

# The Independent.

Entered at the Post-office at New York, as Second-class Mail Matter

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE ENTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XXXVIII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1886.

NUMBER 1944.

## The Independent.

This issue contains 30 Pages.

For Table of Contents, see Page 20.

### NEWPORT NEWS, 1886.

BY JOAQUIN MILLER.

The huge sea monster, the "Merrimac";  
The mad sea monster, the "Monitor";  
You may sweep the sea, peer forward and back,  
But never a sign or a sound of war.

A vulture or two in the heavens blue;  
A sweet town building, a boatman's call;  
The far sea-song of a pleasure crew;  
The sound of hammers. And that is all.

And where are the monsters that tore this main?  
And where are the monsters that shook this shore?

The sea grew mad! And the shore shot flame!  
The mad sea monsters they are no more.  
The palm, and the pine, and the sea-sands brown;

The far sea-songs of the pleasure crews;  
The air like balm in this building town—  
And that is the picture of Newport News.  
NEWPORT NEWS, Feb. 1st, 1886.

### DOETH SHE SERVE?

BY M. H. LEONARD.

In the garden of Beauty I wandered with  
deep'ning delight  
Till the pathway divergent revealed to my  
wondering sight  
Even Beauty herself, in glorious presence ad-  
vancing.

And I, into ecstasy thrilled by the vision en-  
trancing,  
Before her in worship fell prone.  
"O goddess," I cried, "I will render thee ever  
My fealty firm, and enthroned  
Thy form in my bosom forever."

But with gesture of mild rebuke she put all  
my proffers by.

"See that thou do it not; for thy fellow servant  
am I."

Amazeful I cried: "Nay, service belongeth to  
common creatures.

It would soil thy stainless robe and thy peer-  
less perfection flaw.

No touch of grosser use should harden the  
grace of thy features.

Thou rulest a realm far other, thyself thine  
own end and law."

But gently she waved me aside.

"Go question my flowers!" she replied.

So, faring onward, I traversed the spacious  
garden over,

While round my steps, up-thronging, pressed  
numberless blooms of clover;

A lawnful of grassy spirelets my hasty foot-  
steps were crushing:

Around me showered the petals of apple and  
peach-blows blushing,

And, commingled with theirs, the voice of the  
springing corn

From fields anear to my ear by the breeze was  
borne.

"O pass me not slightly by,"  
With eager insistence they said,

"Nor to Beauty our title deny  
Because with utility wed."

"Ye are fair," I said coldly. "I grant it; but,  
fairer by far, ye must own,  
Are the flowerets that stoop not to use, but  
bloom for delight alone."

Then an odorous whisper breathed o'er me  
from blossoming orange boughs bend-  
ing,

"Dost treat our sweet pureness with scorn,  
Or forbid us the bride to adorn,  
Because of the fruitage so luscious toward  
which all our being is tending?"

But I answered: "Each law hath exception.  
And chiefly the fairest flowers  
Know naught save their own perfection  
And the blossoming of the bowers."

Then from heart of the roses faint waftures  
were blown.

"Dost think that the roses no ministry own,  
And in work for the weal of the world hold no  
share

Because more subtle the missions we bear?  
If our beauty doth satisfy need  
In the nature of man, canst thou know  
How far it may germinate seed  
Which into high impulse shall grow?"

And the clustering lily-bells rung  
In full chorus of fragrance and sung:

"Fairest of all the fair charms the fairest among  
us e'er nameth  
Is the precious truth of the Master which ever  
our vesture proclaimeth."

Still I ventured, more humbly: "Once more  
let me ask—

For buried in forests and hid in the clefts of  
the mountains,

By desert winds blown and nourished from  
far-off fountains,

There be myriad flowers that acknowledge  
nor use nor task,

Apart from arena where right doth battle  
with wrong—

I pray thee, doth ministry also to these be-  
long?"

Then a mighty murmur arose,  
As though great Nature's repose  
Were aroused to a deep agitation;

The sand and the stones and all vegetation,  
The insects, the beasts, and the birds,

With one impulse their voices lent,  
And the winds gave soft modulation,

While ocean made rhythm, and the stars joined  
with accents harmonious

The strain that swelled upward in cadence  
symphonious,

Till at last in articulate words  
The myriad voices were blent.

"O Witless One, fallest to learn  
Creation's deep law? Dost not see  
How matter inert the floweret doth feed,  
Which yieldeth in turn

Its sweets to the bee?  
The law to all being decreed,  
To satisfy ever the need

Of some other. Naught liveth alone;  
But in Nature's great Cosmos enlinked  
must be,

What prat'st thou of kingdom apart? 'Tis  
unknown.

So Beauty true dignity findeth in sweet minis-  
tration,

And joineth the chorus that yields to the  
Ruler of all adoration."

Then slowly I turned me to where I had  
seen

Beauty herself, so majestic in mien.  
And lo! she was fallen, a-kneeling with up-  
lifted eyes;

And with strange surprise  
My heart in silence confest  
That of all her charms the best

Were not found in her features so faultless,  
nor yet in her figure's grace,

But were gleams of a greater glory reflected in  
her face.

BRIDGEWATER, MASS.

### WHENCE CAME THIS ICE?

BY WILLIAM F. WARREN,  
PRESIDENT OF BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

"D'où venait cette glace?" To the late  
Brasseur de Bourbourg this was a hard  
question.

In Mexican and Central American anti-  
quities, he was probably the most eminent  
authority in Europe. For years as  
"Ecclesiastical Administrator of the In-  
dians," he had resided in Guatemala. His  
private collection of books, manuscripts,

hieroglyph-copies, maps, relics, etc., relat-  
ing to Indian mythology, tradition, and  
language, was one of the richest ever  
brought together. He had written much  
upon these themes, had made what he be-  
lieved to be great discoveries, and at the  
time of his recent death was probably the  
most widely known of the class of scholars  
called in Europe "Americanists."

One claim which this *avant* had upon  
the interest of mankind, and particularly  
upon the interest of Americans, of all  
nationalities and ages, is not very genera-  
ly known. He claimed to have unlocked the  
hieroglyphic symbols of certain ancient  
texts of the natives of Central America,  
and to have discovered from them the real  
location of the long-sought Cradle of the  
Human Race. And what made his dis-  
covery of perennial interest to all Ameri-  
cans, North, South, and Central, was the  
fact that this recovered cradle was in what  
was originally a part of the American con-  
tinent. So, instead of feeling himself a  
*parvenu* among the nations, the believing  
American may henceforth claim to repre-  
sent the continent where human history be-  
gan, the land to which the first settlers on  
the Nile and on the Euphrates looked back  
as to their mother country. The New  
World is older than the Old.

In fuller form, the doctrine was that the  
American continent was originally almost  
twice as large as now. It filled all the  
space at present covered by the vast Gulf  
of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea and ad-  
jacent portions of the Atlantic. It reached  
far out toward the west coast of Africa and  
Europe. It was the Atlantis of Plato. All  
was Eden-like; but the capital city and pre-  
eminently paradisaic center, Tollan, was to  
the southeast of Mexico, in the part now  
covered by the Caribbean Sea, not far from  
the Antilles. In one of the great geological  
catastrophes of the early world, all this im-  
mense tract was volcanically upheaved;  
then, in the sudden collapse, sunken and  
submerged beneath the waters of the ocean.  
Echoes of the stupendous disaster live on  
in the diluvian traditions of all ancient peo-  
ples; but in the "Codex Chimalpopoca," the  
true history has been preserved, with "all  
the Episodes, even to their smallest de-  
tails."

Feeling a pardonable interest in all Para-  
dise-finders, I may as well confess to a cer-  
tain satisfaction in lighting, the other day,  
upon a fuller exposition of this author's  
view than I had before met. It was in the  
fourth volume of his "Collection de Docu-  
ments dans les Langues Indigènes." Here,  
to the extent of several hundred pages, he  
expounds and illustrates his conception.  
In his etymologies of the Paradise names  
and myths, I found everything I was ex-  
pecting to find—the "navel of the earth,"  
the mysterious "cosmical tree," a different  
"calendar," and even the "Land of the  
Aurora." One thing troubles the author a  
little, and that is, that all the traditions, in-  
stead of locating the primitive Paradise of  
the Mexicans to the southeast, "unani-  
mously place it in the regions to the  
north." (p. 109.) The only solution he  
can suggest is, that possibly, after the  
cataclysm, the old antediluvian names  
"might have been" given to certain locali-  
ties in the North countries.

More entertaining to me is the good  
man's struggle to account for the strange  
miracle reported in his Mexican Bible—the  
*Teo-Amoztli*—according to which, right  
over the boiling lava-streams and volcanic

craters and hissing waters, which marked  
the great catastrophe, *there spread itself* "a  
vast and brilliant mantle" of ice. "Voilà ce  
qui est venu se flair momentanément sur les  
eaux bouillonnantes avec la lave et les vapeurs  
de toute sorte, c'est la glace, dit formellement le  
Teo-Amoztli, cette glace, dont le vaste et bril-  
lant manteau arrive à point pour achever  
d'éteindre le feu des volcans et apaiser l'ardente  
chaleur causée par tant d'épouvantables érup-  
tions."

Here, naturally enough, the astonished  
author raises the question with which we  
began: "Whence this vast Ice-field?"  
Sure enough. He grapples with it bravely;  
but he cannot answer. He wonders if so  
great a convulsion at the equator might  
not detach some of the ice in the high  
North, and float it down over his steaming  
Caribbean Paradise. He glances hastily to  
the far off ice-zone of the South. Frankly  
he confesses his helplessness. He declares  
the fact of the Ice-sheet an unquestionable  
and essential feature of the story; but  
leaves it with the ejaculation: "It is for the  
geologists to find out the rest." (!) "Je  
n'affirme encore rien à cet égard. La seule  
chose qui me paraît certaine, c'est le fait  
matériel de cette débâcle de glace, dont les  
premières montagnes couvrirent la mer des  
Caraïbes, aussitôt qu'elle eut commencé à se  
former, et c'est au-dessus des eaux qui venaient  
de prendre la place du Paradis de Xochitl ou  
de Tamoanchan, dont les terres s'étaient en-  
gouffrées les premières, que ces glaces station-  
nèrent particulièrement. C'est aux géologues  
à trouver le reste." (p. 279.)

Poor man, he had never read "Paradise  
Found"! With the Arctic Eden, its sub-  
mergence at the time of the Deluge, and  
the therewith connected on coming of the  
Glacial Age, how plain the whole story be-  
comes; how accordant with all the oldest  
traditions of the Asiatic world. The vast  
Ice-sheet is, after all, where it belongs, and  
needs to "come" from nowhere.

Many readers of THE INDEPENDENT will  
doubtless be gratified, if, while my hand is  
in, I just postscriptively add, that the new  
interpretation of the mythical geography of  
the Avesta and of the Hindus, has just re-  
ceived the "entire" indorsement of a Euro-  
pean *savant* generally believed to be the  
most authoritative Avestan scholar now liv-  
ing. His name is withheld until his pleas-  
ure as to its use can be ascertained.

### THE SENATOR AND THE SCHOOL- HOUSE.

BY ELAINE GOODALE.

In the course of a recent debate in the  
Senate on the "Dawes' bill" for opening to  
settlement a part of the Great Sioux Reser-  
vation in Dakota, an incidental question  
arose and was summarily settled; a ques-  
tion which is, nevertheless, of the most in-  
timate importance to Indian civilization.  
That famous seventh article of the famous  
treaty of 1868, promising a school-house  
and a teacher to every thirty children  
among the Sioux, was handled without  
gloves by the Senator from Kansas.

The provisions of this act are by Section  
17 of the Dawes bill continued in force  
for twenty years. Senator Plumb pro-  
posed an amendment by inserting this  
clause:

"Or some provision which may, in the judg-  
ment of the President or of Congress, be equiva-  
lent thereto and bring about the same or a bet-  
ter result."

of the prodigal son says nothing of an Atonement. But those who cite this parable, and nothing else, illustrate the mischief of a fragmentary use of the Scriptures. He who uttered this parable of the prodigal son said also: "The Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many." (Math. xx, 28.) He who illustrated the tenderness of a father toward a returned prodigal by this matchless parable, is the one who said: "This is my blood shed for many, for the remission of sins." (Math. xxvi, 28.)

We read in the instruction of the Holy Word that "He suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust"; "he was sacrificed for us"; "he was made sin for us"; "he made his soul an offering for sin"; "he put away sin by the sacrifice of himself"; "by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified"; "he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world"; "he hath reconciled us to God by his blood"; "he gave his life a ransom for many"; "he redeemed us to God by his own blood"; "his blood was shed for many for the remission of sins"; "he hath washed us from our sins in his own blood"; "his blood cleanseth from all sin"; "we are justified freely by God's grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus"; "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses"; "Christ, purchased us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us."

It is futile to say that all these passages are more or less figurative. So is nearly all language. Sir William Hamilton showed that most of the apparently literal terms used in logical discussions are faded metaphors. There are certain unmistakable thoughts conveyed in these sacred texts, and they are that the Atonement made by Christ for the sins of men is a ransom, a propitiation, a sacrifice.

At a recent church congress in America, Canon Farrar, after citing these passages, said:

"All these statements of Scripture, which declare the fact of the Atonement and the reconciliation of man to God, we steadfastly believe."

But he goes on to say:

"No theory of the Atonement ever formulated has been accepted by the Universal Church, or can put forth the slightest claim to Catholicity." ("Report of the Tenth Congress of the Protestant Episcopal Church," pp. 40 and 41.)

My conviction is that the facts represented in these scriptural declarations are a theory of the Atonement [applause] broad enough to make it certain that it is a sacrifice. As Henry B. Smith has said, and the language goes to the heart of much recent discussion: "The very nature and essence of the sufferings and death of Christ is that they are an expiation for sin. This is the very idea of a sacrifice. It is its exhaustive definition. It is the thing itself, and not a deduction or inference from it. This is the fact and not a theory about it." (H. B. Smith, "System of Christian Theology," p. 455.)

Let us be careful, in making theology Christocentric, to adopt Christ's own theory concerning the Atonement, and the whole of that theory, and to speak in his language concerning it; for nothing less will cover the facts. If you will do that, I will not ask from you assent to any other creed on this loftiest of all themes. Heaven forbid that I should go so far as to call upon those who are in the infancy of their religious training and Christian experience to give assent to detailed metaphysical systems. That is not the demand of preachers of any denomination. But we think it utterly unsafe for you to drop below scriptural language, or to believe less on this subject than Christ himself taught.

What, then, must we say are the principles by which we are to arrive at a sound theory as to the nature of the Atonement?

1. A sound theory as to the nature of the Atonement must be true to all the facts of conscience.

2. It must be true to all the facts of Scripture.

3. It must not be tritheistic.

4. It must be justified by its fruits in universal Christian experience.

5. It must exhibit the Atonement in harmony with other accepted facts of revelation and of science.

Taking these as tests, what are we to think of the moral-influence theory of the Atonement?

A truth is in it, no doubt; but a truth which is not the whole truth becomes a most mischievous untruth, if it be taken as the whole truth. [Applause.] My reverence for the memory of Horace Bushnell is greatly increased by the fact that, in revising his earlier work on "The Vicarious Sacrifice," in which he had defended the moral influence theory of the Atonement, he says: "I asserted a propitiation before, but accounted for the word as one by which the disciple objectivizes his own feelings, conceiving that God himself is representatively mitigated or become propitious, because he is himself inwardly reconciled to God. Instead of this, I now assert a real propitiation of God, finding it in evidence from the propitiation we instinctively make ourselves when we heartily forgive." ("The Vicarious Sacrifice," Vol. II, p. 14.) "So far from its being an absurd thing to speak of a propitiation as the necessary precondition of forgiveness, no human creature will ever keep himself

reconciled to his kind without finding how in some of its degrees to practice it." (*Ibid.*, p. 49.)

Bushnell's theory of propitiation has been often shown to be far from scriptural or scientific. In spite of making these concessions, he calls himself yet a defender of the moral influence theory; but in these final words he has so changed his theory that it is in his hands a very different thing from what it is in many of the echoes of his first volume. Not a few young men are preaching, as if by the authority of Horace Bushnell, what Horace Bushnell himself, in these passages, has really canceled once for all.

The moral influence of the Atonement—what is it? Anything in the Atonement that leads us to behold the enormity of our guilt, the glory of the divine holiness, and the divine readiness to pardon sin on repentance. What can show us this more than such a doctrine of the Atonement as our Lord himself taught, of a ransom, a propitiation, a sacrifice, a vicarious substitution? They who say we want nothing of propitiation and sacrifice, and need only the moral influence of the Atonement, are like those who say "Cut down the tree; all we want is its shade." The supreme wealth of moral influence of the Atonement can be the result only of such a presentation of it as our Lord himself made.

What results do we reach when we apply these tests to the position that we are to have no theory about the Atonement, but should take simply the fact from revelation, and make no attempt to understand its relations to other facts?

Is it to be true to all the facts of Scripture to have no theory about the nature of the Atonement? Is this to be true to all the facts of conscience? Is it a position justified by universal Christian experience? Is agnosticism, on this, the most momentous of all themes, at all harmonious with the dictates of common sense, as enlightened either by a study of the Scriptures or by an investigation of Church history, or by deep knowledge of the ethical wants of human nature? I hold that he who has no theory on this matter, and considers himself in harmony with Scripture and ethical science, is strangely and colossally mistaken.

And what of the theory that represents the divine wrath as launched against the Son, and would lead the thoughtless to regard one individual in a tritheistic Trinity as angry with another individual? We must all say of this, that it is contrary to the facts of Scripture. We must not so present our doctrine of the Trinity, nor our doctrine of the Atonement, as to give either a tritheistic character. Undoubtedly many who regard themselves as orthodox are, in their imaginations, worshipers of three separate Gods. Even the doctrine of the Atonement has been sometimes presented in mere caricature to orthodox congregations. Let us apply then our tests to all theories that we have ourselves held, and deliver ourselves from every tritheistic taint, when presenting to our own minds, or to others, either the doctrine of the Trinity or that of the Atonement.

What is, then, a sound description of the Atonement, according to the average theological inculcation?

An American and an English definition of recent date I place side by side, to show the harmony of thought between them.

1. Here is a definition which, I have reason to believe, is approved by New England theology:

"The Atonement is that sacrifice of the God-man which forms the sole ground on which God is justified and satisfied, and the chief motive by which he is actuated, and the chief means which he uses in directly blessing man."

I might spend hours in expanding and explaining this definition; but the object of a lecture here is to present thought suggestively and not exhaustively.

Propitiation, I may define, in accordance with high authority, as that sacrifice of the God-man which involves the sole ground on which God is justified and satisfied, and the chief motive by which he is actuated in directly blessing sinners.

2. A work by Dr. R. W. Dale, of Birmingham, on the Atonement has recently passed through nine editions in England. This fact is so significant a sign of the tendency of currents of serious thought that I beg you to notice how well the definitions this authority gives agree with the five tests I have named.

"The death of Christ," says Dr. Dale, "is the objective ground on which the sins of men are remitted, because in his submission to the awful penalty of sin, in order to preserve or to restore our relations to the Father, through him, there was a revelation of the righteousness of God, which must otherwise have been revealed in the infliction of the penalties of sin on the human race. He endured the penalty instead of inflicting it. . . . The death of Christ did not merely manifest the infinite mercy of God, but really effected reconciliation between God and man. I believe that the conception of the nature of the Atonement which is contained in these propositions, accounts, and accounts naturally, for all the various expressions which are used by our Lord himself and his apostles in describing the unique character and the unique effects of his death. Further, I believe that this conception justifies those representations of the death of Christ, the

substantial truth of which receives strong confirmation from their general acceptance by the Christian Church during eighteen centuries. . . . The death of Christ may be described as an expiation for sin; for it was a divine act which renders the punishment of sin unnecessary. . . . It was a vicarious death. . . . It was a representative death. It may be described as a ransom. It was a satisfaction to the righteousness of God. It was a sacrifice for sin. It was a propitiation for sin."—"The Atonement," by R. W. Dale, p. 431-436.)

Sound scholarship in theology repudiates the idea that personal demerit can be transferred from one individual to another. And yet Martineau and Clarke and multitudes not as cautious as these acute writers, regard it as a self-contradiction in orthodoxy to say that guilt can be removed from one individual and put upon another. Guilt, in the sense of liability to suffer to maintain the honor of a violated law, can be transferred; but guilt, in the sense of personal demerit, is not transferred; and no one of sound ideas teaches that it can be.

No parallel can be drawn between human government in all its parts and the divine government. Every illustration is imperfect in many points; but on one point an illustration can be given that may be of value. If Washington had voluntarily submitted to imprisonment for some years as an atonement for Benedict Arnold; if Washington had bared his own shoulders to receive stripes in chastisement, to exhibit his regard for public and righteous law, and to maintain its honor; if, after these actions on the part of Washington, Arnold had been brought into Washington's presence, these decisive exhibitions on Washington's part of the honor for the law and of the spirit of self-sacrifice and forgiveness, would have placed Arnold upon a new level, that he never could have attained by his own repentance. Arnold's demerit would not have been transferred to Washington. It would remain forever true that Arnold was a traitor. But, if such had been the law of the Republic, that one person could, by his own choice receive chastisement in place of the punishment due to another, we might have found the whole nation melted by this chastisement vicariously endured in the place of Arnold's punishment. We might have found the ages melted by it. We might have found Arnold melted by it, and restored to loyalty by seeing his ruler become in a sense his redeemer. If Arnold were thus restored, the propitiation would not be effective without deeds of loyalty on his part. He would not be saved without good works; but he would not be saved by good works, but solely by clemency and grace.

In a sense here most inadequately suggested, our guilt has been transferred to Another. It is by looking on Him who has made the transference that we are melted, lifted out of a life of sin, by seeing that a way has been provided to deliver us from the guilt of it. This is the mystery and glory of Christianity as a philosophy, that it does not teach us, as Plato and Seneca did, to lift ourselves unaided out of the love of sin; does not instruct us to study the dignity of human nature, and so rise above the love of sin. It teaches us to behold our Ruler as our Redeemer; and when we see him as Saviour, we are so melted as to be made glad to take him as Lord.

Have I given a perfect theory of the Atonement? By no means. But I have insisted on our having as large a theory concerning it as was taught by Him who was and is, and evermore is to be, the Way, the Truth, the Life.

I profess to be dazzled by Christianity as an ethical system; as the way, the truth, the life in the stupendous necessity of our deliverance from the love of sin and the guilt of it. And I find every system of thought that contains less than Christianity utterly inadequate to meet the cry of man for this double deliverance. It is only full-orbed Christianity with an Atonement in it, such as our Lord himself taught us has been made, that matches the lock of human need. This key turns in that lock. It appears certain that He who made the lock made the key.

Let us, therefore, agree with those who say that the ultimate ground of the Atonement is not the justice but the love of God; and that the Atonement is not in order that God might be moved by it, but because he was so moved.

Let us be careful to teach that there is no effective propitiation apart from repentance and faith; and that personal demerit was not transferred from us to Christ, but only our liability to suffer to maintain the honor of a violated law.

Let us affirm, with the Scriptures, that the blood of Christ as the expression, synonym, and consummation of his sacrifice and propitiation, is our hope and only hope.

THE Empress of Austria used to call herself the most beautiful sovereign in Europe, which was not saying much, nor in fact, nearly enough; for the Empress, before her ill-health began, was really a very beautiful woman. At present, the Queen of Servia claims the palm for loveliness among the royal ladies of the Continent. Her ascendancy over her husband, King Milan, is decided.

Biblical Research.

AN INTERPOLATION IN THE DIDACHE.

BY PROF. BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D.

THE majority of English-speaking students of the "Teaching of the Apostles" unite with such German scholars as Zahn, Funk, Bickell, and Langen, and most French critics, in believing that Barnabas drew from "The Teaching," and not *vice versa*. It is one of the consequences of this opinion, though it has been insufficiently recognized, that Barnabas becomes an important witness for the text of "The Teaching." The fragment of a Latin version, which Dr. von Gebhardt was so fortunate as to discover, proves to present a text far closer to Barnabas than to the form of text given in the Bryennios Manuscript. On scrutiny, it is discovered that much the same type of text underlies the Apostolical Canons. On the other hand, the text that underlies the Apostolical Constitutions follows more closely that given in the Bryennios Manuscript. It is evident, on a sharp examination of the phenomena, that we must recognize the two facts: (1) That we have a tolerably rich apparatus for the textual criticism of the early chapters of "The Teaching," and (2) that our witnesses divide themselves into two sets, representing variant recensions; on the one side, the Bryennios Manuscript and the Apostolical Constitutions; on the other, the Latin translation, Barnabas, and the Canons.

The second of these recensions is the most anciently attested. This does not prove it to be the best. But it throws a certain presumption in its favor, which needs only the support of internal evidence to rise very high. Unfortunately, the attestation of the various readings does not often divide itself according to the cleavage of these classes—owing to mixture between Barnabas and the Canons, the small extent of the Latin version, and the scattered testimony of Barnabas. But there is one important reading where the two classes are directly arrayed against one another, and which it will repay us to test by internal evidence.

The whole section from the words, "Bless these that curse you," in I, 3 (line 10 of Hitchcock and Brown) to the words "But the second commandment of the teaching" in II, 1 (line 35), inclusive, are omitted by one whole recension and inserted by the other. Neither in the Latin, nor in the Canons, nor in Barnabas is there any trace of it. On the other hand large part of it appears duly in the "Constitutions," and quotation is made from it by Clement of Alexandria ("Frag. ex Nicetæ Calena," in Matt. v, 42), Hermas ("Mandate," II, 4-6.) and Johannes Climacus ("Migne," Vol. 88, p. 10 sq.). Which transmission seems to represent the original text in this case?

That there are internal difficulties in the passage may be taken as evinced by the fact that Krawutsky in 1882 declared it an interpolation into the original text of the "Two Ways," which was moreover badly placed by the interpolator, not at the end of the discussion of the way of life, where the disposition of the treatise might have made room for it, but at the beginning, where it violently breaks in upon the arrangement of the treatise. Taking a hint from this acute remark of Krawutsky's, we observe on considering the text of the Didache:

1. The presence of this section sharply and seriously interrupts the otherwise logically and admirably arranged sequence of thought. The neatness and logical correctness of the arrangement of the Didache has been noted by all its editors. Harnack says that it surpasses all other early Christian writings in this respect. At this point only is the smooth flow broken. But that a real logical difficulty exists here is sufficiently proved by the vain efforts which have been made to give this section a plausible treatment in the analysis of the treatise. Bryennios hesitates between two views: Whether to regard it as containing commandments growing out of love to God, while the next section contains those that spring from love to our neighbor, or as equivalent to the mandate, "Do the good," while the next section is equivalent to the complementary requirement: "Abstain from evil!" Harnack practically adopts the former view, and argues that the primitive conception always classed such duties as are here named under the rubric of love to God. This may be doubted; but in any event Krawutsky's criticisms (Tübingen "Theolog. Quartalschrift," 1884, IV, p. 560 sq.) appear well-grounded and destructive. The subsequent section of the treatise (II, 1, sq.) does not confine itself to the rôle assigned to it by either author; but busies itself not only with the evil that we must abstain from, but also with the lower duties that man owes to man as man, but with those higher duties that he is to honor God by fulfilling to his fellow, such as I, 3 sq. contain. It is a fact, therefore, that, although a part of a remarkably well-ordered treatise, this section will not submit to be included in that order.

2. More than that; an important part of the

contents of this section is repeated elsewhere in the treatise (IV, 5-8, lines 86sq.) and there the matter is logically in its proper place. The positive commands of the "Way of Life" begin apparently at III, 7 (line 69) and end at IV, 11 (line 104); and divide themselves into (1) Duties to one's self (personal duties of temper), III, 7-10; (2) Duties to the church (to the church teachers, the church members, the church unity), IV, 1-4; (3) Duties to the poor, IV, 5-8, and (4) Duties to the household (of parents to children, of masters to servants, of servants to masters) IV, 9-11. In the midst of this series of positive duties, the duty of charity has its logical place; whereas, at the beginning of the treatise it is out of place, and disturbing in the extreme. It is a fact, therefore, that the section under discussion repeats out of place what is well said in its proper place.

3. We may even go further: in repeating it many and almost contradicts, nay, scarcely saves itself from contradicting itself. All the commentators recognize the superiority of IV, 5-8 to I, 5-8, and the contradiction between the most natural explanation of I, 5 and IV, 7, or even I, 5, has led the best of them to question whether some interpolation of greater or less extent may not have been suffered here.

4. The manner of the section I, 5-8 is different from that of the rest of the treatise. The way Scripture is used; the curious little additions that are made to it, such as "for he is guiltless," "as indeed thou canst not"; the addition as Scripture of an apocryphal sentence; the general lack of clear wording through it—all difference it from the rest of the Didache.

5. This may be stretched a little further: the very Scripture that is used, so to speak, is different from that of the rest of the book. The Gospels are quoted more than a score of times elsewhere and some four times here: and it is from the phenomena of these four cases that Harnack is led to doubt whether the author of the Didache quoted directly from our Gospels. Out of the nineteen clear quotations from the rest of the book, he declares that fifteen of them certainly come from our Matthew, while the others would raise no doubt that Matthew and Luke lay at the base of them also, in the absence of those from this section. The quotations from this section are certainly different from those elsewhere in manner, and they appear to me to render it probable that while the author of the Didache used our gospels as we now have them, the author of this section used Tatian's "Diatessaron," as any one will suspect who will compare Tatian (§17) with the quotations of our verses 3 and 4 (lines 10, sq.).

6. The way in which this section is introduced and closed raises doubts as to its genuineness. It is inserted between two headings, opening with the words, "But of these words the teaching is this," and closing with, "But the second commandment of the teaching," which does duty for the heading of the succeeding section. The first of these sentences is confined, therefore, as a heading to our present section. It will be observed, however, that it promises the teaching of both the "words" given above it, including that which enjoined love to our neighbor as well as that that enjoined love to God; or, if only one, the former of these certainly, not the latter. On the other hand, the second heading commits the author of it to the theory that what had gone before was a development of the command to love God, while all that was to follow was to belong to the "second" command—to love our neighbor. There is confusion here. And the appearance is very strong that originally the first heading stood where the second now stands, but that the insertion of the intermediate section forced the interpolator to invent a new heading here, and what he has given us is the awkwardly fitting one of II, 1 (line 35).

7. Finally, we may urge the first consideration offered in a more positive form: the admirably logical flow of the thought which results from leaving out this section is an argument for its omission. Everything then falls into its place, and the section on the Two Ways exhibits the following strongly concatenated analysis:

- I. The Introduction of the Whole I, 1.
  - II. The Way of Life I, 2-IV, 14.
  - 1. Introduction I, 2 (Statement of the Way of Life).
  - 2. Negative development of the duties of the Way of Life, II, 2-III, 6.
  - A. Negative Commandments of the Way of Life, II, 2-II, 7.
  - B. "What is forbidden in these Commandments," (in the sense of the questions in the "Westminster Catechism") III, 1-6.
  - 3. Positive Commandments of the Way of Life, III, 7-IV, 14.
  - 4. Concluding Exhortations, IV, 12-14.
  - III. The Way of Death, V, 1-2.
  - IV. Concluding Exhortations, VI, 1-3.
- Certainly the treatise so viewed deserves the high praises of its editors.
8. Transcriptional evidence in such a case is ambiguous, but it may be safely declared that the omission of such a section from one whole class of documents is harder to account for than its insertion editorially. The reasons assigned by Harnack for its omission by the author of the Canons are, of

course, inoperative now that we know it to have been absent from the whole type of text that the Canons are based on. Von Gebhardt's conjecture, that a leaf may have fallen out from an early exemplar, the parent of this whole recension, is possible, but not probable, inasmuch as (1) to put this section on one leaf necessitates the assumption that the treatise began in the middle of a page, instead of at the top of one, and (2) the intrinsic internal evidence throws doubt on its genuineness. It seems, indeed, almost impossible to account for the omission of such a section if it originally formed a part of the treatise, while the feeling that the ethical teaching of the treatise fell short of the perfection demanded by Jesus may have easily induced an editor to insert such a section, or at least to write it correctively on the margin, whence it would easily find its way into the text.

This internal evidence seems to me sufficient to raise grave doubts against this section by itself considered. And when we remember that it is corroborated by the absence of the section from one of the two forms of the text that have been transmitted to us, two results appear to follow with very great probability: (1.) This section is an interpolation into the original Didache. (2.) The recension of the Didache represented by the Latin version, Barnabas and the Canons, gives in this case the purest transmission.

The age of the interpolation is set as in the first half of the second century by its quotation in Hermas and Clement of Alexandria, although the latter portion of it (including the quotation from an apocryphal source in I, 6) is found nowhere but in the Bryennios MS., and may be a still later addition. The place where the interpolating was done is hinted at in its apparent use of "Patian's Harmony." These are but two out of many indications that cannot be here stated, which lead me to suspect that the original Didache was made in the late first century in Egypt, and has been preserved to us in an Egyptian Gentile transmission (Barnabas, the Canons, the Latin translation, Lactantius) and in a Judaean Syrian transmission (the Bryennios MS. and the Constitutions). The true text is to be sought in neither form; but in both.

ALLEGHENY, PENN.

Among the Apocrypha the Book of Judith has ever been considered a *crux*, and Christian scholars have never been a unit as to its character and correct interpretation. The historical interpretation has so far found the most advocates. Many have thought that it referred to some historical events in the days of Manasseh or Josiah, and, in fact, this view has probably found the most advocates. Others, like the Jewish historian, Herzfeld, claim that it is based on a military expedition of a prince Holofernes, in the days of Artaxerxes Ochus. Volkmar, who has a special liking for the days of Bar-cocheba, interprets it as referring to an expedition in the days of the Emperor Trajan. Another method of interpretation has been the didactic, which, while not exactly denying to the book a historical foundation in actual fact, endeavors to find its great importance in its teachings and lessons. The leading advocates of this view are Luther, Grotius, and others. Lately Dr. A. Scholz, a Roman Catholic professor of theology at the University of Würzburg, but a scholar who is acquainted with advanced Biblical science, and seeks also to advance its interests himself, has published a new view of the book, interpreting it as a prophecy. There is, however, scarcely more than a formal difference between the didactic and the historical conception of the book. Scholz thus endeavors to explain the Book of Judith, as Merx, in 1879, had interpreted the prophecy of God, namely, as a sort of apocalypse. So able and fair a critic as Dr. Koenig, of Leipzig, while expressing his dissent from the views of Scholz, praises his pamphlet as a scholarly and rich production.

Hymn Notes.

DEPARTMENTS.

BY PROF. FREDERIC M. BIRD.

The advance of knowledge involves and depends upon the division and subdivision of labor. It is long since anybody could be expected to know everything; and in our day a man can know thoroughly only some very small corner of the vast domain of literature and science. This is the age of specialists and experts. The student who wishes to excel must select his peculiar field of research, and see that it be not too large; beyond that he has to be content with superficial information at second or twentieth hand. This is the only way to make any progress, since life is short and art is long, and very much longer for us than it was for our grandfathers.

People sometimes forget this; like the layman

who asked a young minister about some obscure point of controversial theology, and, on his confessing ignorance, told him that it was his business to know: was he not a clergyman? This critic had never heard of the royal Viennese librarian, who said that the Emperor of Austria had not revenue enough to pay him for knowing all that was to be known. When Dr. Holmes's party, in "The Poet at the Breakfast Table," visited the eminent entomologist, and questioned him about the Coleoptera, he replied: "Oh! Soandas attends to them. They are entirely outside of my province. I confine myself to the Lepidoptera. Bugs are too vast a subject to be grasped by a single mind." (I have probably got this wrong, as an outsider naturally would: in the unlikely event of his wanting information about insects, he would know where to go, and that is enough.)

The principle applies no less to so humble a hobby as Hymnology, as to which the learned insist that its *ology* does not and cannot mean "science," since that would bestow a name too large upon a thing too small, and since science deals with the works of Nature and not with the works of man. Science or not, Hymnology has, within the last thirty years, become at least the special study of a special subject, and grown large enough to be divided. One whose attention is first attracted to it may suppose—like our legislators with their Finance and Political Economy—that it can be mastered in a fortnight or so; but those of us who have been interested in the matter for years know that it will take them some time yet to cover all the old facts, not to speak of catching up with the new ones that are constantly coming into view. As an English enthusiast wrote, apropos of two or three hymns which he had traced a few years back of the dates previously set to them, and connected with initials if not with names: "How vast a field is this, when a single explorer, within a few months, can make such discoveries?"

Said a visitor, a few days ago: "Of course your books are in many languages." Not at all. The few in other tongues than the vernacular do not count. English hymns alone are enough to occupy one man, if he had nothing else to do. And even they may well be parceled out. In Mr. Julian's forthcoming *Dictionary* there are articles on Baptist Hymnody, Congregational Hymnody, etc., by members of those bodies, who had peculiar opportunities and motives for mastering each his own topic. The immense quantity of very recent Anglican hymns, as to which we in this country have such imperfect means of information, will doubtless be handled with intimate and kindred knowledge. Foreign and ancient hymns are turned over to specialists therein; the Latin to a gentleman whom I do not know, and the German to the Rev. J. M. Mearns, who gives the results, perfectly methodized, of exhaustive research; he seems to have on his list every sacred song that has been printed in Germany, and every English version of the same, whether ever in use or not. If native English hymns were treated in the same way, the *Dictionary* would make not one big book, but a shelf full.

With us, Dr. Schaff has probably a pretty full and accurate knowledge of German hymns, though it can be but one among the many accomplishments of a very busy man. Inquiries that come to me are usually passed on to Dr. B. M. Schmucker, of Potstow, Pa. Without professing to be an expert in this branch, he knows much more about it than I do. Latin hymns, at least the mediæval ones, have been made his own province by the Rev. S. W. Duffield, whose articles, printed in the *S. S. Times* and other papers, will soon appear in permanent form. His researches are very bold and brilliant, and some of their results are likely to stultify his conservative predecessors in this field, and to win him eminent reputation in a sphere hitherto nearly monopolized (in English literature) by Dr. Neale.

American hymns received no serious attention from any quarter till they were taken up in these columns, five or six years ago. I have lately begun a much more extended list, which aims to include every lyric of home origin that has appeared in any reputable collection. (Not to alarm my readers unduly, it may be well to add that this is intended for private edification.) It will take the leisure of years to complete this catalogue, and to gather (or fail to gather) the most rudimentary information about some scores or hundreds of the obscure authors; and when it is done it will interest very few people. Even this field would admit of division. I have been trying to find somebody who had made, or would make, a "department" or speciality of the "Gospel Hymns" and their innumerable congeners. The study ought to be a labor of love, which just here (perhaps through weakness of faith and patience) to me it is not. I judge we have about 4,000 poets of this kind in the field, who have produced, perhaps, 50,000 lyrics—Fanny Crosby alone is responsible for over 1,000, it is said. If any of the numerous admirers of this section of sacred literature will take it up in earnest, I will joyfully resign all claim to it.

LEHIGH

Sanitary.

HYGIENE AND ITS TERMS.

THE study of hygiene, although so closely allied to that of medicine, is not to be considered as a mere department thereof. It is far more a composite science and art than some imagine. Chemistry, physics, engineering, geology, botany and other departments of knowledge have very intimate relations thereto. While some knowledge of anatomy and physiology are essential, they are only incidental. It is because it is regarded too much as a mere addition that most of the text-books that claim to teach hygiene are filled, all but a few pages, with anatomy and physiology. However interesting and valuable the knowledge of these may be, it is not a knowledge of hygiene. It has so far come to be a science, an art, a study by itself; that we need more familiarity with the terms which are used in regard to it. It derives its name not so much from the temple of Hygeia, as that the temple obtained its name from the Greek word that means health. Health itself is a generic word, from which wealth, welfare, weal, etc., are derived. The word sanitary has its origin in the Latin, as the word hygiene has in the Greek. It were, perhaps, well if the whole of line of Juvenal, a part of which is so often a motto, were quoted. It is as follows: "Pray for a sound mind in a sound body. Ask for a brave soul unscared by death."

We have now come to speak of two great divisions of hygiene—viz., personal and public. Personal hygiene has to do with that which directly concerns the individual. It, therefore, examines the body as to its machinery and functions, so far as necessary to inform us as to the laws under which it operates. It inquires into surroundings, in order to find out how far these accord with the conditions which the body requires. When it sees incongruity or want of adjustment, it inquires what remedies there are therefor, or how far there can be improvement. If unable to secure this, it provides for removal or for protection. Some of the terms used as to disease are not sufficiently definite. Thus many speak of contagious and infectious diseases as if the two terms were distinct or both were needed in order to include what all mean by communicable or transmissible diseases.

Writers are now coming to use the word infections to designate that class or order of disease which is communicable. Then we are able to specify by terms in what way the infectious diseases are communicable. Thus such as arise within the system, and have no known outside source of origin, are called contagious. Such are measles and scarlet fever.

Others are derived from without, and cause disease without being themselves reproduced. It is a disease-producing cause, arising outside of the body, but not communicable from the body. Such are called miasmatic. Malarial diseases, or those derived from marshes or vegetable decay, form a large division of these. So not only bad air, but bad food and bad water, may cause diseases of this class.

Sometimes we have diseases, which, although not communicable from the body, are communicable from excretions or secretions after they have been exposed to the air for a time. Such cholera and typhoid fever are believed to be. These are called contagio-miasmatic diseases, since both the body and the outside air are related thereto. Formerly there was a view that diseases of a catching type were largely due to some special ferment. Hence the term zymotic came into use. With our newer views of the exciting causes of these diseases, it can well be dispensed with. Whatever may be their relation as direct causes, we now know that parasites have mostly to do with such diseases. They had better be called parasitic than germ diseases. Of these there are two great divisions: those due to animal life, and those due to low forms of vegetable life. Since the germ, zymotic or chemical hypothesis of disease has been replaced or modified by the parasitic or germ hypothesis, we speak of micro-organisms, or of disease as dependent on minute organized particles. Pastur and many others speak of these minute particulate forms as microbes or microbia. It is not gas or ferment, but life, that is the first movement toward disease—lower lives, either animal or vegetable, invading the higher life, or becoming so interrupted or transformed in their original, conservative intent as to become the factors of disease. Where there are animalcule they are called microzoic diseases, and where the minute life is vegetable in its classification, they are called microphytic. With clear views as to these terms, many that are used might be retired. As to the multitude of parasites or germs that belong to the microzoa or animalcule varieties, the classic and thorough work of Cobbold is a full authority. In reference to those that belong to the microphytes or lower kinds of vegetable life the classification is not so complete. We prefer the arrangement of Copeyue. He divides them into four well-marked groups—viz., *Bacteria*, small oval or spherically elongated bodies; *Bacilli*, rod-shaped bodies; *micrococci*, little round grains or bodies; and