

# The Sunday School Times

John D. Wattles & Co.  
Publishers

Philadelphia, April 17, 1897

Volume Thirty-nine  
Number 16

## Contents

<b>EDITORIAL:</b>	
Notes.—New Words to a Child. Only One Best. Standards of Conduct. Looking Upward and Outward. Sympathy as a Power . . . . .	241
The Practical Significance of Christ's Resurrection . . . . .	242
<b>NOTES ON OPEN LETTERS:</b>	
George Fox and the Society of Friends. New Map of Paul's Journeys. Why was Saul Called Paul? . . . . .	242
<b>FROM CONTRIBUTORS:</b>	
Dawn [poem]. By Grace Duffield Goodwin . . . . .	243
The Rise of the Society of Friends. By President R. E. Thompson . . . . .	243
Easter Recollections. By the Rev. M. A. Starr . . . . .	244
<b>FOR CHILDREN AT HOME:</b>	
Theodora's Search. By Mrs. Charlotte F. Wilder . . . . .	244
<b>SUPERINTENDENT AND OTHER OFFICERS:</b>	
A Sample Teachers' Conference. By Hamilton S. Conant . . . . .	245
Invitation-Programs for Teachers'-Meetings. Special Bible Questions for Home Study. Class Banner minus Tommy Jones . . . . .	245
<b>FOR THE TEACHER:</b>	
Sacredness of the Teacher's Work. By J. R. Miller, D.D. . . . .	245
Teacher's Letter to Parents on Seed-Sowing. Booklets for Nine Simons . . . . .	245
<b>LESSON HELPS:</b>	
Lesson Calendar . . . . .	247
Outline Studies . . . . .	247
<b>Lesson 5. May 2. Paul Begins his First Missionary Journey. Acts 13: 1-13.</b>	
Lesson Plan and Analysis . . . . .	247
Lesson Surroundings and Critical Notes. By Prof. M. B. Riddle, D.D. . . . .	248
The Lesson Story. By Cunningham Geikie, D.D., LL.D. . . . .	248
To the Regions Beyond. By Alexander McLaren, D.D. . . . .	249
Teaching Points. By Bishop H. W. Warren, D.D., LL.D. . . . .	249
Illustrative Applications. By Wayland Hoyt, D.D. . . . .	250
Teaching Hints. By A. F. Schaffler, D.D. . . . .	250
The Senior Bible Class. By Professor Frank K. Sanders, Ph.D. . . . .	250
Hints for the Intermediate Teacher. By Faith Latimer . . . . .	250
Hints for the Primary Teacher. By Julia E. Peck . . . . .	251
Question Hints. By Amos R. Wells . . . . .	251
Blackboard Hints. By the Rev. E. Morris Fergusson . . . . .	251
Hints for Lesson-Hymns . . . . .	251
Oriental Lesson-Lights. By H. B. Tristram, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S., and the Rev. William Ewing . . . . .	251
Sociological Notes. By President Robert Ellis Thompson, S.T.D. . . . .	252
Lesson Summary . . . . .	252
<b>BOOKS AND WRITERS:</b>	
The Lutheran Commentary . . . . .	252
The Natives of Sarawak and British North Borneo. The Land of the Castanet . . . . .	253
<b>BUSINESS DEPARTMENT:</b>	
Advertising Rate . . . . .	253
Terms of Subscription . . . . .	254
<b>LITERARY NOTES AND NEWS:</b>	
A Biblical Scholar's Semi-Centennial. Periodical for the Christian Orient . . . . .	254
<b>WORK AND WORKERS:</b>	
Convention Calendar. 1897 . . . . .	255
A Bible Normal College . . . . .	255

Copyright 1897 by John D. Wattles & Co.



**New Words to a Child** Every young life is a new life. It was never lived before, but it has now begun to live for always. A word of counsel or of warning to a child may be the first word on that subject which that child has ever heard, even though it is a commonplace thought to him who utters it. That word may influence that child's life and destiny. A parent or a teacher cannot realize too fully the importance and responsibility of any and every talk with a child.

**Only One Best** There is only one best way to do anything. A sweet-spirited, motherly Friend, in speaking of the common readiness to criticise others harshly, said that we might well temper our judgment of one another's mistakes and

shortcomings, for, as she put it, "There are so many ways that are wrong, and only one way that is right." The chances and the Devil are in favor of our choosing one of the many wrong ways, rather than the one and only right way, in any course of action. But let us thank God that he is always ready to help us into seeing and doing the right!

### Standards of Conduct

A noble deed called forth by the exigencies of an extraordinary time, is not in itself a standard of conduct for ordinary times. The man who, in an hour of dire public calamity, throws open his granary or store to the multitude, may be doing a heroic thing, but such an act at an ordinary time would lack all the elements of heroism. Children are often perplexed by stories of noble deeds, related to them by teachers, who fail to distinguish between a deed and the spirit which prompts it. Many a tot has held on to an only doll with a dreadful sense of guilt, after hearing how the disciples "sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need." The object of such stories is not to teach us what to do, so much as to teach us the spirit which should prompt our deeds. They do not furnish us with patterns to cut by; they suggest principles or rules to live by.

### Looking Upward and Outward

Attention to the details of Christian work need not prevent our taking a world-wide view of the kingdom of God. Paul was a workman who never slighted the most obscure and wearisome yet needful details of his work. But he raised his eyes from his work long enough to see the vision of a kneeling universe. He caught a glimpse of the future attitude of every human being,—of the time when every knee should bow and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. It may be that those who are most conscientious and faithful in the unobserved details of Christian living and service are those who are oftenest rewarded by the sweep of the wide horizon of God's great purpose in behalf of believers on his Son. The most assiduous worker may oftenest have before his view the future greatness of Christ's kingdom. He may most distinctly hear the far-off pean and the resounding trumpet-tones of the proclaiming angel: "The kingdoms of the world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever."

### Sympathy as a Power

Sympathy is a large factor in human power. It means more, as an element of strength and of success, than brawn or brain, than skill or experience. Whatever one has in himself, or in these faculties and possessions, if he has the added gain of real sympathy, his power is at least doubled. "Sympathy" is the sharing of another's burdens; literally, it means "to suffer with another," but practically it means to help another in his sorrows and in his joys. Bacon says: "There is no man that imparteth his joy to his friend but he joyeth the more; and no man imparteth his griefs

to his friend but he grieveth the less." Who is there who would not feel greatly helped by another who could double his joys and halve his sorrows? He who has a sympathizing friend has one who can do this for him. He who is in full sympathy with another has power to do this for that other. Many a strong man would fall and fail if it were not for sympathy. Many an efficient man is enabled to do his best work through the help of sympathy of which no one but himself knows.

## The Practical Significance of Christ's Resurrection

THE observance of Easter has now become almost universal among Christians of every name. The increased observance of the day is adapted to bring the resurrection of Christ into a place of importance in modern Christian thought similar to that which it had in the teaching and preaching of the apostles. The resurrection was for them the fact of first importance. They preached Jesus and the resurrection. They laid but a minor stress on the other miracles. It was enough to maintain this crowning miracle as the highest proof of all the rest and of the divinity of Jesus. The apostles used the resurrection of Christ both as a proof of the truth of his gospel and as a ground of personal comfort and hope. We are helped to see why they made this truth so prominent when we consider the real import of Christ's resurrection for Christian thought and life.

Our Lord's resurrection is a well-attested historical fact. The evidence which established it at the time, and which establishes it for us, is ample and convincing. On any theory of the gospel records which a reasonable criticism can justify, the truth of the resurrection stands unshaken.

There is a present proof of the resurrection which we have only to open our eyes to see. The church of Christ, reaching back with unbroken continuity to those first heralds of the resurrection, is itself a most convincing proof of the resurrection. Something happened on the morning of the first day that has changed the face of the world, turned the course of the ages into a new direction, and given a new meaning to history and a new hope to human life. In that fountain of early Christian teaching whose central truth was the resurrection, great historical consequences took their rise. It is the faith which took its first strength and courage in Jesus' rising that has procured our Christian liberty and civilization. It is the hope which the resurrection first made clear and strong that has filled millions of lives with inspiration and joy, and has lighted up the "dark valley" in the hour of death. Men must discredit important facts of history before they can throw doubt upon the resurrection. The facts of Christian life and history are rooted in the historic faith that stands in the unimpeached testimony of many witnesses who saw the risen Lord.

There is a more specific evidence,—the observance of Sunday. The first Christians had no thought of

had studied the question, they would have found evidence in abundance from the records of old Babylonia down to the current customs among the American Indians, the South Sea Islanders, Arabs, and Hindoos. Whenever a great change takes place in the life of a primitive man, through some new achievement or experience, especially such a change as a change of religion, or a change of his object of worship, a change in his name follows, or accompanies it, as a matter of course. More cultivated peoples have had the same custom. The Bible record does not prove this, but it does furnish illustrative examples of it. Childless old Ab-ram becomes Ab-raham, when he is to be known as a real father of many, with all the accruing honors. Gideon becomes Jerubbaal, when the new name befits him. "Call me not Naomi [Pleasant], call me Mara [Bitter]," said the bereaved and childless widow. An Arab of to-day has several names at different periods of his life. He may be called "Son of his Father," or "Nephew of his Uncle," until he has a child of his own, and then he becomes "Father of his Son." Because this custom is not mentioned in every case is no proof that it did not exist in New Testament times. And as we know that it existed before, and has existed since, in Palestine and elsewhere, it is not unfair to suppose that it did exist at that time. We may suppose, from the record, that the leader of the apostles was at one time known as "Bar-Jonah," at another time as "Simon," and yet later as "Peter" in Roman regions, and as "Cephas" where Greek was spoken. In the case of Paul, the mere fact that the special conformity to a well-known custom is not mentioned at a particular time, is not in itself evidence that there was nothing of the kind in that instance. Paul may have had still another Roman name at an earlier date. It is not unlikely that he had half a dozen different names at different times in his life. That was not an uncommon thing. Modern scholars are constantly misled by Occidental ideas of a personal name as a mere fixed label. The date of the first mention of Paul's new name in the record proves nothing as to its origin. It neither shows that he had it before his conversion, nor that it was not selected at that time. If the learned teacher from Illinois would hunt this matter more closely and more thoroughly, he might be the means of bringing light to many who now, with him, dissent strongly from the view taken by the Editor as the result of his imperfect studies. As to the ordinary view of Paul's name, that is available to all. Dr. Riddle states it in *The Sunday School Times*, and any reader can find it in all the helps, from Ramsay and Farrar to Peloubet's eclectic notes.

## FROM CONTRIBUTORS

### Dawn

By Grace Duffield Goodwin

THE dewdrop stars, expiring, shine  
Where the gossamer mist on the hill lies gray;  
And the black moth Night lifts quivering wings  
From the unblown rose of Day.

Glen Ridge, N. J.

CB

### The Rise of the Society of Friends

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

NOTHING is harder than to discriminate between the influence of individuals and the general tendencies of society, in determining how great the share of each in shaping a historic movement. Luther did not create the Reformation; Wesley did not originate the Methodist movement; there were Calvinists before Calvin, and Darwinians before Darwin. There is indeed but one unique and originitive personality in history of whom we can see that he gave history a new direction, in which it moved with a new impulse.

The part played by George Fox in the rise of the Society of Friends is another illustration of this difficulty. "The Society of Friends from the very first shrunk back from calling George Fox their founder. Their usual designation of him is 'our honorable elder,' and they

speak of him only as one among many." Thus Thomas Hancock; but I cannot follow him in the reason he gives for this, namely, that they wished to claim a purely divine origin for the movement. They had a more definite reason.

The rise of the Society of Friends in the seventeenth century in midland England, like the rise of the Friends of God (*Gottesfreunde*) in the Rhine valley in the fourteenth century, was the fruit of a popular reaction against the dominant tendencies in the church of each country and period. In the latter case, the church had grown worldly though its battle with the empire for supremacy, until it had come to value victories of war and diplomacy as the most satisfying of achievements. The worship of the church had become hollow and formal, the intervention of the priesthood between God and the soul had become systematized. Then it was that devout men yearned for escape from forms and shadows to the reality, to the direct contact of the soul with God. Master Eckart, John Tauler, Henry Suso, Jan Ruisbroek, and the unknown author of the "Theologia Germanica," called themselves the Friends of God, because they had escaped from the slavishness of the servant into the freedom of the friend. They called God their Friend, just as the Muslim Soofees had come to do, long before this, in their reaction against the hard dogmatism and legalism of Islam.

In England, in the seventeenth century, there had been a sudden and complete triumph of what is called Puritanism. That form of religious thought had great merits, and rendered great services to England and to America. But it too was dogmatic and institutional. Its emphasis lay on the intellectual side of religion, and the fine distinction drawn by its polemic theologians in their warfare with Romanism, Anglicanism, and Arminianism. It valued victories in the polemic field as the first of achievements; and next to these it placed victories over the enemies of a godly reformation, won on the field of battle.

Against this intellectual and masculine temper, which occupied faith with precise and nicely distinguished doctrines, a very general revolt arose in the very hour of its apparent triumph. Not on one line, but on many, men fell back on the mystical faith which seeks God behind all forms and opinions, and will not rest short of the immediate vision. Some took as their masters the Platonists inside and outside of the early church; others found guidance in Tauler and the "Theologia Germanica"; others yet discovered their guide in the German theosopher, Jacob Boehme, who had been but twenty years dead. Most notable of all was the group of the Seekers, which probably grew out of the visit of Rogers Williams to England in 1643-44, as they represent the position he assumed after his membership of a few months in the Baptist Church of Providence. They declared that the true interpretation of Scripture and the right order of the church were both lost, and that the direct and supernatural interposition of God was needed to restore these. They spoke of themselves "as sheep unfolded, and as soldiers unrallied, waiting for a time of gathering." William Penn says that "as they came to the knowledge of one another, they sometimes met together, not to formally pray or preach, at appointed times or places according to their own wills, as in times past they were accustomed to do, but waited in silence, and as anything rose in any one of their minds that they thought savored of a divine spring, so they sometimes spoke." Some of them, he says, "ran out into their own imaginations," and became the pantheistic party of the Ranters, who rejected all distinctions between good and evil, between God and man. Thomas Edwards, in his *Gangraena* (1646), enumerates among their "errors" that men ought "to preach and exercise their gifts without study and premeditation, and not to think of what they are to say till they speak," and "to pray only at such times as the Spirit moves them."

In a word, the England of 1641-51 was a seething caldron of religious disturbance at the very time when the Long Parliament and the Westminster Assembly thought to settle all things upon the model of "the best Reformed churches," namely, of Scotland and Geneva. Everywhere men went forth seeking for a treasure they did not find in the hands of the recognized teachers of the people. The most notable of these was George Fox, who in the years 1643-47 was going to and fro among men of all ways of thinking, to see if there were any who could speak to his condition, and show him where

to find light and rest. As the period drew to a close, he found himself drawn off from these outer teachers to One who spoke to him from within. It is under the year 1647 that he first records his meeting with any who roused sympathy, and not antagonism, in him, and whom he describes as "friendly people." From this time begins his mission as a preacher who calls men from the outward and the formal to the inward and the essential in the spiritual life. But he begins the year with the statement that "during all this time I was never joined in a profession of religion with any."

Was the year 1647 that in which the Society of Friends began to exist under that name, and with the essential notes of character which have belonged to it ever since? This is assumed by the historians of the Society,—by Gerárd Cresius, William Sewell, Samuel Janney, Professor Thomas of Haverford, and others. There is, however, no necessity for that assumption. The Society grew out of the cravings of the heart for fellowship and friendship with God, and not out of the work of any man. It grew out of men's weariness with theological refinements and distinctions, which occupied the minds, but could not satisfy the hearts, of that generation. As William Penn shows, this mystical craving in the Seekers had assumed a form which approached so closely to the usages of Friends as to suggest an easy transition. Nothing more was required than the confidence of having found, after long seeking.

I am confirmed in this belief that there was a Society of Friends before George Fox belonged to it by his own statements. In a paper he prepared in 1676, during his visit to Holland, he says: "The truth sprang up first to us, so as to be a people to the Lord, in Leicestershire in 1644, in Warwickshire in 1645, in Nottinghamshire in 1646, in Derbyshire in 1647, and in the adjacent counties in 1648, 1649, and 1650." Taking this in connection with his statement as to his own independence of religious societies until 1647, and the beginning of his ministry in that year, I do not see how we can escape the inference that there was a Society of Friends before George Fox was a member of it, and while he was still engaged in that search after the knowledge of the true Guide which came to an end in 1647.

I am confirmed in this belief (1) by the name of the Society. George Fox, in his Journal, is careful to state the origin of every feature of the Society's testimony and discipline, so far as these came under his notice. But he tells us nothing of the naming of the Society. Why was this, unless it was true that he was not present at the christening? that it was named before he belonged to it? The givers of the name may have taken it from John 15:15, or they may have got it from some of Tauler's disciples then preaching in England. Fox apparently knows nothing about the matter.

(2.) The intimate relation of the Seekers to the Friends. Not all the Seekers became Friends. William Erbury, the leading spirit among them, never did so, nor did Roger Williams. But we find Erbury's wife among the enthusiastic Quaker women who greeted James Naylor as the Messiah in Bristol, and we trace many other Seekers to the Society of Friends. In Westmoreland we have the record of Seeker societies, who became Quakers under George Fox's teaching, and that with no wrench. Indeed, with the rise of Quakerism Seekerism rapidly disappears out of the religious life of England. The one passed into the other as naturally as Fox, after his years of seeking, became a Friend. Is it absurd to suppose that the transition took place in some even earlier than in him, when this supposition is confirmed by his own statement?

There is, however, a sense in which George Fox was the founder of the Society of Friends as we know it in history. He was the strongest mind in its membership, and the most potent personal force in giving it shape. Especially is this true of the Discipline of the Society, established between 1666 and 1675, by which, as Professor Gummere says, Fox laid the abiding foundation of the Society. This he did not effect without opposition from an extreme party among the Friends, who possibly stood for the Seeker principle. At any rate, the opposition was strongest in Westmoreland, where the Seeker meetings had become Quakerly.

Nothing can rob George Fox of his eminence as the prophet of the Inner Light and Life in an age of scholastic refinements. But he neither needs nor seeks any honor but what belongs to him.

Philadelphia.