one moment a truer and better conception of the original than could be obtained by any amount of thought or reading. Illustrated books, if the illustrations are good and numerous, are sought after and prized, almost regardless of what else they contain. And the demand for this sort of literature has come to be so great that not only our daily, weekly, and monthly periodicals, but standard works have to be profusely illustrated in order to assure circulation. Dictionaries, even, are made picture-books to meet the popular demand. Appleton's Picturesque America, Bryant's New History of the United States, books of foreign travel, and literary works in general seem to be more prized for their illustrations than for the letterpress. Who that takes a new book in his hand does not first of all turn to the pictures as if they were the chief attraction, thus revealing that between them and the mind there is a natural affinity?

If, now, we turn from books to the art galleries of the world, and observe their attractiveness, we have another phase of the power of pictures to instruct and impress the human mind. One chief charm of foreign travel is to see and enjoy what the art galleries of the old world have to offer. Many a one has journeyed hundreds of miles to look only for a few moments upon a single picture, — Rubens' Descent from the Cross, for example; but that one look was a recompense and enjoyment forever. What would Rome or Florence or Vienna, or Paris even, be without their works of art. Travel would lose all its charm but for the objects

of interest that flash on the vision to instruct the mind and move the heart.

Just now this nation has celebrated its centennial anniversary. All the land has rushed to Philadelphia; and the great attraction in that magnificent bewilderment of curiosities consisted in the works of art there collected. Take the art galleries and the art products from that interesting show, and the charm is broken; its interest is gone. The pictures and statues there exhibited, if their worth were measured in gold, would almost exhaust the wealth of nations. There are single paintings in Europe that could not be bought for millions. But their gold value is of little consequence, except as it shows the power they have over human heads and hearts. And this same thing is illustrated, in a small way, by the efforts that are put forth everywhere to adorn our homes with works of art—the poor with inexpensive, and the rich with costly, pictures. But whether rude or regal, they instruct, elevate, and refine those who live in their companionship.

Another indication of the mind's adaptedness for pictorial illustration is presented in the opera and theatre. These have been immensely attractive in every age and nation. Grant, if we must, that they have been largely of evil tendency; this detracts nothing from their effectiveness and suitableness to impress the human mind. And what is it that gives to these places of amusement such increasing popularity? It is not what is spoken there; for the compositions that are recited are seldom read from books. The most of what the multitudes know of Shakespeare is what they have seen and heard in theatres. It is the pictorial representation, the scenery, the costumes, the groupings, the tableaux, the acting generally, that attract and impress. Take these from the theatre and the opera, and they would be deserted at once. True, the opera has the additional attractiveness of music; but painting and music have kindred elements, and there is no more evidence of the adaptedness of one than of the other to provide for the constitutional

needs of the soul. While I would not commend operas and theatres as they are at present conducted, yet I confidently believe that operatic and theatric performances of a moral and religious character might be inaugurated that should prove greatly useful. The highest and most effective style of popular teaching, could it be rightly conducted and controlled, is the theatric style. And it is worth while for Christian people to inquire if there be not some way of wresting this popular and powerful method of reaching and impressing men from the service of Satan, and giving it to the cause of Christ.

But my one object in all these references to the adaptedness and power of pictorial representation to impress and instruct all classes of mind is to suggest, and to emphasize the suggestion, that the basis of it is in the nature and needs of the soul itself. God has made us to be so impressed, which is but another way of saying that God has sanctioned, if not necessitated, pictorial teaching. We shall have it somewhere and of some sort, and we can have it, and ought to have it, in the Christian pulpit. The preacher should reach the mind through the eye, as well as the ear. In this way he will obtain greatly augmented power, and will help to grasp God's agencies from the enemy, and to employ them in the service of Christ. Thus much upon the point that the pictorial presentation of truth has a philosophic basis.

2. My second argument for pictorial preaching is drawn from God's method of teaching and impressing truth as it is seen in the material world. I know that God speaks to men sometimes, and powerfully, by his Spirit; but he speaks to them constantly through his works. And when the Spirit of God communicates truth to the souls of men, the figures of speech or emblems of communication employed are what nature furnishes. Without these there could be no teaching, or at most but little. Our conceptions of heaven, of angels, of God himself, and of the whole unseen world take shape and proportion from the visible objects of earth. It is only by means of things seen and temporal that we can grasp and

compass things unseen and eternal. Nature is God's panorama, passing constantly before the eye of the universe, to impress himself upon it, and to instruct rational, and even irrational, creatures of things which they need to know as conditions of life and well-being. Nature is not the ultimate, but only the pictorial representation of the ultimate. Here lies the grave mistake of one class of naturalists. They see physical nature only, and do not realize that these visible forms are but the outward and pictorial representations of invisible things, which alone constitute the real and the final. The physical world is allegorical; it carries a meaning deeper and richer than itself. It is but the magnetic wire, stretching from sun to sun and from system to system, and touching all visible objects, along which the invisible truth of God perpetually flashes. "The true theory of the universe," says John Harris, "is, that it is a vehicle or medium constructed expressly for the circulation and diffusion of God's love." The visible universe is a type and expression of the invisible. I believe that Swedenborg's law of correspondences, though often perverted, contains a vastly important truth. The visible everywhere shadows the invisible, much as pictures convey to the mind objects which they are made to represent.

Now, my point is, that nature is intended of God to be man's great teacher, and that those who teach others should study and imitate nature's methods, and address the eye as well as the ear. The heavens above, whether viewed in the golden splendor of noonday or in the stellar brilliancy of midnight, in the purple glow of morning or in the gorgeous glow of the setting sun, are God's great painting to instruct and impress the universe. The earth beneath and around us, with its forests and vales and mountains, and infinitely diversified scenery, whether viewed amidst the buddings and rich bloom of spring, or in the warm, leafy robes of summer, or amid the fruitage and parti-colored foliage of autumn, or beneath its winter winding-sheet of snow and ice,—however and whenever viewed, it is God's landscape spread before us

for study, enjoyment, and profit. The vast ocean with its islands and coasts, near and remote, the cloud-land, now as distant mountain ranges, and now as a canopy of light hanging over it, and winged vessels like angelic throngs drifting on its surface, — whether seen in storm or in sunshine, in calm or in tempest, — is God's sublime painting, in which he mirrors forth himself and his truth to men. A storm at sea is one of the grandest sights, and most impressive of things infinite and eternal, that mortal vision ever gazed upon.

Turning, now, from the vast to the minute, we find that nature presents everywhere the most beautiful pictures, fitted to instruct and impress every thoughtful beholder. We have only to look on some quiet pastoral scene, stretching from vale to hillside, with its flocks and herds feeding in the cool morning or seeking shade at midday; or upon some beautiful grove skirting the river-side, its branches waving in the breeze, and the sunlight peeping through them; or upon some gay harvest scene, where the ripened grain, dancing in the wind, is being garnered by swarthy husbandmen; or on some family group at the old hearth-stone, on Thanksgiving eve, "where age and childhood meet and mingle into one," — we have only to contemplate these, or other of the numberless pictorial scenes that nature everywhere presents, and we at once realize the place and worth of pictorial representation. If the preacher of the gospel would learn from God in nature how to present the truth, he will address the eyes and ears of men alike; he will preach by pictures, and not pen pictures alone.

Let no one assume that such teaching would be vague and indefinite; for, if properly done, it would be quite the opposite. A single glance over Switzerland from Mount Riga, looking northward over the undulating plain and across its flashing lakes, or east and south where in snow-clad magnificence "Alps on Alps arise"; or a single glance at the famed Yosemite valley from Inspiration Point, where the lofty rocks and broken walls, stretching ten miles

away, presents the appearance of a vast but indescribable ruin, gives a clearer and more detailed knowledge of those wonders of nature than any written or illustrated lecture could possibly convey. A picture can never equal, but it may approach, the reality; and if well executed it may be almost as instructive as the original. Indeed, a picture has the advantage, often, of bringing distant scenes into such close proximity that the relations of one part to the other, and of each to the whole, are better seen and realized from the copy than they could be from the original; so that the sketch may be even more pleasing and impressive than the scene from which it was taken.

Thus God, on a scale of boundless extent, and with measureless power, speaks to the eyes of men; and we, in addressing each other, should adopt God's methods as we find them everywhere in nature. The obstacle to be overcome is, that most people go through the world with little or no artistic vision. Humboldt and his horse travelled together over the same mountain ranges, and looked upon the same scenery; but the effect produced by what they saw was strangely different. Many human beings who go out into the wonders of nature are, as to artistic vision, more like Humboldt's horse than like Humboldt. There is need of artistic training, both on the part of those who preach and of those who are preached to; and of this I may speak briefly at the close of this paper. My purpose here is only to illustrate that if we would adopt God's methods of imparting instruction we must, in addition to oral teaching, and in conjunction with it, address the eye by means of pictorial representation.

8. My third argument for pictorial illustration in the pulpit is drawn from the Scriptures themselves, — not so much from what they say as from what they are. If the Bible and nature are both from God, we should expect to find a correspondence between them. If one is pictorial, so should the other be. Now, from Genesis to Revelation the Bible is full of pictures, of sign-language, addressed either to the eyes of men or to

the artistic elements of their nature. Whatever appeals to the imagination is, to that extent, a work of art. The imagination is the constructive faculty. Its office is to take disjointed and scattered elements, and construct them into a completed whole, as the architect constructs his building or the artist his picture. Every man whose imagination is well cultivated and developed is at bottom an artist. He sees with the artist's eye, he speaks or writes from the artist's stand-point. All things come up to him in the picture form, and he recalls from the past what has been pictured on his memory even when he forgets the circumstances out of which the picture was created; so that if the picture was at fault his memory will be also.

Now, when I say that the Bible is throughout very largely pictorial, of course I do not mean that the Bible is full of actually painted pictures (though many of our Bibles are); but I do mean that the Bible is the reproduction, much of it, of real pictures, which the writers saw by natural or supernatural vision. God inspired and instructed them by means of pictorial illustrations; and what they saw in pictures they give us in pictorial form. And I mean more than this — I mean that another large portion of the Bible is literally a pictorial representation addressed to the eyes — a sort of sign-language that conveys truth through the senses, chiefly the sense of sight. In the partial *résumé* that I propose, I shall not always sharply distinguish between what was clearly pictorial to the writer, and what he has made so to us literally or by figure of speech.

If the story of the creation of the world and fall of man, as given in Genesis, is rather an allegoric representation of the facts than a literally historic narrative, as many of our best biblical scholars now contend, then in this opening record we have the grandest picture ever sketched. And if it be literal history, Moses must have taken it not from the facts themselves, but from some picture of them presented to his vision. So that in any view the story of the creation involves picture-making as an element of the Bible. And clearly the whole

system of sacrifices, commencing at the fall of man and running through the Old Testament and into the New, was, and was intended to be, an illustration of truth addressed to the eye. The altar, the slain animal, the fire, the ascending smoke, the priestly robes and attitudes are all visible representations. If they were not literally pictures, they were for my purposes the same thing; they were attempts to instruct the mind and impress the heart through the eye. And it is more than probable that the true doctrine concerning God, and sin, and purity, and forgiveness, and atonement could not have been taught in any other way. Throughout the Mosaic ritual the eye, more than the ear, was directly addressed. Indeed, in the Mosaic service no provision whatever is made for oral teaching. It is throughout scenic — addressed in solemn silence to the eye alone. The building of the ark, and the deluge itself, took on the picture form. They spoke to the eyes, not to the ears of men. True, they were somewhat more than pictures, but they contained the pictorial basis. The same remark applies to the tower of Babel, and to the confusion of tongues there witnessed. Patriarchal life in the Old Testament is filled with pictures. Abraham going at the call of God to seek the land of promise, his conversation with angels, and his offering of Isaac; Jacob's vision at Bethel, his wrestling with the angel, and the strange, sad events of his old age; and the life of Joseph from commencement to conclusion, were all the lessons of God's providence addressed to mortal vision. The story of Moses throughout is one continuous panorama, with accompanying oral explanation. His hiding and finding in the bulrushes, his smiting of the Egyptian, the burning bush on Mount Horeb, the changes of Aaron's rod into serpents, the series of mighty wonders wrought in Egypt for the deliverance of the people, the opening of the Red Sea, the daily manna, the awful scene of Mount Sinai, the cloud by day and pillar by night, the tabernacle and its whole ritualistic service, the forty years of wandering, the vision of Moses from Mt. Nebo, and the manner of his death are all

in their nature pictorial — put before the eyes of men to impress the truth of God. The story of Joshua, of the judges, and of the kings both of Judah and of Israel presents to us not pictures wrought by human hands, but representations addressed to the eyes of men, wrought of God himself, and having the same end in view that pictures of our making, by way of imitation, strive to attain. The prophets abound in pictorial teaching. So numberless are their sketches that I cannot catalogue them. Jeremiah's almond-tree and seething-pot, and his figs good and bad; Ezekiel's wheels, high and lifted up so "that they were dreadful"; his chambers of imagery, and his man with the inkhorn; the plumb-line of Amos and his basket of summer fruit; Jonah's gourd, if not Jonah himself; the candlestick and the flying roll of Zechariah — all these are but specimens of the numberless pictorial devices addressed to the eye with which the prophets abound. The splendid prophecy of Daniel was made from pictures that God himself produced, and which the prophet, seeing, has graphically described.

And the New Testament is not less pictorial than the Old. The grandest fact in the universe — the incarnation — is God's endeavor to bring himself, his attributes, and his character, before human vision. God, who was obscured and incomprehensible, was now made manifest in the flesh. All the circumstances of Christ's coming into the world were pictorial. The manner of his birth at Bethlehem, the angels, the shepherds, and the wise men, his flight to Egypt, the scene in the temple, his baptism and the descending dove, the temptation in the wilderness, his miracles addressed to the eyes of men, his parables, themselves pictures, and founded mostly on familiar scenes in nature — all this was the pictorial preaching of the Son of God. The two ordinances of the New Testament, — baptism and the Lord's supper, — like the Mosaic ritual which they supersede, are purely a representation to the eye; one being the visible sign of inward purity, and the other, of our Lord's sacrifice for the sins of the world. His death on the cross, his burial and

resurrection and ascension were not pictures, indeed, but they were the most powerful sort of illustrated preaching, addressed to the eye of the world, and perhaps of the universe.

The Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles, even, abound in visible representation. The scene of the cloven tongues of fire on the Day of Pentecost, Stephen's vision at his martyrdom, the healing of the impotent man, and the death of Ananias and Sapphira, Peter's vision of the great sheet let down from heaven, Paul's conversion and much of his life, and the manner of delivering the apostles from prison — these and such like scenes owed their power largely to the fact that they were scenes which men looked upon.

The Apocalypse is one long drawn-out panorama, containing the most wonderful series of pictures ever beheld. John saw them literally, and he makes us see them by his graphic description of what he saw. The candlesticks, the seven seals opening into the seven trumpets, and these again into the vials, to be followed by the beasts and the horses and the scarlet woman, are almost to us, as they were to John, literal visions to be studied and interpreted. When, at the close of revelation, God would give us some just conceptions of heaven, he builds before us a vast city, with gates of precious stones and streets of gold, and innumerable multitudes, with harps and trumpets, singing hallelujahs to God and the Lamb.

Thus the Bible is throughout pictorial, addressed to the eyes of men, and especially of those who wrote it. Its attractiveness and abiding power are due largely to its pictorial character. Take away its sign-language of various sorts, and much of the charm would be lost. Now, if God has employed pictures and visible representations so largely in giving us the Bible, we should employ them in the interpretation and enforcement of what it contains. Could we, as the Bible does, put the pictorial element into our popular teaching, the effect, if not doubled, would be greatly increased. We can do this somewhat by word-painting; but if we add to this visible representation, our word-painting even will be

doubly effective. And nothing cultivates so much the power of word-painting as an attempt at pictorial illustration. One who makes pictures on canvas, will be likely to make them in popular discourse, especially if his canvas contains the subject and illustration of that discourse.

4. My fourth and last argument for pictorial preaching is drawn from the place it has held in religious history, both pagan and Christian. Until within about one century art has been, as it largely is yet, and ever must be, the handmaid of religion. For ages it was the popular method of religious instruction. The Egyptians and Assyrians taught history and religion by means of pictures chiefly, as their ancient monuments reveal. The old Greek and Latin mythologies were preserved and expressed by sculpture and painting. These arts were then essentially religious, and were employed for religious teaching. Pictures and statues of Jupiter, Venus, Hercules, and other of their deities and heroes, constituted the sacred works of those remote ages, and they impressed and held the popular mind with wonderful and prolonged power.

For fifteen hundred years, in the history of the Christian churches, the pictorial presentation of truth was not less prominent and impressive than it had been in systems of Pagan worship. Especially from the fourth century to the sixteenth, the church, such as it was, was more dependent on art for its popular teaching, than upon any, if not every other appliance. An educated monk was an artist; and in this his education chiefly consisted. Many of this class could not read or write; and those who could, spent years in illuminating and illustrating the Bible, where they spent days in directly teaching the people by word of mouth. The result was that every church and convent and town was filled with pictures, all of them intended to teach and impress religion. Madonna and Christ scenes, with other Bible illustrations, were found everywhere, and were everywhere looked upon with reverence, if not worship. Of course religion with only such teaching became sentimental and

imaginative. It was even found an easy and not incongruous thing to introduce heathen works of art into Christian companionship; so that Jupiter was baptized as Jehovah, and the Greek Venus became the holy Virgin. So exclusively was art the religious teacher of those generations that churches and cathedrals were built and decorated, not as places where the truth of God was to be taught orally, but that the edifices themselves might teach and impress the people. It is scarcely a hundred years since art began to be divorced from its exclusively religious wedlock. It is probable that prior to that date such a worldly and wicked thing as a landscape painting, executed according to the true laws of perspective, was never made, if it was ever attempted even. In figure and group scenes these laws were understood and applied perfectly; but their application to landscape painting is wholly a modern invention, I might almost say discovery; and it is one that should be turned to moral and religious uses.

These illustrations of the place and power of pictorial presentation in past ages, and in religious history, indicate the place that art should still have in the department of religious teaching. I would not go back to the old methods, neither would I exclude them. They were not chosen and continued through all those centuries arbitrarily. There is a call, a fitness, a need for them, in the nature of things. Old methods must now be modified, but they cannot be rejected without great loss to the cause of religion.

It was a weakness in the old Puritan and Roundhead reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that in their opposition to popery they fell into the opposite extreme, and became iconoclasts. John Knox and the reformers of Scotland pulled down the popish cathedrals, and burned their images and pictures. Their motto was, "Tear down the nests and the rooks will fly away." The cathedral at Glasgow was splendidly painted; and, because its utter demolition was opposed, a compromise was made, and its decorated walls were white-washed. In this way many splendid fres-

coes were thought to be destroyed. But the present generation, at great labor and cost, has removed the lime, and in part restored the old pictures; a fact that shows the drift of interest in Christian art now, as compared with then. The time will doubtless come when our Protestant churches, striking the happy medium, will be decorated, more or less, with paintings of real merit, and of a high moral and religious character, that will greatly impress, educate, and refine the people.

If it be objected that a resort to the pictorial presentation of truth in the pulpit tends to a ritualistic service, as practiced in the Mohammedan, Greek, Roman Catholic, and some Protestant churches, my reply is, that even such ritualisms have, in the past, served some good purpose, and my objection to them as now practised lies mainly against their puerile character. They are fitted for the infancy and not the manhood of society. The priest's robes, the burning lamps, the censers, the altars and bloody sacrifices, were all needed by a nation of slaves who were to be educated into the knowledge and worship of the true God; but when that was reached they had served their end. Hence Jesus and the apostles discarded them. The people who now resort to such puerile devices as wearing a white robe to suggest the idea of purity, or of bowing before an image to suggest the idea of worship, or of having a trail of white-robed boys to suggest the idea of angels, or of burning candles to suggest the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, ought to be children; or if they are grown-up people they should have been born four thousand years ago.

The pictorial illustrations that I would gladly see introduced into the churches should mean something. The arbitrary, and often ludicrous, blackboard sketches that are prepared for Sunday-schools have very little to commend them, except that they are a feeling after something higher and better. What is needed is the bringing to our churches of artistic and powerful representations of divine truth, addressed to the eyes of the people, and accompanied by

manly and graphic descriptions; thus by a double agency enforcing the leading thought contained in the picture. When this is done attention never lags, and the truth that was both seen and spoken makes an impression on head and heart that can never be effaced. To do this is to make place in protestant Christianity, but in a new form, for that old and powerful system of art teaching that has prevailed in the Romish church.

Thus from four sources of argumentation — from man's mental constitution, from the methods of nature, from Bible precedent, and from the history of religion — I argue the desirability and practicability of preaching to the eye as well as ear, and I claim for it an improved method of instruction.

I realize that there are difficulties to be overcome in employing it. The great obstacle is the want of artistic skill on the part of public teachers. Clergymen now, unlike the old monks, are not generally artists. It is desirable that each preacher should be the author of his own picture, as he should be of his own sermon, and for substantially the same reasons. To accomplish this some instruction in perspective drawing and in water-coloring, either in the theological seminary or at an earlier period in one's course of study, would seem to be both desirable and practicable. And the same reasons that call for teaching in oratory would justify instruction in the rudiments of art. Only rudimental knowledge is absolutely requisite. One must have a clear conception of what he wishes his drawing to express; he must give to it unity of plan and simplicity of arrangement, not overcrowding and confusing it with needless and irrelevant detail. In a word, the very qualities of a good sermon that is to impress truth through the ear, are the qualities of a good picture that is to impress the same truth through the eye. The painting and the sermon must be a unit, proclaiming together the same thought.

Let no one be discouraged until he has made faithful and persevering endeavor as to his ability to do this. Success is the child of endeavor. At first one may need some help,

and may succeed but poorly, whether as to his drawing or as to its exposition. But after a few attempts he will gain confidence, and find himself making bold and impressive outlines, on heavy paper background, say four by eight feet in extent, and so richly tinted in water colors that, to persons not close at hand, they will seem to be genuine works of art; and in drawing and perspective they will be. And such a picture-sermon he will, to his own astonishment, be able to produce by the work of a single day, or even less. And when his picture is completed his sermon will be made with it. His imagination will be set aglow, and his discourse, sustained by the illustration, will be in demonstration of the Spirit and with power. Let no one, I repeat, be discouraged who has not made the attempt. Success will be worth more than its cost. Where there is a will there is a way. In the words of an old Latin proverb, "They can, because they think they can." "Before the close of this century," said President Hitchcock, in one of his illustrated geological lectures, "pictures will be as much used in the preaching of sermons as are manuscripts."

Vol. XXXV. No. 139.

72