

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 15.—JANUARY, 1891.

I. ST. JOHN'S ARGUMENT FROM MIRACLES.

1. WE are so accustomed to regard John's Gospel as a sweet, tender evangel, that we are apt to leave out of view its argumentative character. John himself, however, in his twentieth chapter, teaches us to avoid this mistake: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

If we understand this passage, John does not mean that the preceding part of his book is wholly occupied with an account of various miracles. They have their place along with other things—other things, and, it may be, better things; for our Lord is represented as saying (xiv. 11), "Believe ME, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works' sake." What emphasis is to be placed on that pronoun ME, what unfathomable depths of meaning are involved in it, no finite intellect can know. They who are most spiritually minded see in Christ, more than others do, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, and beholding it as in a glass, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord. Perhaps no one ever apprehended this divine glory more fully than did the beloved disciple; but he was preserved from the narrowness of depreciating, much more of despising the argument from miracles; in which, indeed, he would have been untrue to the ancient and sacred beliefs of his race. Hence, in addition to other things, we find in the first twenty chapters of his Gospel

a number of what are called miracles; and he tells us that they have been written with an argumentative purpose.

2. For our ends it is hardly necessary to define the term miracle anew. It is enough to say that any satisfactory attestation of a message from heaven must include the exhibition of a wisdom, a power, or some other attribute, above what belongs to man; something that surpasses the skill, the might—may we not add, the love, the pity, the self-sacrifice—to which we can attain. It must be a *τέρας*, a miraculum, a wonder. Then, too, it should be a *σημείον*, a signum, a sign. Thus will it agree with our Saviour's own words in John iv. 48, "Except ye see *σημεῖα καὶ τεράτα*, signs and wonders, ye will not believe"; wonders that not only attract attention to accompanying instruction, but that prove its heavenly origin.

It is not, then, a matter absolutely indispensable that the sign and wonder should be wrought in the domain of matter, and be discernible by the physical senses. Yet this is usually the case in the miracles of the Bible, and is uniformly so in the miracles appealed to by John in this Gospel. The two apparent exceptions will be noticed in due place.

The reason why the realm of matter is thus honored we take to be this: our bodily senses are less injured by the fall, and less incapacitated for receiving and reporting the truth, than almost any other part of our complex being. A diseased nervous system, or an attack of *mania a potu*, or a debauch on opium or hasheesh, may make us see visions of all kinds. Dr. Guthrie states in his autobiography that one day in his convalescence he saw a beautiful flower growing out of a marble mantel in his chamber, but knew that it was a hallucination. A man once told us that in a spell of delirium tremens he saw it rain fire, and that the most eloquent preacher could not paint the horrors that he endured. So that sin and disease have not left the sensory part of our nature untouched; and yet, taking mankind in general, we find our five senses reliable in their normal condition. Whatever might be true of disembodied spirits, we know that man can be very effectually reached through his senses. There is a commendable sobriety in this method; as John himself intimates in

the opening sentences of his First Epistle: "That . . . which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life; . . . that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you." Honest Simon Peter, too, says: "This voice, which came from heaven, we *heard*, when we were with him on the holy mount." Hence he knew that he was not following cunningly devised fables.

Doubtless there was a divine wisdom in thus exalting the matter which God the Son had made in the beginning, so that during the long centuries of inspiration earth herself should lift up her voice in witness to the truth of his religion. "Marvellous are thy works, O Lord, and that my soul knoweth right well."

3. The most effective argument is not produced by a bewildering mass of proofs, but by a judicious selection. John had a large store to draw from. He chose nine or ten out of a great number of signs and wonders, and rested his case on these. Let us devoutly seek for the principles on which the selection was made.

4. The gospel is intended for all classes and conditions of men, for the learned and the unlearned, for the gentle and the simple. Hence its evidences must, at least some of them, come down to the level of the lowliest understandings, just as the air which all men must breathe descends from the upper heights, not merely to embrace the mountain peaks, but also to flood the vales; and the blessed sunlight rests upon the summit of Mont Blanc and upon the Swiss *chalét* far beneath.

Although, after the teaching of the Master and under the influence of the Holy Spirit, John was a profound thinker, he was not a scientific man in the modern sense of the term. It was needful therefore that the evidences exhibited to him in the natural world should be adapted to his degree of acquaintance with the laws of nature, in order that he might be a reliable witness; that is, a witness who really understood the matter concerning which he was to give testimony. At the same time, and this is one of the most curious and interesting features of the whole subject, the facts adduced must be such as would stand the test of scientific examination at any period of the world's history. It was eminently proper that the natural laws involved should be im-

portant laws, of wide application and susceptible of unquestionable verification. It was absolutely necessary that the facts alleged could not be accounted for by the operation of the forces of nature without special divine intervention. And this must be true although new and unsuspected forces should be discovered in the lapse of ages.

WALKING ON THE SEA.

5. In his sixth chapter John tells us that on one occasion, not long before a passover, our Lord left his disciples and departed alone into a mountain. The disciples entered into a ship and went over the Sea of Galilee toward Capernaum. The sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew. Modern science shows that this sea occupies a very deep depression in the earth. The rapid radiation of the heat from the elevated lands on both sides of the water chills the air, makes it heavier than that lying above the sea, which radiates much more slowly than the land, and thus cold currents rush down the slopes and through the gorges, and lash the lake into fury. On this particular occasion, either from the violence of the gale or from its blowing from the west—John does not state which, but both Matthew and the detail-loving Mark say the wind was contrary—the disciples were toiling at the oars. They had gone three or four miles, when they saw something preternatural walking toward them, and then (Mark) apparently about to pass by the ship. The passover was always at the full moon, sometimes in March and sometimes in April, when the sun sets and rises at or near six o'clock. The incident took place "in" or "about" the fourth watch of the night, *i. e.*, between three and six o'clock A. M. As the moon was near the full, there may have been some light from it hanging low in the west, and it would be advantageously reflected from an object approaching from the east. This probable, though not necessary, feature would add to the phantom-like appearance of one walking upon the sea. The disciples were frightened, as modern men would be; but Jesus said unto them, "It is I; be not afraid." Then they willingly received him into the ship.

We have no doubt of the truth of this narrative. But its truthfulness is not precisely the point we are aiming at. If so, it might

behoove us to notice that on the one hand the enemies of Christ were not present to scrutinize the miracle, and the account is given by his friends alone; and on the other, that both Matthew and Mark had written their accounts many years before, and that John long after re-affirms the story and avows himself an eye witness; that John declares circumstantially that the people on the eastern shore observed that there was only one boat at the landing and the disciples had taken it, Jesus not being in their company; but some other boats from the west side had come near the landing, so that these people took shipping and crossed over to Capernaum in search of Jesus, and were mystified as to how he had gotten over to the western shore. All of this has the appearance of being written by a man who was trying to tell the exact truth. Other considerations might be adduced; but our points are that this miracle was level to the observing capacity of plain men; again, that if it occurred at all, it was something beyond human skill and power; and, once more, that we are not informed precisely how it was effected.

What more, now, can we say by the aid of modern science? Can the men of to-day walk thus upon the surface of a lake, any more than the men of eighteen centuries ago? Assuredly not. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the men of any coming century will be able to accomplish the feat.

We have learned that gravitation, whatever the nature of that force may be, not only affects both organic and inorganic matter, as the ancients must have known, so far as they thought of any force bringing down bodies to the earth; but also that it extends to the binary stars away out in space; for they revolve about a common center of gravity in elliptical orbits. By analogy we conclude with very great probability, if not positive certainty, that the same pervasive force grasps the remotest nebula in space. It is potentially omnipresent in the universe, and indeed throughout immensity; for if God should create a new particle of matter anywhere in the measureless void of space, every previously existing particle would at once lay hold upon it and attract it with a force directly as the mass and inversely as the square of the distance. We say *at once*, for we believe that hitherto no one has succeeded in proving that

the transmission of this force requires time. If that new particle were luminous and as brilliant as Sirius, the light might be millions, billions, quintillions of years in reaching us. Not so with gravitation.

We have learned that electricity is arrested to a large degree by a pane of glass; that galvanism passes through the pane; but gravitation, through a world. As for instance, in a total lunar eclipse, when the earth is for as much as two hours between the sun and the moon, the sun's attraction of the moon is not a whit diminished. Great, occult, everywhere-present Force, conserving the material universe, which otherwise would rush madly to ruin; image and vicegerent of the Deity, interpenetrating, enveloping, upholding all things that are; possibly,—we know not,—yet possibly the Former of the worlds out of primeval star-dust, thou art the servant, not the master, of mind.

It was well that one of John's miracles should be drawn from the realm of gravitation. Modern science has only enlarged our knowledge and enhanced our appreciation of this force. It has not explained away the miracle, but has given it increased dignity in our eyes. As we are not informed by the sacred writer how this miracle was wrought, we can only speculate about it. Two methods may be suggested:

1st. Gravity is not one of those primary qualities of matter, as for instance, mobility or absolute incompressibility, without which matter itself could not exist. A well-known trick of sleight-of-hand is to roll a large ball between the hands, seemingly reducing its size all the while, until it finally disappears entirely. The puzzle lies in this: everybody knows that matter cannot be pressed into nothingness. If this were possible, the mystery would be gone. Some writers appear to think the secondary laws of matter as imperishable and indestructible as the primary. Not so at all. In this miracle of our Lord the attractive force of the earth may have been suspended for the time so far as relates to Christ's body. He who impressed this force upon matter in the beginning, could surely annihilate or suspend it. Man can not do this, because he is not God.

2nd. Another method of explanation depends upon the familiar

fact that in some inscrutable way our own spirits counteract the force of gravitation. We do this every time we lift a weight. Bone, tendon, muscle, nerve, and then, reaching across the dark chasm between two worlds, mental conation, constitute the series by which we raise our hand. Our power in this line is confined to our own organism; but we know of no reason for restricting the power of the Almighty, who can surely move all matter hither and thither as he wills. It may have been by the exercise of this divine force, so much resembling what we possess in a more limited way, that Christ supported his body on the surface of the lake. If so, there was no suspension of gravitation; just as there is none when we hold up a weight in our hand. Gravitation perpetually solicits the weight, but is overcome by a superior force.

Of these two conjectures the latter seems to our own mind the more probable; the counteracting force may have been just great enough to keep the feet of the Master on the surface of the rising and falling waves. But we are not tied to either explanation.

THE WINE AT CANA.

6. Gravitation appertains properly to the inorganic world. It bore sway before the existence of organic life; and it would still rule if every trace of that life should disappear from the universe. Meanwhile it affects organized, living substances, just as it would if they were dead; but one of the functions of life is the counteraction of the force of gravity. These principles have a wide application and could be illustrated with much variety and interest. It is enough for the present to point out that in the making of wine at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, our Saviour passes into the region dominated usually by vegetable life.

In oriental countries it was, and is still, customary to keep a supply of water in earthen or stoneware vessels, each holding quite a number of gallons. At the feast the wine gave out, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, informed him of the fact. Half a dozen water-pots were within view, presumably empty at the moment. Jesus said to the servants, Fill the water-pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. He said to them, Draw out now and

bear to the governor of the feast. This official did not know whence it had come, but pronounced it wine of superior quality.

This miracle could be tested by ordinary men. It was subjected to five senses by its color, taste, smell, its liquid splash on being poured from flagon to goblet, and its cool passage through the mouth. To this we may add the sense of muscular resistance in carrying it about in vessels. It was impossible to practice any deception in the case. The company knew as well that it was wine, as they would have recognized water if water had been given them. The cheap, weak wine of the country was an every day drink with the people. An impostor would have chosen some rare substance, which few or none of them had ever seen, and something that could not be tasted or smelt. Here, too, it must be noticed that the disciples of Jesus were not the only witnesses; the wine was dealt out to a promiscuous throng.

As before, no hint is given of the mode of the miracle's performance, and modern science can only conjecture.

(a.) Wine and water have many properties in common. It is conceivable that the qualities possessed by wine and not by water were superadded to those of the water. Or some of the qualities of water may have been taken away, and certain vinous ones substituted in their stead. For so far as we can judge, the Creator of all things assigns the secondary properties to elementary substances, and directly or indirectly to compound bodies.

This, of course, demands a divine power, and a divine wisdom, too. At least no living chemist can tell what molecular or other condition makes wine red. We can say that if the hulls of the grapes are not removed from the expressed juice, the fermented wine will be red, and there is little, if anything, more that we can say. Who can tell us the ultimate reason why wine is sweet, and also acid, and also bitter, and also fragrant, and yet again intoxicating?

The difficulty of thus converting water into wine is immeasurably greater than the unthinking imagine. Suppose we stood by a water-pot containing fifteen or twenty gallons of water and had superhuman power granted us. What should we do? How should we use our power? What precise effect should we im-

press upon the particles of the water, so that it should absorb the other rays of light in their passage through it, and transmit only the glowing crimson? or that some of those particles should smite upon the exceedingly delicate nerves of taste in their minute papillae with a thrill which the soul interprets as the cause of the sensation of sweetness, while others as inscrutably gave rise to the sensation of acidity, and still others to that of bitterness?

This wisdom is not yet possessed by the race of man, and we have no reason to believe that it ever will be. The work is beyond us, even if we had all the retorts, the alembics, the stills, the re-agents in the world at our command, with heat up to ten thousand degrees centigrade, and with absolute cold to assist us; much more if the work were to be done without the use of any means, by a word, or, as in the actual case before us, by an unuttered volition.

(b.) The same reasoning applies to the changes produced in matter without interfering with its primitive qualities. Thus, as an instance of what chemists call allotropism, phosphorus must be kept ordinarily under water to prevent the combustion which takes place on its exposure to the atmosphere, and which any one who has ever experimented with it will remember as indicated by a fine white smoke arising from it. But if in the proper atmosphere it be subjected to a very high heat for say fifty hours, it loses that extreme combustibility and can be used in the arts. This, however, requires time, a special environment, and a heat of two hundred and forty to two hundred and fifty degrees centigrade, or four hundred and sixty-four to four hundred and eighty-two degrees of Fahrenheit. Just what a chemist can do in his laboratory may be impossible to state, but is not the question here.

We come now to what is known as isomerism.

The same number of atoms of the same kinds of substances may yield very different compounds. "The oils of orange, lemon, turpentine, pepper, juniper, parsley, citron, bergamot, caraway, and others, however widely they differ in properties, have the same elementary composition and are isomeric." This is believed to be due to differences in the arrangement of the molecules, and has been illustrated by the white and the black squares of a check-

erboard, which may be disposed in various patterns. "The sugar which sweet milk furnishes, and the acid which exists in the sour, contain identically the same proportions of the same constituents." (But a molecule of sugar of milk furnishes the material for four molecules of lactic acid.) Then whether the conversion of water into wine is a possible case of isomerism depends on whether water contains the necessary elements of wine.

To illustrate from words: it was more the humor once than it now is to make anagrams. Thus John Bunyan surpassed the wits of his day by saying,—

" Witness his name. If anagrammed to thee,
The letters make Nu hony in a B;"

—a clever re-arrangement of the letters of his name. But if we should attempt to make out of those ten letters the sentence, "England expects every man to do his duty," the impossibility would appear at once. So the question arises whether the elementary constituents of wine are found in water.

Professor George Schaeffer, formerly of Brooklyn, N. Y., and afterwards connected with the Patent Office in Washington city, once said to the writer, "Have you ever thought particularly of that miracle of the making of wine?" We acknowledged that we had not. In fact we had never been quite able to see why our Lord and Master had used his divine power to supply the guests at a marriage feast with an additional allowance of wine; though of this we said nothing to the professor. He proceeded to say, "To me it is one of the most wonderful miracles in the Bible; for I know as a chemist that water does not contain the ingredients of wine, and hence there must have been an act of creation." What, then, are the elements of wine? They are four, chiefly, carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen. These four are the great staples of the world of life, and the first is so important that organic chemistry has been called "The chemistry of carbon compounds." The elements of water are oxygen and hydrogen. Hence it is substantially true that it does not contain all the elements of wine. Absolute rigor of speech requires us to add, that ordinary water has, interpenetrating it, a little air, otherwise the fish could not live, and a trace of carbonic acid, or dioxide of carbon, as we now

say, and of ammonia, which is a compound of hydrogen and nitrogen.

But while very small amounts of these substances are found in ordinary water, there is not enough of them to make wine. And this is still true if we suppose that the water was drawn from a limestone well or a rock-hewn cistern, and held in solution a trifle of carbonate of lime, which might well happen, since the prevailing formation in Palestine is a subcarboniferous limestone, resembling that in which Mammoth Cave occurs.

To resume our illustration: in John Bunyan's name there is only one letter O; in Lord Nelson's famous saying there are two, making the anagram impossible. The parallel will be nearer the truth if we employ Paul's saying, "Owe no man anything, but to love one another." Here we have all the letters of *John Bunyan*, using his freedom of writing I for J, according to the ancient method; but while there is one I, there are six O's, and we cannot duplicate, triplicate or multiply the choice dreamer's name.

Hence new materials had to be introduced into the water, and this could be done either according to Prof. Schaeffer's idea, by an act of creation, or else by summoning the needed elements from air and earth. The former seems to us the more probable of the two methods, but the latter may have been the one actually employed. In either case no human power or skill would have sufficed. To the chemist a new difficulty emerges here. It would not be enough to introduce the new matter into the water. Any chemist could do that at the present day, though by a long, tedious course of processes. But to induce the new elements to combine with the old, so as to produce wine, is a task beyond our chemistry to this day. This kind of production is called synthesis. It is effected very variously in nature's laboratory by the aid of the archmagician, life. In early spring, on the heights along the Rhine and the Ohio, the unsightly stakes of the vineyards uphold the gnarled and leafless vines. A little later and the tender shoots and leaves timidly appear. In due course of time life interweaves sunbeams and soil, rain from heaven and kindly dews, with carbon and nitrogen stolen from the air, into clusters of the most exquisitely colored and most delicious of fruits. This is synthesis.

But when the juice is expressed and set aside in casks, analysis begins; for such in truth is fermentation; certain elements form a new, gaseous combination, and escape, leaving alcohol as a residuum. But the wine is not very good yet, for bitartrate of potash must be eliminated and settle upon the bottom and sides of the casks, and this slow ripening and mellowing takes place in cool cellars through months and years.

It was formerly believed that chemical skill could not build up by synthesis the products of life. It has been found, however, that a few of the simpler organic compounds, such as urea, can be made in this way; and this has been extended to alcohol. The processes are sufficiently detailed in the works of Fownes (Wallace's edition) and other writers. But to effect this in a moment, and by a volition, is clearly beyond human skill and power. Even now with all our progress this is true; and surely it was true then, when neither chemistry nor its visionary predecessor, alchemy, had appeared on earth.

There are several varieties of alcohols known to chemists. Of the single variety designated as monatomic, Fownes gives twelve kinds, and only one of these is found in wine. It is the second in a curious arithmetical series, and hence not the very simplest sort. The human tongue and palate would have very promptly detected the mistake, if the third, or the first, a more or a less composite number of the series, had been stumbled on. The august Maker of the wine at Cana of Galilee anticipated our modern science by many centuries.

Every word of Scripture is valuable. The governor of the feast, after he had tasted this wine, said to the bridegroom, "Thou hast kept the good wine until now;" *i. e.*, instead of bringing on an inferior article late in the evening, you have reversed the ordinary custom. The wine made by Jesus is pronounced better than the best furnished by the bridegroom. How is wine made good? Of course the quality of the grapes is important. But after the juice is fermented and the wine is really made, the two chief modes of improvement are the elimination of the bitartrate of potash already mentioned, and the gradual formation of certain ethers in the wine.

As to the former, it may be supposed that the objectionable bitartrate was not produced at all in this instance. As to the second, besides the various others which distinguish different wines, there is in all wine an œnanthic (*ὄνος*, wine; *ἀνθος*, a flower), or vinous ether, whose presence in abundance gives a superior excellence of both taste and odor. Recent chemistry has isolated this remarkable substance by analysis. No living chemist, we believe, has ever made it by synthesis. No chemist whatever eighteen hundred years ago knew what it was; but any peasant familiar with wine could have at once detected its absence by two of his senses. It was so abundant in this wine at the marriage feast as to attract the attention and elicit the commendation of the architriklinos, or official director of the supper.

So much for the goodness of the wine. But it should not pass unnoticed that no chemist has ever been able, without the aid of vegetable life, to make one drop of wine, whether good or bad.

As to any imaginable counterfeiting of wine, that is hardly worth considering. It is wholly improbable that our modern villainous compounds were known at all in that age, and especially in a wine-producing country like Palestine. The people to whom the wine at Cana was submitted had all their lives been accustomed to a pure article, and were well qualified to detect a counterfeit. Furthermore, to imitate a spurious wine, colored with logwood and adulterated with foreign ingredients, would be as difficult a task as to make the pure article; particularly to give the logwood coloring without any logwood, and the imitation flavoring without any flavoring extracts.

Any smuggling in of wine is thrown out of consideration by the largeness of the quantity. The firkin, or metretes, held about seven gallons and a half. Two or three firkins, then, would be fifteen to twenty-two-and-a-half gallons; and the six stone jars would hold from ninety to one hundred and thirty-five gallons. At a moderate estimate there were one hundred gallons of wine. So that there could have been no surreptitious bringing it in. Besides, this abundance is illustrative of the bounty of the most munificent of all beings, as it furnished a supply to the newly-

formed family. Wine is in itself a good gift of God, though so horribly abused by man.

This first of miracles showed, moreover, that our Lord could easily supply all his physical wants, instead of entrusting that work to the loving hearts and hands of his redeemed ones. This principle is of exceedingly wide application.

FEEDING THE FIVE THOUSAND.

7. The miracle at Cana is related by John only; but the feeding of the five thousand is found in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, also. So that John repeats the account after the death of the other evangelists. Matthew and Mark give another very similar miracle, in which seven loaves and a few small fishes were the starting point of the supply for four thousand men, besides women and children. Why John preferred the former is a matter of conjecture; perhaps because it led to the memorable discourse of our Lord in the sixth chapter. But at least one of the two miracles was needed in order to the completion of the argument. Wine was an ordinary article of table consumption; now bread and fish are introduced. Water or milk would not have served in place of wine. It must be something manufactured by man; something in whose production human skill and labor were exercised; something which every observer knew of a surety that no man could produce in a moment and without the use of means. And to this purpose the liquid, wine, was admirably suited. But two common articles of food remain to be considered—such as a lad would carry with him to a great public gathering for a lunch—five loaves, or thin cakes (*ἄρτοις*), and two small fishes (*ὀψῆριον*, a diminutive of a word which originally means some kind of food accompanying bread; then fish, as this was the usual solid addition to bread in that country and among the common people).

Many of the same principles enounced in the previous division concerning wine are applicable to the bread, and need not be repeated here.

But the miracle of the bread is in some respects more wonderful than that of the wine.

Surely no man can be deceived into supposing that he is eating

bread when he is not; or that he is eating a piece of ordinary, well-known fish, when such is not the case. No impostor would have dared to select these two kinds of food for his jugglery.

Human agency is more largely employed in bread-making than in wine-making. The latter requires much care in the selection of the grapes, the rejection of the under ripe, the avoidance of crushing the seed, the due exposure of the must to the action of the atmosphere, the proper construction and preparation of the casks, and perhaps a few other points. But to procure bread they must thresh by oxen or with the flail, winnow, grind in the little mill at home, knead, and bake. Few, if any, in that day knew why the cereals support human life so well; or what the rising of the sponge in bread is occasioned by; or why barley bread rises so much less than the wheaten loaf; or just what baking accomplishes in the process of bread-making. But any of the simple folk could distinguish between bread and a stone, between a barley and a wheaten cake, and between a mouthful of uncooked dough, or flour and water, and a mouthful of genuine bread.

In all generations the simple folk outnumber the scientists, and the gospel is mostly for the unlearned. The few noble are not so few now as in Paul's day, but they are few yet. The multitudes of unscientific ones needed then, and need now, something sure and something impressive; something that comes home to the men who handle the sickle or the reaper, the flail or the thresher; to the women who then ground the grain in little household mills, or who now but hear the rumble and roar of the rollers, yet everywhere more or less knead and bake as of old; to the children who carry their lunches to school or picnics; in a word, to the hungry, toiling millions who know nothing of science, but can infallibly distinguish bread from a stone.

Well may the toilers wonder and believe, when Jesus does in one moment what they attain only by weary hours, days and months of labor; above all, when he accomplishes the work without plowing or sowing, without sickle or flail, without mill-stones or bakers' ovens; and yet, most wonderful, when he does all without flour or water.

This brings us to a new aspect of the miracle. The materials

must have been furnished; whether by immediate creation, or by miraculous gathering from overhead and underfoot, they *must* have been supplied, and there was no opportunity of transmutation. For the double purpose, as we suppose, of teaching a lesson of economy, and of verifying the actuality of the miracle, twelve baskets full of fragments are taken up. Our senses are appealed to as trustworthy. No illusion is practiced, and no properties are given to various kinds of matter which they did not possess before.

8. What light does our modern science throw on the subject?

(1.) It analyzes the bread and finds in it two kinds of food, the respiratory and the plastic. The former is composed principally of starch and sugar, which contain carbon, hydrogen and oxygen, but no nitrogen; the latter contains nitrogen, and is specially needed in the formation of muscle. Respiratory food supplies warmth, but does not replace the waste of organized tissues; plastic food may poorly furnish warmth, but this is not its proper province. Another interesting discovery is that much of the building material of our bodies is furnished by the vegetable world in such condition that no great change is necessary to fit it for its place. Another is that mankind have, so to speak, stumbled on a very suitable combination of dietetic articles. The boy's bread and fish went well together, bread being rich in starch, and animal food in fibrin.

(2.) Science shows what effects are due to cooking. Baking bursts open the little starch-cells, destroys the germs of the yeast after they have done their work, hardens the gluten in wheaten bread, and expels a portion of the water used in kneading. We do not speak of boiling, as it does not appear to have been used on this occasion; nor of cooking the fish, as it is probable that it was dried, like our herring. Baking also converts a small portion of the starch into gum. If yeast is used, it converts part of the starch into sugar and then into carbonic acid (carbon dioxide), and into alcohol, which usually escapes, but has been occasionally collected. It forms no part of the bread.

John informs us twice that it was barley bread. Chemists say that barley has almost the identical constitution of wheat, but the

former has albumen where the latter has gluten. As a consequence the barley does not make a light spongy loaf like wheaten bread, which is owing to albumen's inferiority to gluten in elasticity and tenacity; the rising bubbles of gas escape too soon in barley or rye bread. But rye bread, and we presume barley bread, which closely resembles it, does not become stale so soon as that made from wheat, in which the water left in the fresh bread does not indeed escape, but enters into some kind of molecular union with the other elements of the loaf.

But with these interesting discoveries in chemistry, it is unquestionably true that no scientist has ever been able to make by synthesis from the primary elements one crumb of bread or one particle of fish.

Christ either created bread and fish, or he made them from elements already existing. Before the mystery of creation *ex nihilo* the peasant and the philosopher alike are dumb. But as to making by synthesis, the philosopher does know how very hard a thing it is, and he may form some idea of the reason why it is so hard.

Oxygen and nitrogen mixed, but not chemically combined, are at hand abundantly in the air, and there is always present a little aqueous vapor to furnish the hydrogen, and a little carbon dioxide to supply the carbon; very often, too, a little sulphuretted hydrogen, which blackens silverware exposed to the atmosphere. This would give the sulphur, and the soil beneath us contains phosphorus. Other elements in very minute quantities might be found by an all-seeing One. It may be conceded that science proves that a creation is not absolutely required, a conclusion which might have been reached without science's aid.

How could any human being summon to his assistance a dozen or more elementary substances by a mere volition? The chemist might have either the simple elements that enter into bread or the compounds which nature uses, as carbonic acid, ammonia, water, and the rest, and he could not make a crumb for one of God's sparrows.

Science indicates the reason of this inability. We do not yet know the molecular structure of the protein bodies, such as gluten, and vegetable albumen and casein. (The name protein is retained

as descriptive.) Their general composition is given by Prof. Porter, of Yale College, as 55.16 per cent. of carbon, 7.05 of hydrogen, 21.81 of oxygen, 16.96 of nitrogen, with $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 per cent. of sulphur and phosphorus in an unknown form. The combination is a very complex one. Fownes and Prof. Bloxam, of London, give as an empirical formula of the proteids, C 72, H 112, N 18, O 22, S, with a little phosphorus probably mechanically intermixed. In starch, "the lowest form of organized vegetable material," each molecule is composed probably of sixty-three atoms, viz.: carbon, eighteen; hydrogen, thirty; oxygen, fifteen. (Fownes.)

Herein we see the wisdom of our Lord in selecting these *very complex* bodies, which never have been imitated in all these eighteen centuries; yet our gustatory nerves distinguish very promptly and surely even between barley bread and wheaten.

In making bread from its elements by chemical synthesis, regard must be paid to the fact that the most admirable dough is not bread. The changes produced by baking must be known and in some way effected. Who can do this without baking?

9. The question recurs in a somewhat new form, Was any law of nature suspended in this miracle? We have seen that an advance has been made over the previous miracle by the introduction of animal food. The two small fishes are important.

It seems to the writer hardly proper to say that the force of vegetable life, or that of animal life, was suspended in this miracle. These mysterious powers still held sway all over earth and sea. In the five loaves and the two fishes they had accomplished their ends. Here, if anywhere, there *was* a suspension; for the grinding of the wheat had crushed the tiny germs of the grains, and the life of the fishes had ceased to be. Death is a cessation. But in the abundance supplied by our Saviour, neither vegetable nor animal life had ever entered the lists. No surcease was possible. The Maker of all things simply produced, without the aid of vegetable or animal life, what we can produce only by their assistance. It was a case of intervention, not of suspension—just as without leaving my seat I may stretch forth a walking cane for something beyond the reach of my hand; or, if preferable, I may arise and

get it without using a cane. My using means may be owing to my limitations of power and presence, which of course are not to be attributed to God. The thing to be explained in reference to him is not why he ever works without means, but why he ever uses them at all. Into this most inviting field of speculation our limits forbid us to enter to any length; but we may be allowed to suggest that the Almighty delights in the exercise of his attributes, and among them not the least is wisdom. If he should work everything by power alone, there would be no room for divine skill. Besides, he could not, as he now does, develop created wisdom by countless object lessons. But there are reasons for his working by means; reasons for his indirectly producing the five loaves and the two fishes by the ministry of nature's forces and of man. It seems quite inexact to say that the forces of nature were suspended in the production of the rest of the food. We might as well say that man's powers were suspended. Neither nature nor man was called into requisition, but God wrought without them. This is the simplest and truest way of putting it; while we have no objection to any revealed suspension of the laws or forces of nature. If by a suspension of the laws of nature it be meant that God directly, by an immediate exercise of his power and wisdom, did that which he ordinarily accomplishes by second causes, the intent of the phrase is good though the phrase itself is hardly felicitous.

The progress of science, therefore, has shown us what bread is, and why we need it; what animal food is, and why that is helpful; but it does not show how wine, bread or fish can be manufactured synthetically. The most recent and expert chemists do not know the molecular structure of bread or fish; much less can they make in their laboratories the least particle of either. No torture of nature in furnace or crucible has wrung the secret from her mute lips. It is an ignorant sort of argument to say that electricity and magnetism have effected great wonders in our day, and that Christ may have wrought his so-called miracles by natural agencies. On the contrary, science testifies that he could not. How could an unlearned Jew in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar accomplish, without apparatus or re-agents and in prodigal abun-

dance, what the finest chemists with the best equipped laboratories of the last quarter of the nineteenth century do not know how to set about doing on the smallest scale?

It is important now to cast an eye over the argument up to this place, and to observe that John has touched nature at several points: 1st, The inorganic world; 2nd, The world of vegetable life; 3rd, The world of animal life. In each case there was present an exhibition of what nature and man can do, and, close beside it, one of what nature and man cannot do. This was important for contrast and verification. The disciples were kept from sinking in the waves by the boat they were in; Jesus, by divine power. The wine, the bread, the fish that preceded the miracle, had been produced by vegetable and animal life, chemical forces and human agency; that which Christ gave was made without these means. The force of the vegetable and the animal life had been expended in the production of the wine, the bread, the cooked or dried fish; the products were tested by the human life acting through nerves and muscles. We are thus led up to three new miracles in which the life is not yet spent, and that life is, as it should be, the life of man—the most important form of animal life, and that of which perhaps we are the best qualified to judge.

THE NOBLEMAN'S SON, THE INFIRM MAN, THE MAN BORN BLIND.

10. In these cases life is still existent, but it is assailed, or its perfect development is thwarted.

The nobleman (*βασιλικός*, kingly) was probably one of Herod's courtiers, as Josephus uses the adjective to distinguish Herod's officers from those of the Roman Emperor (Jacobus, *Com. in loc.*). His son was sick of a fever at Capernaum. The father had most probably heard of the miracle at Cana, which was not very far from Capernaum.

The salient points here are that the healing was performed by an agent at a distance from the patient, at a time when the son could not have known that his father had just met with Jesus, and on a youth (*παῖδιον*, a little boy) about to die. It was, moreover, an acute disease, whereas the infirm man was suffering from a chronic malady.

How it is precisely that our modern medicines, as the salts of quinia, cure fever, no man can say. The intimate pathology of these and other diseases is, not yet fully understood, if, indeed, it ever shall be.

Endow a physician with ample power to heal; bring him to the bedside of his patient, and he would not know what to do. Any man has enough physical strength to repair a watch that is out of order; but where and how to apply his strength—that is the question. Especially if he is not permitted to open the watch and examine its works; still less if he has not even the opportunity of observing any outward manifestation of the internal disarrangement or breakage, but must accept an indefinite report from a non-expert.

Presence in the sick-chamber gives a physician access to the mind of the patient, and thus it is possible that cures have been effected on the body. An impostor would not have failed to avail himself of this subtle influence. The misguided faith-cure operators of our day visit their patients, or have their patients go great distances to them. Why should this be necessary, if God be everywhere, and the faith of miracles still dwell in the church? It should, in fairness, be conceded that fevers sometimes leave a patient suddenly. This can be accounted for frequently, though not always. Humanly speaking, it is just possible that the fever left this little boy both suddenly and inexplicably; but this is a wholly improbable solution. A deceiver would not have risked everything on so exceedingly slender a chance.

A chronic case is given us in the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda. The nature of his malady is not stated. He was weak, ἀσθενῶν, ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ; but we are not informed as to the cause of his weakness, except that ἀσθενής by *usus loquendi* means weak from disease, or sick. The multitude of the sick is divided into three classes, the blind, the lame, and the withered or paralytic. We are sure that he was not blind, and are confident that he had not lost a limb. It may have been an inveterate case of rheumatism or paralysis, as it was of thirty-eight years' duration. Whatever it was, a man similarly afflicted at the present day would be sent to a home for incurables.

This man is not represented as having any faith in Jesus. On

being asked if he desired to be made whole, or following the Greek more closely, "Do you wish to become well?" he omits the natural answer, "Yes, of course, I do, or I should not be here," and explains why he has not already gone down into the water; as though he had said, "I am not here as an idle spectator; I need the healing, but have no assistant to put me into the pool at the proper time." His whole tone is explanatory and apologetic, and indicates no faith whatever in Jesus, who was evidently a stranger to him, for he wist not who it was. The healing was instantaneous. The man immediately became well, and took up his bed and walked about, (*περιπατει*, the same word as that used by Christ in his command.)

Compare with this the coaxings, the exhortations, the solicitations, renewed sometimes day after day, in the cures of hypochondriacs; where there was no genuine disease except perhaps a weakness of the nervous system, and no cure was effected save by the minds of the patients upon their bodies. It is not easy to believe in the absolute sincerity of faith-cure performers, when they leave so convenient a loop-hole for themselves: "If you are healed, it is by divine power conditioned upon your faith; if you are not healed, it is for lack of faith in you, or possibly in me."

Of this transparent fallacy Jesus never made use. He never failed to heal any applicant, and never hesitated to stake all his claims to be the Son of God and the Saviour of men upon each and every attempt to work a miracle.

There is another class of maladies about which the faith-curers walk very gingerly. They are such as require surgical aid. A broken limb, a cataract in the eye, anything which demands the ligature, the bandage, the surgeon's knife,—why are these beyond the reach of faith? In his ninth chapter John introduces a case of congenital blindness, in that day regarded as hopelessly incurable. Here we are almost certain that surgical treatment was needed.

We believe that the faith-curers do not exercise their art in blind asylums, though much needed there. A grown man, blind from his birth, would offer a signal opportunity. Our Saviour did not avoid so difficult an undertaking, but accomplished the cure in

a brief space of time without the use of means. He spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay. Of course there was no curative virtue in this, nor in the washing in the Pool of Siloam. Why the anointing and the subsequent washing were resorted to, it may be impossible to say. Might it have been to signify the washing away of the filth of sin, and the giving of sight to the spiritually blind by him that was *sent* to remove sin's guilt and sin's darkness?

If any one who reads this article shall examine general medical works, or still better, some special treatise like that of Nettleship, he will be surprised at the number of diseases to which the eye is subject. We may begin at the conjunctiva which covers the front of the eye, and go back not merely to the optic nerve, but to the farthest portions of the brain, and we shall find all along the route organs, or parts or accessories of organs, that may become diseased.

Our present instance restricts us to cases of congenital blindness. Some diseases do not cause blindness, so that an inquiry is limited to those which do produce blindness and produce it previous to birth. In addition to our own reading, we have availed ourselves of the technical knowledge of Dr. Reynolds, of Louisville, Ky., the well-known professor and specialist. He gave the following possible causes of congenital blindness:

1. Arrested development.
2. Persistent pupillary membrane.
3. Syphilis and tuberculosis, affecting the occipital lobes of the brain.

As to the third of these, we have at least the testimony of our Lord that the blindness in this case was not owing to any foul disease of his parents. "Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents." The clay, the saliva, and the water would have reached none of the three.

Again we are confronted by the fact that the evangelist gives no precise description of the malady relieved. If he had been inspired to do so, his account would have been unintelligible for many centuries, and even now unintelligible to all but a few.

It is extremely probable that no physician of his day understood the nature of the young man's blindness. Evidently no one

had ever healed him, and he himself, if his testimony may be admitted, expressed the universal belief of his times when he said that since the world began it was not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. If at the present day a cure of such a case should be performed, which is a possible thing, it would redound to the skill of the operator and the instrument maker. If the most expert operator in the world should be asked to accomplish such a cure without instruments, without medicines, without more or less prolonged treatment, without means of any kind, he would regard the applicant as an unseemly jester, a fanatic, or a madman.

There is an opening here for the apostles of infidelity to help on their cause by showing practically that our Saviour's miracle can be duplicated. Let them hunt up the most distinguished oculist in London, Paris, Vienna, or the whole world; let him go out from his office, leave behind him his operating chair, his ophthalmoscope, his belladonna, his knives and pincers, and take a congenitally blind beggar on the street and heal him. Let the man come back from some public fountain with his eyes wide-open, seeing as others do who have seen all their lives. Surely this proposition is as fair as Tyndall's about the Christian and the prayerless hospitals. It is more than fair, for it gives the infidels the benefit of all the study and research that eminently skilful men have devoted to the eye. Their champion may know all that is known of the coats, the humors, the muscles, the reticulated nerve, the crystalline lens, the pigmentum nigrum, the ciliary process, the white disk, the arteries, the veins of the eye. Let him heal!

LAZARUS.

11. Life may be not only hindered and thwarted; it may perish. Can it be created anew? This surely is a crucial test, for no man thoroughly knows what life is, much less can any man restore life to the dead. Three theories have been advanced as to the nature of this mysterious power. (1.) That it is a force correlated with other physical forces and producible by some combination of them. Thus Mr. Huxley, in his well-known jest—for jest it should be considered—about aqosity. Oxygen and hydrogen are mixed by some

chance; by some other chance a flash of electricity passes through the mixture, and the two elements unite to form water, whose differentiating quality or property may be styled aquosity. So the elements, carbon, oxygen, hydrogen and nitrogen, with mayhap a trifle of sulphur and phosphorus, singly or in binary or trinary compounds, are intermingled, when lo! a flash of something or other, and LIFE starts into being! This savors too much of the mountebank to require special refutation.

(2.) That it is a force *sui generis*, directly originated by the Almighty in the outset, but transmissible by his creatures; capable of inhering in matter, though not itself a substance, either material or immaterial, and known to us only by its effects. This is the view held by probably nine-tenths, if not ninety-nine-hundredths of thinkers.

(3.) That it is an immaterial substance, endowed with certain peculiar powers, inhabiting our bodies until death comes, and then perishing utterly. Such, if we have been able to understand it, is the theory of a few thoughtful men. As a theory, it is novel, curious, and worthy of respectful consideration, but labors under the grave objection of postulating a third substance, which is neither mind nor body, and which is not needed as an element of the cause of the phenomena. As far, however, as our present argument is concerned, it would derive even more strength from the third than from the second of these theories.

Now, three instances are given by the evangelists in which life was originated by our Lord. The little daughter of Jairus was dead for a very short while, some minutes, or a quarter or a half of an hour. The only son of the widow of Nain was in his bier on the way to the cemetery, and had reached the gate of the village. The most notable case is reserved for the pen of John, and time, place, name, and circumstances are given with unusual fulness of detail. Lazarus has been dead four days, and incipient decomposition must have set in. Life's sceptre is broken, and the inorganic powers are in revolt, and are forming new combinations, tetrarchies, dukedoms, or provinces, out of the former august empire. Let now the first, greatest, most thoroughly equipped association of scientists on earth stand at the grave of some modern Lazarus.

What could they do? Do they know what life is? Have they the power of originating life? If they had the power, would they know how to exercise it? Would they bring a thousand-cell galvanic battery into play upon the nerves of the already putrescent corpse? Alas! this might produce immediately after death a horrid distortion of the features, a spasmodic contraction of the limbs; but life, fair goddess, would keep aloof from the profanation of her deserted temple.

This is not all. The association must not be allowed to have a single cell of any kind of battery, or a single implement, or utensil, or instrument of any sort whatever. Naught but a prayer, a tear, a voice. Naught, finally, but a cry of two words, that shall ring down the centuries, and all through the regions of the dead, so that Death himself shall quake on his throne. If such an attempt should be made by the most learned of our scientists, it were hard to decide which element of the scene would predominate, the shocking or the grotesque.

Spinoza said that he would give up all opposition to Christianity if he could be convinced of the resurrection of Lazarus.

There is another even more interesting feature of this miracle. Not only was animal life created; the soul was recalled and reunited to the body. Whither goes the soul when it leaves the body? To heaven? But where is heaven? To hell? But where is hell?

“When coldness wraps this suffering clay,
Ah! whither strays th’ immortal mind?”

So sang Byron; and the Roman Emperor Hadrian had sung long before him that pathetic address to his soul beginning with the tender words,

“Animula, vagula, blandula,”

and ending with the terror-stricken question,

“Quae nunc in loca abibis?”

Ah! yes, let our science summon back one soul, just one, from the unknown void. But if it were brought back, how could it be reunited to the body? What mysterious tie is this, far below the sounding line and plummet of consciousness? What manner of bridge sweeps over the dark chasm between the material and the

immaterial? How does it anchor itself to body at one extremity and to spirit at the other? Here we find one of the two apparent exceptions adverted to near the beginning of our article. The miracles recorded by John are wrought in the domain of matter. A part of this one appertains to the higher realm of mind. But the column, though reaching aloft into the upper air, has its solid base upon the earth. For the evidence that the soul of Lazarus was restored to its dwelling place in the body was addressed to the senses of all who beheld him once more alive. It was a thing about which the humblest, most unscientific observer could not be mistaken.

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

12. Like Luke and Mark, John leads us in his twentieth chapter to an open sepulchre. The stone is already rolled away and the sepulchre is empty. He does not inform us, with Matthew, that there was a great earthquake, and that the stone was rolled away by an angel; but he brings out more clearly than any of the other evangelists the truth that this resurrection was effected by Christ's own power. Thus, as early as in the second chapter, we have Christ's saying, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." To which John adds, "He spake of the temple of his body." Very fully, too, in the tenth chapter, "I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power (*ἐξουσίαν*, right, privilege) to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." In the original the word *power* is made emphatic in each clause by being placed first: Power have I to lay it down, and power have I to take it again.

The claims made by the sacred writers are (1), that Christ's body, unlike that of Lazarus, did not see corruption; (2), that it arose on the third day, by the power committed to him by the Father: "This commandment I received from the Father;" (3), that his body arose to an endless life, as a promise and pledge of our own resurrection from the grave; (4), that not only the reasonable human soul of Christ, but also his divinity, was reunited to his true body. Here the earth-based column rises up

into the heaven of heavens. But while our dazzled eyes gaze upward, as well as they may, into the exceeding glory, John does not hesitate to recall our look to that which we may clearly behold. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life; for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us; that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

This passage from the beginning of the First Epistle of the beloved disciple, the "heavenly mystic," is very instructive. The divinity of our Lord is substantiated, yea, is independently proved, by testimony addressed to our five senses; just as Paul, in Rom. i. 4, teaches us that Jesus Christ was powerfully declared to be the Son of God as to his highest and holiest nature by his resurrection from the dead. This resurrection was, of course, to be judged of, and accepted or rejected by those senses which God has given us. Christ's own prediction that he would rise from the dead was addressed originally to men's hearing; and he risked his claim to be a divine person on the fulfilment of this prophecy, so that John strictly agrees with Paul and with our Lord himself.

If now any one of all these miracles were actually performed,—none others being attempted—it would settle the whole question. The voice of universal humanity re-affirms the confession of Nicodemus, "No man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him." But inasmuch as the supernatural is thus attested by the natural, it was wise that nature should be interrogated at every point, and everywhere give a consentaneous answer. Is there not a beauty of wisdom in the method of John?—or may we not say, in the method of the Holy Ghost speaking by John? From Christ standing on the deck of the fisherman's boat and overruling nature's first great force, all the way up to the same Christ seated at the right hand of the Father, Lord paramount of the universe, all forces, all worlds, all principalities, all powers, all men, and all devils are subject to him who filleth all in all.

As has often been said of the sacred writers in general, so we may say specially of John, that he could not have been deceived as to the facts which he relates. This feature of John's argument has scarcely attracted its just attention, being somewhat thrown into shadow by the effulgence of the person of Christ. Nevertheless, John himself emphasizes it, and we ought to be in full sympathy with him. His opportunities of close scrutiny were abundant, by day, by night, on land, on sea, in public, in private. If Christ had been an impostor, it must have been found out by John.

The question then arises, Why should John have falsified about the matter? If Jesus had not really arisen from the grave, he had been dead about sixty years. The witchery of his presence had mouldered in some unknown sepulchre. The spell of his enchantment had been broken, and two generations of men had passed away since a blaspheming pretender to equality with God had met a felon's doom. Would John, would we, would any sane man, persist in reasserting and defending the horrible imposture?

An adventurous traveler once planted a black cross high in the eternal snow of Mt. Ararat. Thrown into relief by the background of spotless white, it could be seen from far beneath; it remained so for years; it may peradventure be there to-day. The whiter the snow and the blacker the cross, the more certainly and the more distinctly could its blackness be seen.

The application is obvious. If John were a wilful impostor, he has taken the most remarkable means of exhibiting his baseness to all subsequent generations. He has selected the one spotless background of all history in front of which to place his baseness. What should be said of a man who, knowing his master to be a liar and a blasphemer, should portray him as the one exalted and infinitely pure God-man?—and persist in this shocking falsehood down to an age of ninety or a hundred years, when ambition's fires have died out on the hearthstone, and the dawn of eternity is peering in at the door-way?

If it were not aside from our present line of argument, we might add that the colors of the portraiture which he has given us of the Christ are not found on the earth; the brush must have been dipped into the tints of heaven.

Falsification in John would have held him up to certain contempt and universal reprobation.

Why should we not as readily believe John's statements as those of Julius Cæsar? This leads to the further question: Why do we accept as true in the main that ingenious campaign document and adroit piece of self-glorification, the Commentaries on the Gallic war? Because Cæsar would not have dared to forge accounts of what had never happened; because he is everywhere so precise, so graphic, so circumstantial; because the facts recounted by him are necessary to explain collateral and subsequent history; because even the pure Latinity of his style is befitting to a man of culture in the latest days of the Roman republic.

All these points are just as striking in the case of John. As to circumstantiality, see how he names persons, places, occasions, and even introduces the criticisms, favorable or unfavorable, of bystanders in the streets of Jerusalem.

It is more in the line of our present article to ask how John, unless divinely guided, could have made the selection of the facts which have been detailed? Were the sacred writers not naturalists? This has often been alleged by unbelievers, and we suppose it to be true. So much the better. We have had to slightly rearrange the facts so as to exhibit their wonderful relation to our modern science, just as in botany, geology, zoölogy, we take widely scattered facts and trace their beautiful scientific relations, and thus, with John Kepler, think God's thoughts after him.

As John touched nature at so many points, why did he make no mistakes? Plato had by general consent one of the finest intellects that has graced philosophy. Yet see the pitiable blunders in natural science in his *Timæus*! How was John preserved from all this except by the all-wise One himself? One of the most remarkable aspects of this whole affair is, that John has erected a citadel which has withstood all the attacks of infidelity, from even the most unexpected quarters. When we visited Fortress Monroe, a few years since, it appeared to our unprofessional eye to be a very strong place. What with the granite walls, the moat, the enormous ramparts, the siege-guns above and the bomb-proof casements beneath, it seemed a fortification of consummate

powers of resistance. But an officer on duty there told us, that the recently-invented projectiles thrown from on board ship of an armor-plated squadron would plow their way through and through all those earthworks faced with granite. Suppose two thousand years hence the art of gunnery shall have gone as far beyond that of our day as ours is in advance of the catapults and battering rams of ancient Rome, can any man of the present time invent a fortification that will resist all attacks in every century after this nineteenth, and some of whose provisions of strength shall not be understood or appreciated until the ordnance of the twentieth century below ours shall have been devised and tried on those inexpugnable works? Yet this is what John has done in his Gospel. And, so far as we can judge, he could not foresee the nature of the assaults to be made nineteen or twenty centuries later. Was he not building under the guidance of Him who foresees the end from the beginning?

Last of all, we note the repose of manner in this beloved saint. Whatsoever others may think, John always calmly asserts that he knows whereof he speaks. He had seen, heard, touched, handled. John Ruskin says, in his *Modern Painters*, that God has stamped his rest on the vales of this earth; and this is as true as it is beautiful. But there is another part of nature in which his rest is even more conspicuous—the rest which comes after labor. Ten or twelve miles from the writer's home, above the old Silurian strata, the Appalachian chain which divides the Atlantic slope from the valley of the Mississippi has thrown out an isolated peak. Only a few miles away, and in full view of this solitary height, is an elegant country home whose hospitalities we have enjoyed when invited to preach in a neat chapel hard by. We have sat and watched the sunlight as it fell on the forest that sweeps from the plain to the summit, and the deep masses of shadow that trailed over the northern slope. How strong, yet how quiet, was this lonely mountain! Like a Roman sentinel on the outposts of his legion! Like the first pyramid that looked out from the valley of the Nile upon the eternal desert beyond! Older than Rome and her legions; older than Egypt and her pyramids; outlasting the legions, and, it may be, yet to outlast the pyramids, for its builder

was God. Layer after layer it was built up, until the topmost stone was laid, and then God rested from his labor, and his rest and his strength are there in the work of his hands. His deeper rest and mightier strength abide in the Gospel which he constructed by the hands of John, and the storms rage about its lofty heights in vain. The mountain and the evangel shall remain until Christ himself shall return to earth. "Even so; come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!"

If any soul of man, troubled with doubts and misgivings, should let fall a kindly eye on these pages, may we not in the deepest humility adopt the words of the beloved disciple, "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name."

L. G. BARBOUR.