

# The Sunday School Times

John D. Wattles & Co.  
Publishers

Philadelphia, December 3, 1898

Volume Forty  
Number 49

Published weekly, and mailed, post free, to any address in the United States or Canada, for \$1.50 per year. For rates to foreign countries, and for lower rates to ministers and to club subscribers, see eighteenth page.  
Copyright 1898 by John D. Wattles & Co.

## In this Issue

Lesson 12. December 18. The Captivity of Judah. Jer. 52: 1-11

The Words of Nebuchadnezzar Concerning Himself  
By Professor Robert W. Rogers . . . 802

Music in Joseph Parker's Church  
By A. J. Hawkins . . . . . 803

Luther and the Epistle of James  
By President Robert Ellis Thompson . 803

The Possibilities of a Christmas Anniversary  
By Samuel B. Huey . . . . . 805

Holiday Books of Humor and Fiction . . 811

For complete Table of Contents, see page 817.

## "And He Was Not, for God Took Him"

By William Cleaver Wilkinson

SO sudden and so swift  
The earthly end to him!  
Upward, O God, we lift  
Our eyes suffused and dim,  
Yearning to see, above  
These clouds about us blown,  
In sign thou still art love,  
The rainbow round the throne!

University of Chicago.

## Editorial

**Hopefulness** Hopefulness means fulness of hope. And the next thing after being full of hope is to run over with it. One of the best things about hopefulness is that it has some to spare for others; it is contagious. Genuine hopefulness is like a perennial fountain; it does not run to-day and go dry to-morrow, but, full to the brim, it moistens even the earth at its feet.

**Two Aspects of Christmas** The approach of a set season of festivity and merriment, like Christmas, is a promise of keener pain to the sorrowing. It is at just such times that losses are most severely felt. The noise of the world's gaiety sounds like the world's proclamation of indifference to bereavement. It grates harshly on an ear sensitized by sorrow. Yet the festivity must go on,—this is its right.

And sorrow must be considered,—this is its right. Neither festivity nor sorrow should rule, for each can be merciful and generous to the other.

**Duty of Being Loved** Being loved is a duty. The duty of loving is admitted by all, but the duty of being loved is not so generally recognized. A husband has a duty of being loved by his wife, a father by his child, a pastor by his people, a teacher by his pupils. Unless one is loved in such a relation, he cannot do his best work in it. It sometimes costs a great deal to win love, but it must be done by him who would do his full duty. If a man has not won the love that he ought to have in any close and dear relation, he must know that he himself is to blame for it. How is it in your case?

**To be Seen Giving** Obeying the letter of a rule may be the violating of its spirit. We are told not to let our left hand know what our right hand is doing, in the line of charitable giving. Now, if a man were to refuse to give with his right hand at a proper call for help lest his left hand should know about it, he could hardly be called a well-doer even by the standard of our Master's teaching. Giving in order to get credit for it from others, is contrary to the spirit of that rule; but giving to a good cause in a proper way, even though one is seen to do it, is not so, whatever the letter of the rule seems to say. To be seen giving is not always giving to be seen.

**Strength in Tenderness** He that would have most power over men must cultivate the grace of tenderness. It is a common saying, in business circles, that there are times, in dealing with one's debtors, when it is necessary to use a certain amount of severity. There are men who have failed in business because they interpreted this precept to mean that there are times when it is necessary to be cruel. There are no circumstances in life which require for a single moment the suspension of tenderness. A heavy, cruel hand never succeeds where a strong, tender hand has failed. God has not coupled cruelty with strength, tenderness with weakness. It is the weak man who feels the need of being cruel; it is the strong man who loves to be tender.

**Life's True Object** Not gain, but service, is the true object in life. If gain is made the object in one's life, one must inevitably fail, for the simple reason that the best things of life are not to be gained by striving for them; they are of a texture that cannot be grasped. One may strive for bread and win it, but one may strain every nerve to breaking in the pursuit of happiness, and he will never overtake it. On the other hand, if service is made the object in one's life, that life cannot be a failure, for the reason that one has chosen the only path above which the windows of heaven are always open. The happiness that eludes the grasp of every man

who strives for it descends, like the gentle dew of heaven, upon him who is striving in service. He alone gains what he strives for, and more.

## Christmas Gifts and Christmas Giving

LOVE and gratitude and reverence naturally show themselves in the giving of gifts. This has been so in all the ages. It will be so as long as man is man, and the promptings of the human heart are as they are. Wherever we find a primitive people we find that the best impulses of their being and the best practice of their lives are in the direction of making an offering of their possessions to those whom they recognize as their superiors in age or wisdom or power, or to whom they are grateful for special favors received. With peoples of the highest cultivation and attainments we find the same impulses and practices. All history, in its records and lessons, gives evidence that this has been so from the beginning, and that it must be so while man is man. This is shown by man Godward and manward, and the spirit is much the same in both directions.

In the Bible narrative, Cain and Abel, the first of the children of men, are represented as bringing gifts or offerings to God, as if it were a matter of course because man is man and God is God. Abraham, father of the faithful, when returning from his victory over Chedorlaomer, gave a portion of his spoils to Melchizedek as a representative of the Most High God who had given him the victory.

When Jacob went from Peniel to meet his elder brother Esau, from whom he had been long estranged, he took a present of his flocks and herds as an offering or a gift to Esau, in accordance with custom. When the sons of Jacob went from Canaan to Egypt to buy corn, they took, besides the money for payment, a present of balm and honey and spicery and myrrh and nuts and almonds. From the time that the children of Israel came out of Egypt, the command of God to them was that they were not to appear before him empty-handed; and this was not as a new command, but as in accordance with primitive customs and later.

When Saul, the son of Kish, wanted to ask help of Samuel, the Lord's prophet, in finding his father's asses, he would not go empty-handed into the presence of the prophet, and he took a portion of silver as his only available offering. In coming to King Solomon the Queen of Sheba brought a gift of much spices and gold and precious stones. Long centuries after this, the wise men from the East, who came to Bethlehem to see him who was born King of the Jews, brought gifts of gold and frankincense and myrrh. And so in all the Bible record of the Old Testament and the New.

On the monuments of ancient Babylon and Assyria and Egypt there are representations of the giving of rich gifts to the sovereigns of those days by embassies from other lands. And the oldest written records of outside history tell the same story as the Bible record of this custom in the Far East.

In our own day, there are frequent illustrations of the continued prevalence of this primeval custom

The Assyrian and Babylonian kings have left hundreds of inscriptions recounting in boastful phrases their great deeds. These inscriptions were written by the official keepers of records, and we shall probably not go far astray if we believe that all these inscriptions were influenced by the priestly class. But, though this be true, it is nevertheless perfectly just to assume that, whether of priestly origin or not, they were so written as to please the king. They give, indeed, just such a portrait of him as he wished should be handed down to later days. Was he a king full of honors won on many bloody fields of conquest? The inscriptions will ring with victory and resound with boastful words. Was he a king who took pride in the gathering of books and the founding of libraries? His written annals will tell soberly of this also, when they speak of his success in holding the great empire together. Was he a king who gloried in the digging of canals, the erection of temples, the beautifying of cities? His official texts will smack of engineering details and boast of marvels of construction. In a word, it is safe to say that, no matter who wrote them, the clay books of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings spring out of their own hearts.

We have many inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar written while he lived and worked. What do they show that he thought of himself and his deeds,—of what was he most proud? Let us answer that double question by the setting down of a few translated pieces from the records which have survived the wreck and ruin of a country which he made and kept great.

One of his most important inscriptions begins in this boastful fashion: "Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, sublime, exalted, favorite of Marduk, lofty priest-king, darling of Nabu, serene (?), possessor of wisdom, who regards the way of their godhead, who fears their lordship, governor without weariness, who takes thought daily for the care of E-Sagila [a temple in Babylon] and E-Zida [a temple in Borsippa], who thinks ever upon pious works for Babylon and Borsippa; wise, prayerful (?), maintainer of E-Sagila and E-Zida; chiefest son of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, am I."<sup>1</sup>

Those words are scarcely less noteworthy for what they omit than for what they contain. There is not one word of battle or of booty, of blood or of conquest, though these would form the burden of an Assyrian king's triumph. It was at the beginning of the reign of Sargon that Samaria fell into Assyrian hands, and the kingdom of Israel met its end. The inscriptions of Sargon boast only of war. There is just a ray of comfort in this thought that the kingdom of Judah, great David's line, should meet its end at the hands of a "scourge of God" who did not boast of war, but of peace, who cared not for destruction, but for rebuilding, who was indeed cruel when deceived as Zedekiah had deceived him, but who "thinks daily upon pious works for Babylon and Borsippa." Such a man as that might safely take God's people into a temporary exile, from which they should return to found a church and continue the outworking of God's plans for the race. He was a "governor without weariness," and would govern even exiles temperately. He was a "possessor of wisdom," and would keep them together by the banks of the Chebar, where their national solidarity might be preserved, and not sow them broadcast over his empire, as Sargon had done with poor doomed Israel.

But there are other revelations of the man in his words. Hear him again, as he says, "Since Marduk created me for sovereignty, and Nabu, his true son, entrusted his subjects to me, I love, like dear life, the building of their abiding-places."<sup>2</sup> Those are the words of a man who would much rather build a temple to Marduk or Nabu than tear down a temple to Jehovah. And the same spirit shows forth in those eloquent words, "Babylon, my darling city, which I love,"<sup>3</sup>—words of patriotism that would do honor to the best heroes of even modern life. But even more than these things was Nebuchadnezzar. Perhaps the finest prayers that the Babylonian religion has left for us come right out of his inscriptions, of which only one may here be set down: "O Shamash [the sun god], great lord, as thou enterest with joy and triumph (?) into the dwelling of thy lordship, E-babbara [a temple in Larsa], look with friendship upon the pious work of my hands. A life of many days, an established throne, a long reign, be thy com-

mand."<sup>4</sup> The man who could offer or accept as his own a prayer like that was a devout man. On that side of his nature he was a safe man to keep the people of the God of Abraham, even though he was himself a worshiper of gods many and lords many. There was religious tolerance enough in his land to enable Ezekiel to dwell there and to teach unmolested, in his own house, the doctrine of the one God.

That is the other side of Nebuchadnezzar. It is worth the telling. It will not bid us alter in any way the picture that the Old Testament has left of him. It only makes more clear how well his own character suited him to the work which was set him in God's providences of discipline for his chosen people.

*Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.*



### Music in Joseph Parker's Church

By A. J. Hawkins

Organist and Musical Director of the City Temple, London

THE City Temple is the oldest and one of the largest Congregational churches in London. The foundation stone of the present building was laid in 1873, the church itself being opened on May 19, 1874. The organ, a fine three-manual instrument, by Foster and Andrews of Hull, was opened on May 1, 1876. The choir are seated in front of the organ,—a position that enables the voices to be heard all over the building.

Upon undertaking, in 1893, the direction of the music, it was apparent to the writer of this article that, with such a cosmopolitan congregation and gifted preacher, the psalmody should be raised to the highest possible state of efficiency, thus making the ministry of song attractive and serviceable to the people and acceptable to our Lord and Saviour.

The great feature of our praise service is the grand hymn singing. No other word can rightly describe it. The vast congregation is like one great choir, and nothing, to my mind, is more inspiring, than to hear the whole congregation heartily joining in the "Old Hundredth," "All hail, the power," or any other well-known hymn. At the same time, I consider that the introduction of solos, quartets, chants, anthems, etc., renders the service more enjoyable to those who have a natural taste for good music. In this I am aided by a choir of some fifty members, under the leadership of a professional quartet, and they one and all possess the spirit of devotion, and are animated by intense zeal and earnestness in their work.

The choir meets for rehearsal every Friday evening, and it is essential that every one, including the quartet, should be present. The practice is conducted to the accompaniment of a pianoforte, and vital points in the singing to be strongly emphasized are precision, sharpness of attack, clear enunciation of words, and intelligent reading. We usually have a work of some kind in rehearsal, to quicken the interest and improve the reading power of the members. The preparation of the music for the following Sunday occupies the principal portion of the time set apart for practice, as we go over every item of the service, in order to give the necessary expression even to the hymns.

The full order of service is as follows. At five minutes to eleven o'clock a voluntary is played, and punctually at eleven o'clock Dr. Parker enters the pulpit, and the service begins with a short anthem or introit, in which the congregation usually join. Then an unaccompanied setting of the Lord's Prayer is sung by the choir, followed by the opening hymn (always a bright and familiar one), the first lesson, chant, second lesson, anthem (the congregation standing), then another hymn, and the sermon. During the offertory a solo or quartet is generally sung, followed by the closing hymn, with benediction and choral amen, in which the choir and congregation join. A voluntary as the congregation retire brings the morning service to a close.

In the evening, a voluntary at five minutes to seven o'clock (the signal for strangers to be seated) leads to the general confession being sung by the congregation and choir; then follow invocation, opening hymn, Scripture lesson, anthem (usually of a more elaborate character than in the morning, the congregation remaining seated), prayer, hymn, sermon, offertory and solo, closing hymn,

<sup>1</sup> "Inscriptions of Western Asia" (Rawlinson), Vol. I, p. 57, No. 3, column ii, lines 15-21.

<sup>2</sup> East India House Inscription, column i, lines 1-22.

<sup>3</sup> East India House Inscription, column vii, lines 26-31.

<sup>4</sup> East India House Inscription, column vii, lines 34, 35.

benediction, choral amen, and voluntary on organ or cornet solo as the congregation disperse.

The service is simple, but there is a splendid stateliness of movement in it, and an orderliness which is deeply impressive. A printed order of service is handed to each worshiper by a member of the staff, therefore making it unnecessary to announce any of the items. The whole arrangements of the service are unique, and certainly aid devotion, everything works so smoothly and apparently without an effort. The perfect finish and excellence of every detail make the service bright and incomparable. Dr. Berry says "that the musical service of Dr. Parker's church cannot be too highly praised. The people sing heartily, and the choir is thoroughly efficient. Until last Sunday [February 16, 1896, Dr. Berry was preaching in Dr. Parker's absence] I thought I had an objection to a cornet, but now I find I have none."

Now, as to the instruments I find most effective, of course the organ is quite indispensable. And, indeed, what is more impressive than the rolling volume of sound from a large organ, which, after all, is the backbone or foundation of that heartiness which is so soul-stirring in the hymns? A good, solid organ accompaniment is at all times necessary therefore. From our orchestral society we utilize about half a dozen violins, which are singularly effective in the soft and pathetic verses of the hymns, when I frequently drop the organ entirely, and the voices are led by the plaintive stringed notes alone. The congregation are quickly sensitive to the *piano* required, and the pitch is always preserved thereby. In addition to the strings, two cornets are used, and certainly assist in keeping the congregation together,—nothing is more dispiriting than a dragging hymn. On festival days we have quite a small orchestra in addition to the above instruments, a double bass and cello especially being very telling. I believe that all instruments help us in the worship of God if they are correctly and reverently played, as they should be for divine service. I advocate all reforms in the music of the sanctuary, in the full belief that they are most beneficial to our churches. Let us make the fullest use of the divine art of music in our worship of God. Let our best be given to his service.

I cannot close this paper without paying a very humble tribute of gratitude and thanks for the sympathy, interest, and cordial support, Dr. Parker ever shows in the service of praise, and one recognizes by his unvarying kindness how much a minister may further or hinder the congregational song.

*London, England.*



### Luther and the Epistle of James

By Professor Robert Ellis Thompson, S.T.D.

AMONG the questions which were reopened at the time of the Reformation, not the least important was that of the true canon of the Scripture. In the case of the Old Testament, the Reformers rejected as "apocryphal" those books and portions of books which were not found in Hebrew or Aramaic,—a mechanical test of standing which might have introduced the Book of Ecclesiasticus into the Protestant Bible if the Hebrew original, of which fragments have been recently discovered, had been in existence at that time. Substantially the canon accepted by the modern synagogue was taken as that of the ancient Jewish church, although the Lutheran and the Anglican churches treated the apocryphal books with a respect which the Calvinistic churches refused to them.

In the case of the New Testament no such rough-and-ready test of language existed, as all is in Greek. Neither was it possible to appeal to any existing church, either Greek or Latin, for a different canon from that of the Latin Vulgate, for that had been accepted by all the orthodox branches of Christendom for a millennium past. For these reasons the Protestant churches have settled down to accepting and vindicating the long-accepted canon as though it had been established by some infallible authority. This, however, was not the attitude of the Reformers, and especially not that of Luther. Even Calvin doubted the Petrine authorship of 2 Peter, excluded the Book of Revelation from the Scriptures on which he wrote commentaries, and also thus ignores the Second and Third Epistles of John.

Luther went much farther than this in refusing canonic authority to those parts of the accepted canon which were not either the direct work of an apostle or composed—as in the cases of Mark and Luke—under his direction. He thus rejected from the rank of canonic authority the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, that of Jude, the Second Epistle ascribed to Peter, and the Revelation. The two first do not claim apostolic origin; that claimed by the three last he rejected as un-historic.

It must be remembered that all the books thus assigned to less than canonic and apostolic rank were disputed in the early church for reasons which seemed strong to men who stood much nearer to the apostolic age than did Jerome and Augustine, whose judgment finally fixed the canon for the Western church. Origen of Alexandria, who lived A.D. 185-254, arranged the books for which a place in the canon had been claimed into three classes,—genuine, disputed, and spurious. Eusebius of Cesarea, who lived A.D. 265-340, repeats this classification, stating the grounds on which books we now have in the canon were rejected by some authors and by some parts of the church. The list of the disputed (*antilegomena*) includes those which Luther declined to accept as of apostolic authority, while he acknowledged in general their excellence of doctrine, and inserted them in his German New Testament, but with prefaces which indicated his opinion of them. I mention this to show that Luther was not acting on his personal impression merely, but with some regard to what church history had to say on the subject. He doubted if the questions thus raised in the patristic church had been settled on the best evidence.

It is his attitude toward the Epistle of James which has attracted the most attention, because, partly, of the relation of its teaching to that Pauline doctrine of justification by faith on which he set so great a value, and partly because of the characteristically strong terms in which he has contrasted its character with that of other parts of the New Testament. I cannot find that the earlier Roman Catholic controversialists alleged the teaching of James against Luther's doctrine. Thus Dr. John Eck, in the Leipsic Disputation of 1519, made nothing of it, while he poured upon Luther a flood of quotations from the Church Fathers. Yet some one must have suggested the objection, for, after his return from Leipsic, Luther published a sort of review of the arguments he had used in the Disputation, in which he says:

"As to the Epistle of the Apostle James, which is quoted as saying that 'faith without works is dead,' first, the style of that epistle is far beneath the majesty of an apostle; secondly, Paul is speaking of a living faith. Now dead faith is not faith, but opinion. But behold our theologians, how they hold on to this one authority by their teeth, caring not the least that all the rest of Scripture commends faith without works. For this is their fashion, to rend one little saying from the context, and to exalt their horn against the whole Scripture."

That there arose, at the time, a difference between Luther and his colleague, Dr. Andreas Bodenstein of Carlstadt, with regard to the authority of the Epistle, must be inferred from the latter's tract "On the Canonical Scriptures," which appeared in Wittenberg in 1520. It is the first treatise on the subject by any modern theologian, and it exhibits both learning and acumen. Substantially it is a vindication of the accepted canon on the grounds which had satisfied Augustine and Jerome, to whom Carlstadt constantly refers. Luther is not named, but more space is given to the Epistle of James than to any other book of the New Testament. Dr. Carlstadt objects very plainly to Luther's treatment of the epistle, as partisan, as irreverent toward the sacred writings, and as inconsistent, since Paul himself, in Romans 2:13, teaches substantially what is faulted in James. He finds fault with the "temper" (*iracundia*) which had been introduced into the discussion by his "brother," who had taken the other side.

This small tempest seems to have blown over, as we find Luther doing Carlstadt a good turn after this tract had been published. But the dispute seems to have left an impress on his mind, and to have been the cause of his vehemence in expressing his opinion of the matter. This appeared in the first edition of his German translation of the New Testament, which he published in September of 1522, after his return to Wittenberg from Wartburg Castle. This has a general preface, and one to each of the separate books. The former concludes

with a comparison of the books of the New Testament, to show which are "the noblest." Into this list he puts the Gospel of John, the Epistles of Paul, and the first Epistle of Peter, which he advised Christians to read first of all, and to make them as familiar as their daily bread:

"These are the books that show thee Christ, and teach thee all that it is necessary and saving to know, though thou never sawest nor hearest another book or doctrine. Whereas St. James' Epistle is a very epistle of straw in comparison with these, for it has nothing of an evangelical sort."

This whole comparison of the New Testament books was withdrawn from the later editions of his New Testament, perhaps because there was no use for it when the people had become more familiar with the contents and character of those books. This fact has misled some into supposing that Luther altered his opinion of the Epistle of James, which he never did. In the special preface to the Epistles of James and Jude, also printed in 1522, and never withdrawn or essentially altered, the same depreciatory estimate is expressed, though not in such graphic language. He begins, indeed, by praising the Epistle for "not setting forth the doctrine of man, but pressing hard the law of God." But he goes on to deny its apostolic character on the ground that it flatly contradicts Paul and all the rest of the Scriptures with regards to righteousness through works; also, because it teaches nothing with regard to the great mysteries of the gospel exhibited in the passion and resurrection of Christ, and, in fact, does not "preach Christ." He regards the author as one who lived after the apostles, but had acquired fragments of their teaching from their disciples, and wrote with reference to those who abused the doctrine of justification by faith, but ran into legalism because he was not equal to the handling of such a nice question. And this estimate Luther continued to publish as his own down to his death, modifying some expressions in the edition of 1545, but retracting nothing of the substance.

The point at which one might have expected a modification of Luther's opinion of James's Epistle was the so-called Antinomian controversy of 1528. John Agricola of Eisleben, who wanted to be more Lutheran than Luther, attacked Melancthon for teaching that the law had its uses in bringing sinners to repentance. Luther sustained Melancthon, and from that time spoke more guardedly about the relations of law and gospel, but never altered his opinion of James, even although Melancthon undertook to reconcile his teaching with that of Paul. Thus, in the "Table-Talk" of Luther, which was collected by his friends about 1535-37, he says:

"Many have labored, wearied themselves, and sweated over the Epistle of St. James, that they may reconcile it with St. Paul. As also Philip Melancthon has dealt with it in the Apologia [for the Augsburg Confession, 1530], but not with seriousness; for it is a flat contradiction,—'Faith justifies,' and 'Faith does not justify.' Who can make these agree, I will put my doctor's cap on his head, and I will let him call me a fool."

Nor was Luther without followers in this opinion. His classification of the books of the New Testament as more or less authoritative on account of authorship, was maintained by the great Lutheran scholars and dogmatists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They generally regarded the Epistle of James much as he did. It is only in our own century, through the labors of Neander (1822), Stier (1845), Delitzsch, and others, that the reconcilability of James and Paul has become the general view of orthodox theologians of the Lutheran Church.

Yet the statement has been made very widely, and is still made, that Luther retracted his depreciatory judgment of the Epistle of James. Matthew Henry, Philip Doddridge, Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," and others, have treated it as a youthful opinion, which the great reformer withdrew in his riper years. As Luther was thirty-nine years old when he wrote those words "an epistle of straw," he hardly can be supposed to have not yet reached years of discretion. The truth is that the reformer was a fallible, though a very great man, and that in this case he dealt with James's words in a mechanical and wooden fashion, which was unlike himself, and which he himself could least have afforded to have applied to his own words in many a case.

Philadelphia.

## For Children at Home

### The Y. G. Ball Team

By Alice Augusta Smith

NINE heads bobbed and nodded energetically; nine boyish voices rose unitedly in such eager, half-anxious discussion that their teacher would certainly have inquired into the trouble, but that they had gone far enough into the woods behind the schoolhouse to be out of sight and hearing. It was the Boys' Grammar School base-ball team having their first meeting to discuss ways and means.

Jim Terry, captain, had called the meeting, organized the team, and unfolded a plan.

They would call themselves "The Young Greysons," after Mr. J. Greyson, a wealthy resident of Newtown, who was known to be very kind and generous to boys. They would write him a letter telling him, and doubtless he would feel so honored that he would provide them with the needful things. It was quite natural they should think so, for every one in Newtown was interested in base-ball, and most of the teams had been supplied with money by gentlemen better able to pay than play.

Jim's plan would have been accepted at once had not Ed Lane come with an equally good offer. If they called themselves the "Young Grahams," Mrs. Graham, a friend and neighbor for whom Ed frequently ran errands, would give them the use of her large back lawn, and had even hinted that she would help them get suits.

"We'd better be Greysons, and get our balls and things," said Jim.

"But we ain't sure of them," replied Ed. "Anyway, we've got to have a place to play. If we're Grahams, we're sure of that and suits too, likely, and the other things are easier to get than those."

And then the discussion became so lively that it seemed likely there would be two grammar-school nines or none.

Suddenly, a bright idea came to Jim.

"See here," he said, "we can get both of them. 'Graham' begins with G, and 'Greyson' begins with G. We can be 'Y. G.'s, Young Greysons or Grahams, whichever you like."

Some of the boys eagerly agreed, but Ed Lane said promptly:

"That would be cheating."

"That's so. It don't seem just the thing," put in one of the others.

Jim Terry looked disgusted.

"Look here, Ed Lane; you're always upsettin' things with your old-granny notions, and settin' up to be more honest than the rest of us. Now show us the harm in this."

"We can't be both, and one would be cheated," said Ed doggedly.

"What's the reason we can't be both?" Jim went on, scornful and defiant. "Depends on where we are. Ain't we grammar-school boys and base-ball club boys both? 'Tain't as if they was getting anything by us being named after them."

And so they talked on, one by one agreeing with Jim, and when the bell rang for school he had conquered. If there were lingering doubts in the minds of any of the boys, they were forgotten as the happy weeks flew by, and the "Y. G.'s" enjoyed the generosity of both of their friends.

But there came a day when the captain called a meeting out under the oak. Jim's manner told them something was wrong, and they gathered promptly, looking anxious and expectant.

"Why, I've got these two letters,—that's what," said he in answer to their questions; "and they're both invitations, and both for the same day, and I don't know what's to be done about it."

Mr. Greyson wrote that a friend of his had his yacht in the harbor, and he would be pleased to have his team, the Y. G.'s, spend Saturday afternoon with him in a sail on the bay. And Mrs. Graham would be greatly pleased to have her boys spend the afternoon with her, and take supper on Saturday.

The boys heard the notes, and then Rob More asked: "Which came first? We could tell the other 'previous engagement,' you know."