

ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTES.

JOHN ELIOT, THE APOSTLE TO THE INDIANS.

SPECIAL attention has been called to the life and work of the Apostle Eliot, by the observance last October of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of his first preaching to the Indians. Some new facts have been brought to light by recent investigations. It is possible to form a more intelligent idea of his missions, and of their results, than it was a few years ago.

He was one of the first generation of the Puritan ministers in New England. Born in Widford, a small parish, twenty-five miles north from London, in 1604; the third child in a Nonconformist family of seven, brought up in Nasing, Essex County, from which so many of the Colonists of Massachusetts came; educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he received the degree of A.B. in 1623; employed as a teacher in the Grammar School at Little Baddow, under Thomas Hooker,—he was abundantly prepared for his work in New England. He sailed from England in the "ninth month," 1631, in the good ship *Lyon*, and was landed in Boston, November 3d of that year. He was at once employed to preach in the First Church in Boston, in the absence of their pastor, Mr. Wilson, in England. He was married the next year to that "beautiful Puritan maiden," Hannah Mumford, and was settled as pastor in Roxbury, November 5, 1632. His ministry, of almost sixty years, in that church, was much like that of the other Puritan pastors of the Colony. He was a very able and a well-read man, a careful student of the Bible and of the theology of the Reformers. He was an earnest and faithful preacher. He had a special interest in young people. His conversation was "sprinkled with wit." "His manner," we are told, "was commonly gentle and winning; but when sin was to be rebuked, his voice swelled into solemn and powerful energy. On such occasions there were as many thunderbolts as words."

Why was it that this earnest pastor of the church in Roxbury became the missionary to the Indians? Because the Pilgrims and the Puritans had crossed the sea as missionary colonies. Governor Bradford says that one reason for coming to New England was the "great hope and inward zeal of laying some foundation for propagating the kingdom of Christ in the remote ends of the earth." The Massachusetts charter states that the

principal end of the plantation was to "winn and incite the natives of the country to the knowledge of the true God and the Saviour of mankinde." The seal of the Colony had the figure of an Indian, with the words, "Come over and help us."

In the earlier years they were not able to carry out their missionary plans in any systematic way. The struggle for a bare subsistence absorbed their energies. But they cherished friendly relations with the Indians who came every day into their settlements. They were an imitative race, and susceptible to acts of kindness from their Christian neighbors. Some of them in the early years gained a knowledge of the Christian religion. A few became members of the churches. As early as 1632, Roger Williams began to study their language with a view to preaching to them. In 1636 the Plymouth Colony provided by law for the regular preaching of the gospel among the Indians. Eight years later, the younger colony of Massachusetts Bay requested the ministers to report what means could be used for the more systematic instruction of the Indians; and in 1646 the General Court directed the ministers to select each year two of their number to preach to the Indians. This was a signal for definite and systematic work. The idea of missions was in the air. The ministers were studying the language of their dusky neighbors, and the people were praying for their conversion. It is not surprising that a number of the Puritan ministers, at about the same time, began to preach to them.

John Eliot was among the first of these missionaries, and he was in some respects the most eminent. He says: "God first put into my heart a compassion over their poor souls, and a desire to teach them to know Jesus Christ, and to bring them into His Kingdome. Then presently I found out a pregnant-witted young man, a servant in an English family, who pretty well understood our language, and well understood his own. Him I made my interpreter."

Mr. Eliot's first effort to preach to the Indians was not successful. They gave "no heed to his word, but were weary, and despised what he said." The next effort was at Nonantum (now Newton), October 28, 1648. It was only four or five miles from his own house. He went in company with three of his friends. The Indians had come together, in the great wigwam of Waban, to meet him, and to hear his message. He preached to them for an hour and a quarter from the vision of the dry bones in the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel. But he knew better than to follow his text. He began with the ten commandments, explaining the meaning of each one, and showing to the Indians in what ways they were every day breaking the law of God. He told them that God was angry with them every day for their sins. Then he told them of the Saviour whom God had sent to save lost Indians; and that if they would put away their sins, and ask God to forgive them, his anger would turn away, and he would love them as his dear children.

This was the beginning. He went again by invitation two weeks later.

The Indians at Neponset asked him to preach to them, and for some months he went once a week to Nonantum, and once a week to Neponset. He catechised the children. He gave the Indians opportunity to ask questions, and the most useful part of these services was their inquiries, and the replies of the missionary. He was invited to preach in a number of other Indian villages in Eastern Massachusetts, and he went as frequently as he was able, to tell the "old, old story."

All the accounts that have come down to us indicate that there was a genuine religious work among the Indians at that time. They left their old religion and worship, and began to pray, not only by themselves, but in their families, and to return thanks at meals. They taught their children, as far as they were able, and asked for teachers and for schools. They began to keep the Lord's day, and to meet by themselves, when Mr. Eliot could not be present, to pray, and to speak of the things they had learned. Waban, the most intelligent of them, took the lead in teaching his people, and in the devotional services.

A few months later, the Cambridge Synod met for its second session, and Mr. Eliot was permitted to assemble the praying Indians from the neighboring villages, and to preach to them in their own language in the presence of the Synod. He catechised the children, and the Puritan ministers were delighted not only by the attention of the people to the word, but especially by "the readiness of divers poor naked children to answer openly the chief questions that had been taught them." From that time, this work had a large place in the sympathies and the prayers of good people, not only in New England, but in Great Britain, where narratives of these events were published and read by great numbers of the people.

It was a cardinal principle with Mr. Eliot that civilization must go with religion. The savage must form habits of industry before he could have strength of character to live an honest and virtuous life. He thought it necessary to separate the praying Indians from their tribe and gather them into villages by themselves, where they would learn the ways of the English, and be under English laws. He established the first Indian Community at Nonantum, where the General Court "purchased land for the Indians to make a Towne." He furnished them with tools such as the English used, and promised to pay sixpence a rod for all the stone wall they would build. In the course of two or three years it was found that this reservation was too small, as the number of praying Indians was increasing rapidly. It was also too near the English settlements. In 1650 he secured a larger grant of land at Natick, on Charles River, eighteen miles southwest from Boston. A town was laid out with three streets, one on one side of the river, and two on the other, with a foot-bridge, built by the Indians, across the river. A house-lot was assigned to each family. They built a large frame-house for the common use,—the first story of which was used for a school on week-days, and for a church on

the Lord's day,—the upper story as a store-room for their furs and other articles. They also built a fort for defense against hostile Indians. They cultivated a large tract of land, and became a prosperous agricultural community, regulating their own local affairs, while submitting to the laws of the Colony in matters of general interest. Natick was the model for a number of Indian communities which were organized within the next twenty-five years by Mr. Eliot. Each of them had its reservation secured to the community by the General Court. Each of these reservations included from four to seven thousand acres of land. In 1674 there were fourteen of these communities of praying Indians, each with its native preacher and its schoolmaster. Mr. Eliot trained twenty-four Indian preachers, some of whom he "set over their churches," in true apostolic fashion, while he employed others to preach among the pagan Indians. These communities included eleven hundred persons at that date. Many of them had been baptized, and were living Christian lives. A smaller number had been gathered into Indian churches.

The funds for this extended missionary work came from Great Britain. When Mr. Eliot began to preach to the Indians there was not a Protestant missionary society in the world. Very careful accounts of the work among the Indians were printed and sent to England, such as the *Day Breaking*, the *Clear Sunshine*, etc. These excited so much interest, that a corporation was established by act of Parliament, with the aid of Cromwell, then Lord Protector, with the title: "The President and Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England." Several thousand pounds sterling were sent to New England by this society, within the next thirty years. With this money they paid the salaries of missionaries, built the Indian college at Cambridge, educated native preachers, printed the two editions of the Indian Bible, and assisted the Indians in procuring tools and other things for their farms.

The translation of the Bible into the language of the Massachusetts Indians was regarded by Mr. Eliot as the great work of his life. For almost forty years he was preparing for this translation, and carrying it forward. The language had never been reduced to writing. It was especially poor in words to express spiritual truth. Mr. Eliot had no companions in his work except such Indian interpreters as he had taught to read and to write. He had the care of his church at Roxbury, through all those years, the care also of the Indian churches and communities. He made frequent missionary journeys into the wilderness, to establish new missions. It is very wonderful that the translation was finished at last. The first edition of fifteen hundred copies was printed in Cambridge in 1661-63. This lasted about twenty years, and it was the cherished household book in hundreds of Indian cabins. The second edition of two thousand copies was printed in 1680-85. The expense of the two editions was about two thousand pounds.

In these three ways,—by preaching to the Indians, and gathering them

into communities and churches; by forming the first Missionary Society in England, the pioneer of so many other Protestant missionary societies; and by his translation of the Bible,—Mr. Eliot was laying a broad foundation for missionary work among them. He confidently expected that the Indian race would become Christian within a generation or two.

But the Indians in New England were comparatively few. Some authorities place the number, in 1675, at thirty thousand. The highest estimate I have seen is fifty thousand—a number less than the population of a city of moderate size. They had been decreasing for some years before the English came. The tribes of the great Algonquin family were jealous of each other, and often at war.

The missionary work was limited to the smaller tribes, such as the Wampanoags and the Massachusetts. Mr. Eliot tried in vain to get a hearing for the gospel among the more powerful tribes, such as the Mohegans and the Narragansetts. It may be that the segregation of the praying Indians into communities tended to hinder the work. Modern missions have been conducted on a different plan. Certainly the pagan Indians were jealous of the Indians who had become Christian and were hostile to them. Still the work was pushed vigorously by Mr. Eliot and his collaborators, and it continued to extend up to the time of King Philip's war. It is very likely that if peace had continued the Narragansetts, at least, would have become Christians. In 1675 there were about thirty-six hundred praying Indians in the whole of New England, with at least six organized churches.

The great war interrupted the work, and swept away the larger number of the Christian Indians. Philip was a vigorous and crafty leader of the hostile tribes. There was a reign of terror for about three years. The burning of villages, the massacre of women and children, the infernal torture of prisoners, roused the Colonists to a vigorous and, in the end, a successful war. The praying Indians were crushed between the two forces. They were not trusted by either party. As a class, they were loyal to the English. Several hundred of them enlisted in the army, and did good service. Many of them lost their lives in the course of the struggle. When the war was over, the survivors came back to their old settlements. But they were few, and disheartened. They found their homes in ruins. The war had almost exterminated the Indians of the Eastern Colonies. After that time, they no longer appeared as an important element in the population.

Mr. Eliot resumed his work as soon as the war was over. He endeavored to gather the survivors into their old villages, but they were never the same people again. They faded away year by year. The Indian race lacked iron in the blood,—vigor of purpose,—power to resist temptations to intemperance and other vices.

Mr. Eliot's last years were busy years. He went regularly among the villages. At the age of eighty-three he was still preaching to the Indians

once in two months. In 1684 he wrote that the villages of praying Indians were reduced to four. "There is a cloud," he said, in his old age, "a dark cloud upon the work of the gospel among the poor Indians. The Lord revive and prosper the work, and grant that it may live when I am dead."

His prayer has been answered. His shining example as the pioneer American missionary has helped to keep alive the interest in missions. It was a hundred and twenty years from John Eliot to the American Board. Many of its most successful missions were among the Indians. Thousands of the red men are reading the Word of God in their own languages. John Eliot did not live in vain.

EZRA HOYT BYINGTON.

NEWTON, MASS.

SCIENCE AND THE SUPERNATURAL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA :

DEAR SIR :—In the *Tribune* of Sunday the 14th appeared an article entitled "Religion and Science," in which I find the following expressions: "In the opinion of many clear-minded Christian thinkers a point will soon be reached—if indeed it has not been reached already—when no compromise with science will be possible. Christianity cannot throw supernaturalism overboard without ceasing to be Christianity. But can it retain its belief in the supernatural and at the same time accept the methods and conclusions of science? . . .

"They believe that ultimately religion must fight science, and that therefore all attempts to temporize with it are not merely useless but harmful."

I desire to express most emphatically, both as a man of science and a professor of religion, my dissent from the views expressed and implied in the above quotation.

In the first place, as a man of science, I would protest against the suggestion that the methods and conclusions of science are in any way inconsistent with the acceptance of the supernatural.

What is the supernatural, in the view of science, except that for which nothing that we know or have deduced in the way of law or the observable succession of phenomena will account? In other words, any inexplicable phenomenon, until an explanation is discovered, is supernatural, i. e., beyond the application of what we call natural law.

The rainbow was a supernatural phenomenon prior to its explanation; and in my opinion the hatching of a chicken from an egg is just as much beyond the reach of our present scientific knowledge as to its cause and origin as is the restoration of vitality to a dead body.

Unless, then, the man of science is assumed to believe his knowledge to be final and complete (which I am confident all men of science will disavow), it is not reasonable to assert that to him anything claimed by

enlightened believers in historic religion as the foundation of their belief is inconsistent with a strict adherence to the methods and results of scientific study. In other words, the man of science studies the phenomena which are within the ever-enlarging range of his powers of perception and deduction, and he would be simply abandoning the methods of his own subject if he went beyond this range to deny the existence of that which is outside of his present horizon.

To make my meaning plain I had best take a concrete case. The man of true science, as I understand him, is not, and certainly need not be, an atheist. Without pretending to know *how* the universe came into existence, he does not believe that it is eternal or created itself. He is therefore entirely at liberty to assume, as the only remaining hypothesis, a creator, who must certainly be supernatural.

Again, the man of science finds himself surrounded on all sides by forces, the origin of not one of which, from gravitation to thought, has he made the least progress in explaining. We know no more to-day than did the first man, by what means the sun reaches out through millions of miles of space and holds the planets to their orbits, and the same is true of every other form of force. We only know that, judging from their effects, these forces are omnipresent throughout the universe; omnipotent, as controlling everything; and omniscient, as adapting their influences to the ever-changing configurations of the bodies on which they act. What is more, the man of science sees that these forces in the past have acted in the direction of an evolution from the lower to the higher, —physically, intellectually, morally.

In view of all this, what more consistent with the methods of sound scientific induction than the foundation of an hypothesis that the supernatural creator of the universe was and is the supernatural but immanent source of the past and present forces of the universe?

The man of science of course will not claim that he knows this in the way that he knows that an unsupported weight will fall to the ground; but he can accept this hypothesis as freely as he does that of the luminiferous ether, and proceed with his investigations of phenomena and their relations as freely, in the presence of this supernatural final cause, as he can proceed in his investigations of the phenomena of light in the presence of the hardly less transcendental hypothesis of the luminiferous ether with its supermaterial properties.

The conflict between Science and Religion only arises when one party or the other transcends his own limitations and assumes a knowledge which he does not possess.

Thus, when theology claimed that facts of science were taught by the Bible, and denounced those who said that the earth's motion, and not the sun's, caused day and night, because the Bible taught the contrary, a conflict resulted whose consequences were most disastrous. So again, when certain men of science assumed that because they could not find in

the range of scientific research evidence of a future existence, none such was possible; they likewise went beyond their controlling limits in placing ignorance as a foundation for conclusion, and another conflict was developed.

In the words, however, of John Fiske, in that admirable little book "The Destiny of Man," "The materialistic assumption that there is no such state of things" (a future life), "and that the life of the soul accordingly ends with the life of the body, is perhaps the most colossal instance of baseless assumption that is known to the history of philosophy."¹

The past conflicts of Science and Religion have been fought over errors, on one side or the other, arising from dogmatism on each side as to matters outside of its own range of knowledge; and in my opinion, in place of an inevitable conflict in the future, we have reason to look for a gradually developed and perfect agreement as each comes nearer the truth by extension of knowledge. In the eloquent words with which Mr. Fiske concludes the book above referred to, "The future is lighted for us with the radiant colors of hope. Strife and sorrow shall disappear. Peace and love shall rest supreme. The dream of poets, the lesson of priest and prophet, the inspiration of the great musician, is confirmed in the light of modern knowledge; and as we gird ourselves up for the work of life, we may look forward to the time when in the truest sense the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever, King of kings and Lord of lords."

HENRY MORTON.

STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

March 24, 1897.

EDITORIAL NOTE ON GENESIS AND GEOLOGY.

APROPOS of President Morton's note on page 468, it is but fair for me to say that "the general views" in which we are represented to be in accord do not include our critical opinions concerning the origin of the Pentateuch, for I have not yet been convinced of the soundness of the arguments adduced for a late date of that literature, and my experience in attempting to verify the conclusions of Professor Driver and the class of critics to which he belongs has not given me unquestioning confidence in their methods of reasoning. I may add, also, that prolonged attention to the subject has increased my respect for those who have sought a positive harmony between the geological history and the system unfolded in the first chapter of Genesis. It has seemed to me that the opponents of all attempts at positive harmonization have too generally failed to appreciate the peculiarities of popular literature as distinguished from scientific, and have assumed that the freer handling of language, appropriate

¹ Twenty-second edition, p. 110.

to popular presentation, is incapable of giving any expression to general truths. In this respect it has seemed to me that Gladstone has a great advantage over Huxley. The principles of interpretation of Genesis upon which Huxley has insisted would totally fail of attaining the truth when applied to general literature.

Viewed in this light, the obscurities in the first chapter of Genesis seem of slight importance when compared with the numerous clear coincidences. Still I do not object to being held in the main to the brief statements made in "Studies in Science and Religion" in 1882, and in "The Divine Authority of the Bible" in 1884, portions of which are appended:—

"In seeking to draw out a close parallelism between the progressive stages of geological and paleontological development and the six days of creation described in Genesis, the error is twofold. First, there is no such sharp distinction between geological periods as was formerly supposed. The gaps in the geological record are so many and so great that the apparent evidence of sudden changes is probably delusive. Changes in the fossils of succeeding strata, which were formerly considered the results of *convulsions*, are now accounted for on the supposition of *migrations*. Geologists are more ready than formerly to reckon the realm of their ignorance as greater than that of their knowledge.

"In the second place, it was not modern science with which the sacred writers wished to be reconciled, but polytheism which they wished to cut up root and branch, which gave rhetorical shape to the first chapter of Genesis. Followed by the traditions of polytheistic ancestors, tainted by the polytheistic conceptions of the Egyptian people from whom they had escaped, and surrounded by the civilized worshippers of Baal and Ashtaroth, the children of Israel needed to have the unity of God emphasized. Historically it can be shown that the first chapter of Genesis has had more influence in disseminating correct views of the divine unity and personality than all other literature put together. Now what does it say? Why, it denies the plurality of gods. It denies it both in general and in detail. It affirms, in general, that God—the God of Israel—created the heavens and the earth. The writer then descends to particulars, and affirms (1) that it was this same one and true God who created the light which some ignorantly adored as itself divine; (2) it was also the same God that ruled both the sky and the earth. (3) The fruitfulness of the earth, which some worship as the manifestation of a particular divinity, is also the gift of Israel's God. (4) The sun and moon are not to be worshiped; God created them. (5) Why worship the sacred bulls and cats of Egypt, when it was God who created every living thing—the beast of the field as well as the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea? (6) Finally, God created man, and set him over all the things he had made. Why should the lord of creation bow down to stocks and stones?

"Such, to the contemporary of Moses, was the purport of this most remarkable 'poem' to God's revelation of man's condition and ground of hope. It should be remembered that the first chapter of Genesis had the same editorial supervision with the ten commandments. When thus we consider it as a protest against polytheism, and an enforcement of the first two commandments, it seems an impertinence to endeavor to find all modern science in the document, however easy it may be for science to find shelter under the drapery of its rhetoric."¹

"Another view, however, has been entertained in recent times by many eminent scientific men. This view regards the six days of creation mentioned by Moses as six great periods or cosmogonic days, which are supposed to have marked the progress of the earth's creation up to the advent of man; and it certainly is a most remarkable occurrence that centuries before the Christian era an orderly account of creation should have been written into which it is so easy to adjust all the facts of modern science. Even the theories of evolution, so far as they are capable of proof, find little to oppose them in this remarkable composition. As Professor Guyot has pointed out, the language of Genesis would necessitate only three distinct periods of creation, leaving the rest to proceed by natural processes."

"Thus, according to our author, 'the question of evolution within each of these great systems—of matter into various forms of matter, of life into the various forms of life, and of mankind in all its varieties—remains still open.'

"On either of these theories of the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis, it certainly is a marvelous result that a cosmogony should have been presented at that early day in language that can be easily interpreted so as to avoid conflict with the science of the present day. No other religious system has a cosmogony with which the men of science can by any possibility be at peace."²

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT.

NOVEL BIBLE HISTORY.

[The April number of the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* contained an article by ex-President S. C. Bartlett, cited from the *Advance*, in refutation of an editorial statement of a religious journal, that the law of Moses authorized the Jew to sell diseased meat to the foreigner. He furnishes also the following note along the same line.—EDS.]

In the previous note, an editorial statement of a prominent journal, that the law of Moses permitted the Jew to sell diseased meat to the foreigner was shown to be baseless and unjustifiable. Other equally inconsiderate editorial declarations appeared in the same number of the paper.

¹ *Studies in Science and Religion*, pp. 365-367.

² *The Divine Authority of the Bible*, pp. 197-199.

or not long before and after. Coming from other sources they would not require attention, but when such things appear in a religious and denominational journal, they should not pass unchallenged.

The article referred to also declared, "Moses, David, Elijah, Jeremiah, Peter—indeed all the apostles—made mistakes while they were attempting to interpret to men the will of God." Understanding that there is no intentional ambiguity in using the word "while" instead of the accurate word *in*,—which would reduce the remark to the truism that all men make mistakes,—we ask for proof of this sweeping assertion, or even of a part of it. Errors and sins in their personal character and conduct are obvious and unconcealed. But that when they claimed to interpret God's will to men they made mistakes, remains to be shown. Elijah fled in despondency, but when he interpreted God's will, whether to Ahab or to the prophets of Baal, where was the mistake? Peter failed in conduct at the Corinthian church; but his teaching had been the same as Paul's (Acts x.), and he had simply failed to conform to his own express teachings, and for that "he was to be blamed." What particular teaching of his first (and undisputed) Epistle would our editorial friend reckon among his mistakes? And when he so easily expands the remark to include "all the apostles," will he please to inform us what particular information he has of the mistakes of Bartholomew and Lebbeus and Simon Zelotes and Philip, for instance, in attempting "to interpret to men the mind of God"?

In the same article and in the same strain we read, "Christ often in his teaching corrected the ethical positions of his apostles." Certainly, while they were in training, and doubtless afterwards, if by "correcting their ethical positions" is meant disapproving their *conduct* in some instances, rather than withdrawing their apostolical authority—which is a very different thing. Surely the writer cannot have forgotten that Christ did not pronounce them fully equipped for their work as apostles till they had, after his death, tarried at Jerusalem, been "endued with power from on high," had "the Holy Ghost come upon" them, and then been definitely appointed "witnesses unto me unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 2-8). After this complete qualification, which of the attempts to interpret the mind of God contained in the writings of John, James, Peter, Paul, will he point out as the "mistakes"? Our editor indeed recognizes the promise, for he adds in the next sentence, "He [Christ] promised them that the Holy Spirit should guide them into all the truth"; but the very next words bring them down again to the common level,—"and that promise is as truly for us as for them." If this ambiguous phrase "as truly" means *as fully*, that is, with the same inspired authority, then Christians generally will prefer the teachings of Paul and John to those of "us." To which of the editorial "we" has the Saviour said, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven"?

Equally emphatic and more distinct is the statement just before: "Our appeal to holy men of old is never to what is final authority, independently of the Holy Spirit illuminating our own minds." This is a very novel discovery that the final authority of the apostles or of Christ—or any "final authority," human or divine—depends for its reality on the degree of "illumination" in the subject of it. Was the decalogue not an authority, and a "final authority," when the Jew had "a wicked *mind*," and "the imaginations of an evil heart"? Are not Christ's declarations concerning the new birth, and the necessity of faith on himself, final authority, and "independently" of our illumination?

Not to fail of being understood, the writer adds, in the next sentence but one, "The exhaustive word concerning the character of God and his will has not been spoken yet." Who is to speak it? A greater than Jesus Christ? We pause for a reply.

In the same article we read that "Christ forbade the hatred of foreigners which breathed in prayers of the Old Testament saints." Where are the prayers of those saints which breathed hatred of foreigners *as such*? All that has been claimed by the most unfriendly critics is hatred of foreigners *as foes*. Here is, of course, the old story about the imprecatory psalms. The subject has its difficulties to many minds. But an intelligent editor should be aware that a large portion of the Christian church have not accepted the view that these utterances were the expression of vindictive feeling against the personal enemies of the psalmist, but of righteous indignation against incorrigible wrong-doers, the enemies of God, of God's kingdom and God's friends. Is he not aware that men so eminently respectable as Albert Barnes, Bela B. Edwards, Professor Park, Tholuck, Perowne, and the like, have expressed this view, some of them very distinctly and strongly? Why not candidly recognize the fact that this aspect of the case, though often implied rather than definitely stated, is frequently given in express form? Thus in Ps. cxxxix. 21, 22, "Do not I hate them that hate thee, O Lord? Am I not grieved with them that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred, I count them mine enemies." So in other Psalms more or less explicitly. Intense as are the expressions, we are not to forget that they are but the open, frank utterance of what was involved in the prayers offered in every loyal pulpit during the war of the Rebellion. Every prayer for the triumph of lawful authority, it is sad to say, meant havoc and death to its armed foes, and, alas, it involved widows and orphans too. The terrible sufferings that accompanied the answer to those prayers equaled and far surpassed anything expressed in those psalms. It is a fact not to be ignored; and cavils at those psalms were hushed during the war. Professor Park then felicitously said, "That one phrase, 'They are *confederate* against thee' (Ps. lxxxiii. 5), has suggested to many American Christians the crime of those States that are now 'confederate' against our Union." And the late Dr. A. P. Peabody said to me in Cambridge, in

the midst of the war, "I have come to your view of those psalms." Professor Moulton, in his "Literary Study of the Bible," speaking of the imprecatory psalms, well states the case thus: "We in modern times are quite accustomed to feel enthusiasm for the abstract thing we call 'a cause'; with the ancient world it was necessary for the cause to be embodied in a concrete party, if it was to win devotion or the reverse. . . . When the psalmist's hatred of evil men has once been translated into the form of hatred against evil, it will be felt that the passages cannot be too strongly worded." Such well-considered views, from such sources, cannot be disposed of by a sweeping condemnation, much less by a misrepresentation.

A month later the readers were informed by the editor, without qualification, that "the prophets bitterly contended with one another." This broad statement, unrestricted even as to time, would be true of some particular times, *provided* always that we disregard all distinction between prophets as true or false, a distinction definitely stated in Deut. xiii. 1-5; that is, provided we cover with one term the prophet Elijah and the prophets of Baal, or Ahab's four hundred prophets who said to him, "Go up," and "the prophet of the Lord," Micaiah, who told him the truth. If we may confound opposites after this manner, then we have here genuine Bible history.

The statement is not improved in its bearing by the next sentence: "Even those whose sayings we now most cherish did not command any more confidence from the people than ministers now receive who claim to present messages from God." This remark may—or may not—be true in the letter, but it is not true in its meaning, if it is intended to imply, as it appears, that they were *entitled* to no more confidence than modern preachers. That such is the intent of the statement appears from the immediate sequel: "They [the prophets] were influenced in their convictions, as we are, by fear and hope, by passions of ambition and patriotism, by anger against those who opposed them, and admiration of those who agreed with them, as well as by indignation against sin and approval of righteousness." Here at length the prophets are brought completely down to the common level,—"*influenced as we are*" by the evil "passions of ambition" and "anger," and that too "*in their convictions.*" There is an earlier statement that they were influenced or "moved by the Holy Ghost," which some of us still prefer.

We were told also, somewhat earlier, that "it is a great principle of divine teaching, that truth from God can become a revelation only when interpreted by human experience." Now this may mean one of two things: either that a truth cannot become a matter of experience till it is experienced; or, that a truth cannot be a truth till it has become a matter of "human experience." In the former meaning, it is no "great principle," but a truism, and indeed a tautology. In the latter significance it is neither truism nor truth. There is no such "principle," hu-

man or divine. To take a human instance, Cannot a physician reveal to his patient the "truth" that he has a mortal disease, and is it no revelation till the patient is dead? And to take a divine instance, Is it not an actual revelation that God will save men by faith on Jesus Christ, whether any given man chooses to experience it or not?

It is much to be regretted that such ill-considered utterances, confused and confusing, should proceed from sources otherwise respectable and respected.

S. C. BARTLETT.

HANOVER, N. H.