

CONGREGATIONAL LIBRARY
JAN 2 1925
14 BRADDOCK ST
BOSTON 9 MASS

The Sunday School Times

Copyright, 1924, by The Sunday School Times Co. Entered at the Post-office at Philadelphia as second-class matter

Published weekly by The Sunday School Times Co., 1031 Walnut St., Phila., Pa.

Philadelphia, December 27, 1924
Vol. Sixty-six, No. 52

\$2.00 a year; in clubs, \$1.50
See page 811

Lessons for January 11 in this Issue

International Uniform, 2—The Last Judgment. Matthew 25:31-46.	
Whole Bible, 67.—Confirmation of Decrees. Ezra 6-18.	
Notes on Open Letters:	
The Science League of America	802
Does Prayer Really Change Things?	802
The Bible Teacher and Biblical Facts. By J. Gresham Machen, D.D.	803
Our Unconscious Hours. By Fitzwalter H. Wentworth	804
Questions on the Site of Sodom. By Melvin Grove Kyle, D.D., LL.D.	805
How God Helped with the Anesthetic. By Mrs. Freda J. Tomkinson	805
International Uniform Lesson	806-809
The Whole Bible Lesson Course	809, 810
The New Whole Bible Lesson Course	810
Young People's Prayer-Meeting. By John W. Lane, Jr.	810
To Prevent Errors and Delays	810
Children at Home	811
A Day of Need—and a Call to Prayer	811
Girls' Problems of To-day. Discussed by Mother Ruth	811
For Family Worship	811

THE Sunday School Times offers you a high grade of co-operation through its carefully scrutinized advertisements. But co-operation means acting jointly. Have you done your part by reading and using the advertising columns?

His Gift of Service Rare

By Sarah E. Loucks

MID the long, slow-trailing hours
When days and nights of pain
Like clouds, gray-clad, pass shadowy
In weary, irksome train,
The faint heart sometimes falters—
"My Father, tell me why
These hands that long to serve Thee
Must here in quiet lie?
—These feet that fain would hasten
On errands swift for Thee
Must leave those tasks to others?
Hast Thou no part for me?"

Soft through the silent stillness,
Between the pulse of pain,
The love-throbs of the Father
Surge strong with joyous strain;
He heeds with loving patience
My yearning heart-distress;
His voice of comfort answers
Like soothing, soft caress—
"My child, if thou wouldst serve Me
I give thee service rare—
Be thou as watchman—stationed
At the Mercy Seat in prayer."

EDITORIAL

A Second Chance?

Is there a "second chance," after this life, for those who have not received Christ as Saviour? At one of our various Life Conferences last summer a group of people were discussing this question. One of the conference speakers, in his address, said to them: "Excuse me, but may I ask you to remember this: 'Eternity keeps you.' That is the Word of God. During this life 'the bride [the Church] say, Come. . . will, let him take the water of life.' God's Word: 'We then as we are with him, beseech you also that ye receive the grace of God in vain. (For he saith, in a time accepted, and in the day of vengeance he will scourge thee; behold, now is the day of salvation.)'"

(2 Cor. 6:1, 2). And then, in tragic contrast with the freely offered gift of salvation in Christ stands the record and prophecy, in the same Word of God, concerning those who will not accept their opportunity of this life, for "whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. 20:15).

Training Not Enough

How can we be true to our best? The answer is the secret of success. An American business man, Charles M. Schwab, was recently asked for "a formula for personal achievement." His reply began, "If you can train yourself to be true to what you believe is best in life . . ." That advice is sincere and well meant, but it has a fatal weakness because no man can thus train himself. Being true to what one believes is best is never accomplished by training, by education, by self-discipline, or by any other form of human endeavor. It can come only by faith, never by works. Christ as Saviour is the only solution. If you would do what you believe is best, then "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." Having received Christ as Saviour, and having experienced the new birth by the Holy Spirit, a man receives supernatural power to be true to what he knows is best. Without Christ he is impotent to do this. But he can "do all things through Christ which strengtheneth" him (Phil. 4:13).

When the Spirit Asserted His Presidency

It was by an act of judgment that the Holy Spirit asserted his presidency over the young Apostolic Church. The Holy Spirit is usually gentle. He was symbolized by a dove at the baptism of our Lord. He "broods" as a hen over her young ones, as at the Creation. We think of the Spirit as "wooing" the erring sinner to be born again, and the Prodigal Son to return to the Father's house. He "loveth" even

to jealousy those of God's children who are compromising with the world. But he struck dead Ananias and Sapphira for keeping back part of the price and lying to Him. He is a Person—one of the Godhead—and although Peter was the human presiding officer over the early Church, the Holy Spirit is the real President, the Bishop and Convener and Moderator of all groups of the body of Christ. As he first asserted this right to be the Leader, "great fear" fell upon all those who believed. He shook a house, the place where the Christians were assembled together; he shakes the living temples by this act of judgment. It was an illustrative punishment to show God's hatred of all trifling and insincerity in our Christian service. Did Paul have something of this thought in mind when he said, "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men"?

Let God Make the Love Match

Real love matches ought to be made in heaven. All too often it is ambitious mothers who make love matches. But love matches ought to be made as was arranged the union between Isaac and Rebecca, in which angels played a part. Not so familiar to us is the love match between Jehosheba and Jehoida. It is said that this marriage is the only incident in Scripture of a royal princess marrying a high priest. God wished to circumvent Satan, who was trying to break the Davidic line from which the Messiah was to spring, and therefore God needed to have a princess in the royal palace who could save a baby from slaughter, as Jehosheba saved Joash when Athaliah had attempted to massacre all the seed royal. And God needed for this princess one who should be wife of a high priest, and who could hide that rescued baby in God's temple—the very safest place for him, as the national worship had been transferred from God's to Baal's temple. It is not too much to say that God has purposes for the bringing in of His kingdom through every union of young believers which is brought about by the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Is the Simple Gospel Sufficient for All?

THE Christian need not be one whit less up-to-date in his defense and justification of his faith in Jesus Christ as the Bearer of his sin than the most "progressive" and philosophical thinkers of our time. A stream of modern thought, for example, that has tended to dissolve Christian truth into mere experience is the science of psychology. Psychology says that religions form themselves out of the needs of men, and are based upon those needs as they change with each stage of civilization. But here is a weapon for the Christian, and not a new one either. Christianity is true because Christ fully satisfied the deepest needs of men.

In particular, the Christian doctrine that Jesus bore our sins in his death on the cross, that "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," that Jesus was "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," that "he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin,"—this truth of a real atonement for sin made by Jesus on the cross satisfies a need of the human heart that can be satisfied by no other teaching about Jesus. This need is just that of knowing that God himself has somehow disposed of our sins, that they have already actually been borne by some one else, upon whom they were laid by the Father.

There is an ineradicable tendency in men to believe that somewhere and sometime sin has to be suffered for. It is a fundamental and right instinct of our nature. All the queer aberrations we see in Roman Catholicism and in Hinduism are so many evidences of the need felt by men of expiating their sins. The only religion that satisfies this longing is the religion of the crucified Christ. It draws away man's attention from what he thinks he can do to improve or save himself, and focuses it on what God in Christ did for him. And then it directs this energy that was formerly misapplied in attempts to do the impossible, and uses it in the new life in Christ.

Only so can man find peace. His self-life can never

give him peace, and his self-life is what dominates until it is crucified with Christ who died for him. "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Here there is peace, and nowhere else. "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls." The Lord Jesus was not speaking of himself simply as the teacher of moral and religious truth, but of all that he was going to be, the Saviour of the world by his expiatory death on the cross. *The blood of Jesus gives us peace and rest. Nothing else can.*

This truth is adapted to the simplest minds. The Sunday School Times recently told of an old Chinese woman who was being examined for church-membership. "Who was Jesus?" asked the missionary.

"Jesus died for me."
"How did he die?"
"I don't know."
"Who were Jesus' disciples?"
"I don't remember. I can't read."

The deacons then spoke up, saying that the old woman was one of the most faithful, coming to services regularly, though living three miles away, and giving money when possible. Formerly she had a terrible temper, but since her conversion she had become kind-hearted and patient, and everybody in the neighborhood knew about it. The missionary questioned her about her prayer life, and found it very real. Of facts she knew hardly any, except the one important fact that *Jesus had died for her*. With this one fact she was a new creature in Christ Jesus.

"Yes," say some people to-day, "that is just it; this old-fashioned Gospel of yours is adapted to the simple, untutored minds that know nothing about history

The Bible Teacher and Biblical Facts

Have men the right to interpret the Bible as they please?

By J. Gresham Machen, D.D. Assistant Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis, Princeton Theological Seminary

IN THE sphere of education, facts are having a hard time. The old-fashioned notion of reading a book or hearing a lecture and simply storing up in the mind what the book or the lecture contains—this is regarded as entirely out of date. The other day I heard a noted educator give some advice to a company of college professors. It is a great mistake, he said, to suppose that a college professor ought to teach; on the contrary he ought simply to give the students an opportunity to learn.

This pedagogic theory has been having its natural result; it has joined forces with the natural indolence of youth to produce in present-day education a very lamentable decline. The decline has not perhaps been universal; in the sphere of the physical sciences, for example, the acquisition of facts is not regarded as altogether out of date. But in the spheres of literature and history, and still more in that of language-study, the tendency is perfectly plain. An outstanding feature of contemporary education in these departments is the growth of ignorance; pedagogic theory and the growth of ignorance have gone hand in hand.

The undergraduate student is being told that he need not take notes on what he hears in class, that the exercise of the memory is a rather childish and mechanical thing, and that what he is really in college to do is to think for himself and to unify his world. He usually makes a poor business of unifying his world. And the reason is clear. He does not succeed in unifying his world for the simple reason that he has no world to unify. He has not acquired a knowledge of a sufficient number of facts in order even to learn the method of putting facts together. He is being told to practise the business of mental digestion; but the trouble is that he has no food to digest. The modern student, contrary to what is often said, is really being starved for want of facts.

But if that condition prevails in the sphere of general education it is tenfold worse in the sphere of the Christian religion and in the sphere of the Bible. Bible classes to-day often avoid a study of the contents of the Bible as they would avoid pestilence or disease. But surely that tendency should be resisted. It does seem to me—hopelessly out of date as it may be regarded—that the first function of the Biblical teacher is to impart a simple knowledge of what the Bible contains. Discussion may come later, but the first thing is to let the Bible—the whole Bible, not an expurgated Bible—the first thing is to let the Bible speak for itself.

The Abandonment of Historical Method

A generation or so ago this notion of letting the Bible speak for itself, or at least letting the individual Biblical writers speak for themselves, was exalted to the dignity of a principle. The principle was called "grammatico-historical exegesis." The fundamental notion of it was that the modern student should distinguish sharply between what he would have said or what he would have liked to have the Biblical writer say, and what the writer actually did say. The latter question only was regarded as forming the subject-matter of exegesis.

This principle, in America, is rapidly being abandoned. It is not being abandoned in theory; lip-service is still being paid to it. But it is being abandoned in fact. It is being abandoned by the most eminent scholars.

It is abandoned by Professor Goodspeed, for example, when in his translation of the New Testament he translates *dikaioo*, "justify," by "make upright." I confess that it is not without regret that I should see the doctrine of justification by faith, which is the foundation of evangelical liberty, thus removed from the New Testament; it is not without regret that I should abandon the whole of the Reformation and return with Professor Goodspeed to the merit-religion of the Middle Ages.

But the point that I am now making is not that Professor Goodspeed's translation is unfortunate because it involves—as it certainly does—religious retrogression, but because it involves an abandonment of historical method in exegesis. It may well be that the New Testament is a sinful man may become "righteous" but that does not interest the modern translator; the historian must certainly admit that it is the apostle Paul. And the translator of the New Testament, if he be true to his trust, place the emphasis where it is placed and not where the translator wished it placed.

The case of Paul is true also in the case of the modern writers who have abandoned the grammatico-historical approach. They persist in concluding that they could have wished that the question what Jesus actually said, the most popular recent books on the subject—*The Reconstruction of*

Religion by Professor Ellwood—I came upon the following amazing assertion. "Jesus," the author says, "concerned himself but little with the question of existence after death!"¹ In the presence of such assertions any student of history may well stand aghast. It may be that we do not make much of the doctrine of a future life, but the question whether Jesus did so is not a matter of taste but an historical question which can be answered only on the basis of an examination of the sources of historical information, which we call the Gospels.

And the result of such examination is perfectly plain. As a matter of fact, not only the thought of heaven but also the thought of hell runs all through the teaching of Jesus. It appears in all four of the Gospels; it appears in the sources, supposed to underlie the Gospels, which have been reconstructed, rightly or wrongly, by modern criticism. It imparts to the ethical teaching of Jesus its peculiar earnestness. It is not an element which can be removed by any critical process but simply suffuses the whole of Jesus' teaching and Jesus' life. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." "It is good for thee to enter into life with one eye rather than having two eyes to be cast into the Gehenna of fire"—these words are not an excrescence in Jesus' teaching but are quite at the center of the whole.

At any rate if you are going to remove the thought of a future life from the teaching of Jesus, if you are going to reject the *prima facie* evidence, you can do so only by a critical grounding of your procedure. And my point is that that critical grounding is now usually thought to be quite unnecessary. Modern American writers simply attribute their own predilec-

¹ Ellwood, *The Reconstruction of Religion*, 1922, p. 141.

TUCKED away almost at the end of a magazine entitled with unconscious irony "Christian Education" is the address by Professor Machen which *The Sunday School Times* gladly gives to its readers as its contributed leader this week.

"Christian Education" is the organ of the Council of Church Boards of Education in the United States of America, representing the various evangelical Protestant denominations, but sadly misrepresenting their historic creeds and the true Church of Christ. Its December issue is devoted to the annual Conference of the National Association of Biblical Instructors held at Columbia University, New York, in December of 1923.

The President of this Association is Professor Charles Foster Kent, of Yale, the well-known destructive critic who gained notoriety through his editorship of the *Shorter Bible* and who now plans to capture America's colleges for unbelief by his "Schools of Religion." The magazine reports Professor Kent's address, in which he refers to the Lord Jesus Christ as one of the great "pioneers of human thought and experimentation."

Other addresses were by extreme radicals, such as Professor B. W. Bacon, of Yale, speaking on "The Biblical Teacher and Liberalism," in which he refers to "John the Apostle (according to tradition) whatever John he may have been," as one who in his New Testament writings wisely and tactfully dodged such questions as the physical resurrection, the judgment day, and the visible second return, "by spiritualizing these ideas. The ancients knew very well that it was a spiritualizing Gospel. Its author refused to know Christ after the flesh; he knew him after the Spirit. . . . We, if we are wise, will seek to apply such principles to the problems of our own time."

Other Modernists, including Professor Henry T. Fowler, of Brown University, Professor Irving F. Wood, of Smith College, and the like, delivered their addresses in complacent rejection of the facts declared in the Word of God.

Then came Professor Machen's address. It would have been interesting to watch the faces of that group of "Christian educationists" while he uttered his masterly, scientific, unequivocal and unanswerable message. If the reader keeps in mind the setting and atmosphere in which Dr. Machen dealt these giant strokes for the truth and the Gospel, his utterances will be seen to have an almost unique significance.

tions to Jesus without, apparently, the slightest scrutiny of the fact.

This wholesale abandonment of historical method is being summed up in the use of one word—the word "interpretation." Formerly when men had brought to their attention perfectly clear assertions they used to accept them or else deny them. Now they no longer deny, but merely "interpret." History, men say, must be interpreted in accordance with the thought of our own age. But I sometimes wonder just where this business of interpretation will stop.

I am in a company of modern men. They begin to test my intelligence. And first they test me on the subject of mathematics. "What does six times nine make?" I am asked.

I breathe a sigh of relief; many questions might have placed me very low in the scale of intelligence, but this question I think I can answer. I raise my hand hopefully. "I know that one," I say. "Six nines are fifty-four."

But my complacency is short-lived. My modern examiner puts on a grave look. "Where have you been living?" he says. "Six nines are fifty-four—that is the old answer to the question."

In my ignorance I am somewhat surprised. "Why," I say, "everybody knows that; that stands in the multiplication-table; do you not accept the multiplication-table?"

"Oh, yes," says my modern friend, "of course I accept the multiplication-table. But then I do not take a static view of the multiplication-table; every generation must interpret the multiplication-table in its own way. And so of course I accept the proposition that six nines are fifty-four, but I interpret that to mean that six nines are a hundred and seventeen."

And then the examination gets into the sphere of history. The examiner asks me where the Declaration of Independence was adopted.

That one also I think I know. "The Declaration of Independence," I say, "was adopted at Philadelphia."

But again I meet with a swift rebuke. "That is the old answer to the question," I am told.

"But," I say, "every one knows that the Declaration of Independence was adopted at Philadelphia; that stands in all the history books; do you not accept what stands in the history books?"

"Oh, yes," says my modern friend, "we accept everything that stands in the history books—hundred-percent Americans we are. But then, you see, we have to interpret the history books in our own way. And so of course we accept the proposition that the Declaration of Independence was adopted at Philadelphia, but we interpret that to mean that it was adopted at San Francisco."

Interpretation, a Substitute for Denial

And then finally the examination turns to the history of the Christian religion. "What do you think happened," I am asked, "after Jesus was laid in that tomb near Jerusalem about nineteen hundred years ago?"

To that question also I have a very definite answer. "I will tell you what I think happened," I say: "He was laid in the tomb and then the third day he rose again from the dead."

At this point the surprise of my modern friend reaches its height. The idea of a professor in a theological seminary actually believing that a dead man rose from the grave! "Every one," the examiner tells me, "has abandoned that answer to the question long ago."

"But," I say, "my friend, this is very serious; that answer stands in the Apostles' Creed as well as at the center of the New Testament; do you not then accept the Apostles' Creed?"

"Oh, yes," says my modern friend, "of course I accept the Apostles' Creed; do we not say it every Sunday in church—or at least if we do not say it we sing it—of course I accept the Apostles' Creed. But then, do you not see, every generation has a right to interpret the Creed in its own way? And so now of course we accept the proposition that the third day he rose again from the dead; but we interpret that to mean, 'The third day he did not rise again from the dead.'"

In view of this modern art of interpretation one may almost wonder whether the lofty human gift of speech has not been rendered entirely useless. If everything that I say can be interpreted to mean its exact opposite, what is the use of saying anything at all? I do not know when the great revival of religion will come. But one thing is perfectly clear. When it does come, the whole elaborate art of "interpretation" will be brushed aside, and there will be a return, as there was at the Reformation of the sixteenth century, to plain common sense and common honesty. It is a very great mistake to suppose that as Biblical teachers you "have a right" to interpret

the Bible as you please. Certainly if your interpretation differs from mine I have no right to force you, by physical compulsion, to hold my view. But as for you, in the presence of God, the only interpretation which you have a right to hold is the interpretation which is true—not an interpretation which changes from generation to generation, but the interpretation which was held by the original author of the books.

The widespread abandonment of historical interest in dealing with the Bible is not without importance. At bottom it involves nothing less than an abandonment of the Christian religion. For the Christian religion differs from other religions just in being founded, not merely upon permanent truths, but upon events. If certain things happened in the first century of our era, as they are said to have happened in the New Testament, then the Christian religion is true; if they did not happen, then the Christian religion is false, and some totally different religion, such as the naturalistic Modernism of the present day, which is essentially the same, I suppose, as the religion of humanity of the Positivists and of Professor Ellwood, must be substituted for it. Or else—an alternative which I personally might be obliged to prefer—we shall have to get along without any religion at all.

But is the Christian religion really founded upon events? That question involves a question which has actually gotten into the magazines and the front pages of the newspapers—the question, "What is Christianity?"¹

How shall that question be answered? I for my part believe that it can be answered only by an examination of the thing that is to be defined. I am actually old-fashioned enough to think that if you are going to tell what Christianity is the proper thing to do is to look at Christianity. If I were asked to give a description of the City of New York I should not go into the center of Kansas and evolve a description of New York out of my inner consciousness, but I should take a train to this city, and, having looked the place over, I should try to tell what it is like. So it is with Christianity. Christianity is an historical phenomenon like the city of New York or the United States of America or the Kingdom of Prussia or the Roman Empire. And being an historical phenomenon it can be investigated only by historical means. When you say that Christianity is this or that you are making an assertion in the sphere of history; it is very different from saying that Christianity ought to be this or that, or that Christianity would have been better if it had been this or that, or that the ideal religion would be this or that. The question "What is Christianity?" does not lie in the sphere of idealism; it is not a question about what ought to be, but a question about what is. And as such it must be investigated by historical means.

But how shall we determine what any great movement in its essence really is? I do not see how you can avoid going back to the beginnings of the movement. Unless there is some sort of continuity between the later manifestations and the beginning, the use of the original name is obviously misleading. So it is with Christianity. It is quite conceivable that the originators of the Christian religion; whoever they were, were mistaken—that is a matter for investigation. It is quite conceivable that they had no right to legislate for all subsequent generations. But at any rate they did have the right to legislate for all generations that should choose to bear the name of "Christian." We can determine what Christianity is only by examining the beginnings of Christianity.

And when the examination is carried on without prejudice, the result of it is plain enough. Clearly, Christianity at its inception was not just a way of life, but a way of life founded upon a message. If one thing is abundantly plain it is that the first Christian missionaries did not just come forward and say, "We have been living in contact with a wonderful person, Jesus of Nazareth, and we call upon you our hearers to submit yourselves to the contagion of that great personality." That is what modern men might have expected the first Christian missionaries to say. But as a matter of cold historical fact it is perfectly plain that they said nothing of the kind. What they did say was, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; He was buried; He has been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures." Christianity at its inception was certainly a strange new type of life; but it was a type of life founded not upon mere exhortation or upon the contagion of personal relationship, but upon a piece of news; it was not a life as distinguished from a doctrine, but a life founded upon a doctrine. . . .

Jesus came, as has well been said, not primarily to say something, but to do something. And all Christianity is based upon the recognition of that fact. Christianity, in other words, is not a philosophy but a redemptive religion; it is founded not merely upon what always existed but upon what happened, not merely upon eternal truths but upon historical facts.

There is one advantage about facts—they stay put. All knowledge is based upon a static view of facts—the knowledge involved in the physical sciences and also the knowledge involved in the Christian religion.

¹ For what follows, compare Christianity and Liberalism, 1923, especially pp. 19 ff.

When I was very young I used to ask myself whether God could make a thing that had happened so that it had not happened. The question no longer troubles me. Possibly God could do it, but I am quite sure that he never will. A fact remains a fact for millions upon millions of years, and it remains a fact not only here but on the remotest star.

But modern Biblical study is increasingly indifferent to facts. "It makes no difference" is its great slogan where historical questions are concerned. The result is a lamentable intellectual decline. In the evil days upon which Biblical scholarship has now fallen one can almost long even for the errors of the past. The Hegelianism of Baur and his associates was no doubt a serious error; but unlike modern pragmatism it was not an error that discouraged intellectual life.

Many of you no doubt disagree with me about the facts of Biblical history—about the Virgin Birth of Jesus, his miracles, his resurrection. I certainly cannot hope to convince you, in the half-hour which is now at an end, that I am right and you are wrong. But let us be clear about one point—these things are not matter of indifference. It is upon these questions that the future of the Christian religion depends. The Christian religion is not independent of science—scientific history or the physical science—it is not a harmless and useless epiphenomenon without interrelation with other spheres of knowledge, but like everything else that is worth while it must seek to justify its place, despite all the conflicts which that involves, in the realm of facts.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Our Unconscious Hours

The confidence with which we may approach the borderland of natural or artificial sleep

By Fitzwalter H. Wentworth

Few there are who at some time in their lives do not have to face submission to an anesthetic. Is it right to be put to sleep artificially? Is it right to take a sleeping draught or other deadening drug? In this fifth article in his series, "Beside Our Beds of Pain," Mr. Wentworth, a pastor of wide experience in hospital chaplaincy, answers these and other questions that trouble earnest Christians. Are you eager to share the series with friends who need just this counsel? The seven chapters appearing here, and others of equal value in same, kindly advice, are now brought together in an attractive volume to be had from The Sunday School Times Company, at \$1, postpaid.

SLEEP is the divine benediction following labor, physical weariness and grief. It comes as the healing breath of God in hours of pain. It gives those mysterious recuperative forces within our bodies unhindered opportunity to fulfil their providential purpose. Our worrying wills too often interfere with these powers in our periods of wakefulness. And this is frequently true also in reference to our spiritual life. We depend too much upon the things that can be seen, heard, and felt; and so often fail in our faith when it comes to realities that are unseen and eternal. Consciousness as we understand it is but a small phase of the human personality. We do not cease to think when we sleep. Mind continues its mysterious activities; so much so, that the problems of our waking hours are often solved during our sleep. Dr. Andrew Murray, that great spiritual teacher whose devotional books have helped so many of God's people, wrote, with more than psychological insight, "Deeper down than where the soul with its consciousness can enter, there is spirit matter linking man with God; and deeper down than the mind and feelings or will—in the unseen depths of the hidden life—there dwells the Spirit of God."

It means more than we can tell to fall asleep "thinking God's thoughts after him." To fill the mind in the moments before sleep with Scriptural truth is to enrich all our waking life; for thus do we give to the Holy Spirit, in the hidden depths of our being, that material which he seeks for the building up and strengthening of Christian character.

Sleep, the very mention of the word in weary moments seems to have hypnotic influence upon us. Mrs. Browning asks in reference to Psalm 127:2:

"Of all the thoughts of God that are
Borne inward unto souls afar,
Along the Psalmist's music deep,
Now tell me if that any is,
For gift or grace, surpassing this—
'He giveth His beloved sleep?'"

How truly human, how greatly one with us in our common life, do we see our divine Lord to be, when we read: "As they sailed he fell asleep!" Not even the terrific storm awoke him, nothing less than the terrified cry of the apostles, "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" But after his "Peace be still," he asked, "Why are ye so fearful? how is it that ye have no faith?" These questions remind us that while Christ in his humanity found sleep a necessity, "He that keepeth thee will not slumber . . . neither slumber nor sleep." He is, as Josiah Conder so finely declares,

"Quickener of our wearied powers;
Guard of our unconscious hours."

There are times, however, when we suffer from insomnia. Especially is this the case in some forms of sickness. The more we seek sleep the more does it fly from us. Various methods of inducing sleep are recommended by different friends, but they may all, somehow, fail.

We need to realize that to worry about sleeplessness is to drive sleep farther and farther from us. Worry is nothing but a scarecrow, or rather scare-sleep. And we know that scarecrows are not intended to woo, but, as their name suggests, to frighten away.

We can be sure that sleep will come sooner or later. We need not bother our heads about the exact time; nature will see to that.

Napoleon I said, "Different affairs are arranged in my head as in drawers. When I wish to interrupt one train of thought, I close the drawer which contains that subject and open that which contains another. They do not mix together or inconvenience me. I have never

been kept awake by an involuntary preoccupation of mind. If I wish for repose, I shut up all the drawers, and I am asleep. I have always slept when I wanted rest, and almost at will." Sir Walter Scott seems to have been blessed with similar power. But sick folk and nervous people sometimes find that while they endeavor to shut up every drawer, there is always one that will not quite close. It will project a little and expose the subject they wish to dismiss from mind. In that case it is wise to say to oneself, "If that drawer will not go in, let it remain out—I will not bother with it!" Let us call to mind that beautiful old German hymn:

"When sleep her balm denies,
My silent spirit sighs,
May Jesus Christ be praised!
The night becomes as day,
When from the heart we say
May Jesus Christ be praised!"

Not every one needs the same amount of sleep. We must not measure our needs by those of another, or even by those of our more active life, when in health. So long as we are resting it matters little whether we actually sleep or not. And ceasing to worry about sleep will help us to rest apart from it.

But what, when we cannot rest, not because of worry, but because our body is racked with pain? Is it right to take a drug or sleeping draught to induce sleep? Most certainly if prescribed by an honorable physician, yet only when really necessary. Let us make up our mind that we will not ask for it when there is no pain or when the pain is reasonably bearable. It is foolish to take it for an ordinary case of insomnia. The sleep it gives is only artificial. One does not awake from it refreshed, but rather craving for more of the stupor it creates. There is scarcely a worse bondage, when once it gains the mastery, than the drug habit. It destroys the usefulness of both body and soul.

How about taking an anesthetic, some will ask? Not a few people dread dying under its influence. And occasionally one meets with a person who wonders whether it is right, especially in certain cases, to be put to sleep. Of course, nearly all the people in hospitals awaiting an operation have fully made up their minds in the matter; but there are always numbers outside who have not done so. And some of these latter may be growing rapidly worse through delay.

Well, let us not forget that when God wanted to perform a certain important operation upon Adam, he put him to sleep, "deep sleep," say the Scriptures. And God did not awaken him till the special rib was taken away and the flesh closed up. Therefore the surgeon has strong Scriptural reason for the use of an anesthetic.

It is true that once in a great while we do learn of some one dying under an anesthetic, but the proportion of such deaths is exceedingly small. And, after all, these very people might not be in some more painful fashion.

I used to think that I would never need an anesthetic. I had a peculiar dream, largely artificial unconsciousness, largely artificial, in certain dreams in childhood. But I was seriously ill of an abscess behind my ear, and meant having the drum pierced to taking an anesthetic, and two days of having the drum pierced without any favorable result. I was persuaded me to go to the hospital for an anesthetic. And I have wondered if I didn't take it in the first place. My consciousness had stood in the