

ARTICLE VI.

HAVE WE NOAH'S LOG-BOOK?

BY S. E. BISHOP, D.D.

As the heading above indicates, this article will endeavor to present substantial reasons for believing that in the Genesis narrative of the Deluge we have clear internal evidence that it incorporates an actual transcription from the record kept during his momentous voyage by the Commander of the Ark. Of course, at first thought, this idea is likely to strike readers as fanciful. Perhaps it has never occurred to any other person than the present writer, who presented it in 1878 while lecturing on Genesis to a class of Hawaiian theological students in Honolulu.

Since then the thought has hibernated, being now stirred to public expression by a notice in the *Literary Digest* of the championship, upon scientific grounds, by Dr. G. F. Wright, of the historical verity of the Noachian story of the flood.

In propounding this theory for whatever it may be worth, or as possibly the creation of a misguided fancy, it must stand wholly upon its own merits, as being in accord with the actual text of the Deluge-story as we possess it in Genesis. All of the modern critics, as I understand, concur in regarding that account as a comparatively late compilation, made by Jewish writers out of Chaldean traditions of the Deluge, which, according to the more advanced critics, had been derived from Babylonian sources during the captivity; or which, according to the more moderate critics, may have filtered down, through the family of Abraham, from earlier and less corrupted Chaldean sources, during the earlier Hebrew residence in Chaldea.

But, if the theory herein advocated is sustained by the internal evidence of the text, then both of those diverse conclusions of Higher Criticism must be set aside, and it will appear that the Genesis text of the Deluge-story contains a real transcript from the actual record of the voyage of Noah in the Ark, as made by himself at the time. It will also be a probable conclusion that, through the sacred Semitic family of Eber and Abraham, there had been preserved and transmitted with reverent care an independent and careful history of that primeval event, which finally became embodied in the book of Genesis, probably by Moses, who, through his intimacy with the devout priest of Midian, more than any other man, possessed the opportunity to secure that tradition, besides having the disposition to renew it in permanent form.

My contention then is, that the Genesis history of the flood evidently embodies a literal transcript from an original form of record which the commander of the Ark had made from time to time of the leading incidents of his memorable voyage. In other words, we therein possess an actual copy of parts of Noah's Log-book, precisely and punctiliously transmitted to us through the long centuries, probably not less than four thousand years before Abraham's day. We have included in that history an original document of inestimable value, the oldest historical document in existence. The evidence of its genuineness is to be established by the very peculiar internal literary structure of its statements.

It is here to be observed that it is not absolutely necessary to this view to maintain that Noah and his sons were able to employ writing in our sense of the term, either as alphabetic, cuneiform, or hieroglyphic. It is well known that among different peoples there have prevailed quite precise and intelligible forms of recording facts, in which no definite alphabetic or

syllabic characters were used. Noah might have employed some form of picture-writing or of Runic notching, which would have definitely and intelligibly recorded his meaning, so as afterwards to have been put into written form. But it seems entirely unreasonable to deny the probability that some system of definite character writing actually existed in Noah's day. A civilization in other respects highly developed must at that period have grown up. The generally advanced mental and social condition of the Caucasian breeds which have sprung from Noah, points to a highly civilized origin. Art and commerce must already have reached an advanced stage to have enabled the construction of so large and staunch a vessel as the Ark. Such a matured civilization, of necessity, involves a system of writing and accounting. Besides this, we already know, from the Chaldean monuments, that cuneiform writing was in public use as early as 4500 or 5000 B.C., which may not have been more than two thousand years after the flood. Must not such writing have been of far earlier origin than the dates from which we have hitherto unearthed it?

The fact that the cognate Egyptian race, who evidently migrated from Arabia to the Nile, possessed hieroglyphic writing at even an earlier date, lends the highest probability to the belief that some art of writing must have been in common use before the time of Noah. It may indeed be asserted with positiveness that no form of civilized society is known to have existed among any race of men unaccompanied by an art of writing in some form. The absence of that art is incompatible with the complex conditions and necessities of any civilization. The art spontaneously grows up by its own pressure for existence. Unquestionably, Noah must have known how to write.

But now to proceed to the identification of the Log-entries incorporated into the story. The History of the Flood is

contained in three chapters of Genesis, the sixth, seventh, and eighth, besides a sequel occupying the ninth chapter. This history is mainly in an eloquent narrative form, giving, as in any well-told story, an impressive prominence to the leading features of what took place. Passing by the preliminary statements relating to God's orderings and his commands to Noah, to the preparation of the Ark, to its occupation by Noah and his family with their precious freight, and to the commencement of the tremendous cataclysm, we come, in the seventeenth verse of the seventh chapter, to a peculiar change in the style and structure of the narration. Here the sweep and stress of the story suddenly drop into a mechanical recounting of a singular *chain of specific consecutive incidents*, such as are of relatively small moment in comparison with the gigantic events in progress, although such as would be apparently notable at the time to an immediate observer. These incidents are noted in regular sequence, just as a log-book would hold them recorded, but not like a history subsequently written from memory, in which the grand and majestic events would tend to obliterate the lesser memories.

This peculiar section of the story records six consecutive occurrences as follows:—

a "The waters increased and bare up the ark, and it was lifted up above the waters." (The floating of the vessel.)

b "The waters prevailed and increased greatly upon the earth." (The flood assumes formidable dimensions.)

c "The ark went upon the face of the waters." (The ark got into active motion, drifting rapidly.)

d "The waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth." (The dimensions of the flood had become overwhelming.)

e "All the high mountains that were under the whole heaven were covered." (The submersion had become complete.)

No remaining elevation of land continued in sight above the waste of waters.)

f "Fifteen cubits upwards did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered." (Either an actual measurement of depth was secured by sounding, and recorded; or possibly an estimate of depth was made from the great hulk's known draft of water when slipping over a covered mountain top.)

We note the peculiarities of the literary structure of this section of the narrative as follows:—

1. The incidents are stated in a mechanical consecutive-ness, corresponding to separate successive entries in a log-book.

2. There is a threefold repetition of the increase of the flood (*a*, *b*, and *d*). A natural narration would certainly have combined all these in a single emphasized statement. The repetition seems to indicate a copying from three separate entries, made successively as the increasing magnitude of the cataclysm grew upon the awed mind of the voyager.

3. Three of the incidents here reported are too comparatively insignificant to have found a natural place in a narration subsequently composed from memory alone. They would have disappeared from thought in the overwhelming majesty of the grander events. The first is that of the floating of the vessel (*a*). Such an incident would at the moment be extremely agitating to the voyagers, as they felt their habitation upheaved and shaken about. It would naturally find record in the log. But as an historical event it is altogether insignificant, and could not possibly have found place in a composition made independently of the original record, when the appalling submergence of a world and the extinction of nations were occupying the thought. Much the same may be said of the drifting of the Ark (*c*), which would be a terrifying thing

to its occupants, and yet not momentous enough for natural mention in an independent later narration. And that little detail about the "fifteen cubits" depth of the water over the mountains (*f*), is evidently a mere item from the log-book, never to have been noticed by an independent historian of the mighty cataclysm.

4. The style of this portion of the story is distinctively matter-of-fact, mechanical, and homely. It is wholly devoid of the distinction and impressiveness which so characterize the majestic, terrific, and pathetic narrations which precede and succeed it. It is a plain strip of homely tartan inserted between splendid breadths of grand tapestry. But it testifies unmistakably of the Ark-home and rude loom whereon it was woven.

In presenting the foregoing deduction, made from the literary form of the Deluge story, it seems desirable, in order to avoid misconstruction, to state the writer's mental position in reference to the facts recorded. I believe them to be true, and see no adequate reason for doubting their historical verity. At the same time it is regarded as a serious error of interpretation to apply the traditional severity of literal construction to the terms employed in describing the extent of the Deluge. Those terms are manifestly not intended to designate a universal submergence of the land surface of the entire globe, for the reason that Noah's conception of the earth did not embrace any large proportion of the globe, and the language used by himself, and that of God to him, was necessarily accommodated to his limited understanding. The facts described mean simply that the whole of the earth as it was known to Noah was submerged, and all of its breathing inhabitants destroyed, except those which were saved in the Ark.

The reality of a universal deluge is absolutely excluded by those scientific facts, so long completely established, as to the present distribution and ancient pedigree of the forms of animal life in the various sections of the globe. I deem also that any thorough consideration of the great inherent diversities in the various breeds of men localized on the different continents and islands will equally preclude the idea that all, or even the greater part, of mankind perished in the Deluge of Western Asia. We have to note, first, the inherent improbability that, during the ages of human existence before the Deluge, the tribes of mankind should not have effected their migrations to the remote regions where they have so long been isolated. And, next, the greatness and permanence of their variations of racial type appear to preclude their descent from a type so matured and fixed as that of Noah must have been.

Such extreme variations of human type as we find remotely localized could have originated only during the infancy of the human race. In their primeval plastic condition great variations would easily have been set up, while, during the early wanderings and isolations of those primeval tribes, such variations would naturally become established into fixity by means of their segregated interbreeding. But such great diversities of type could not possibly have originated in a comparatively modern descent from the long-established breed of the Noachian family.

It has appeared to the writer, that a just conception of the Divine interposition in saving a chosen family from the destruction which overwhelmed that portion of mankind inhabiting Western Asia, must be sought by interpreting it as a wise act of Divine *selection and segregation* for the purpose of protecting and establishing a permanent stirp, from which to propagate a superior breed of civilized and religious man.

This end would appear to have been adequately accomplished by the production of the dominant and progressive Caucasian families, with their comparative social purity and regard for law.

It is in such a theoretical setting that the writer contemplates the great historical event of the Deluge.

ARTICLE VII.

CHRYSOSTOM THE PREACHER.

BY THE REVEREND HENRY COOK SPERBECK.

IN studying Chrysostom as a preacher we discover a rare union of superior qualities. He was distinguished for his simple, practical, and pathetic appeals, for his ornate style, for his fiery invectives, and for his flights of eloquence. He was expository and practical, and, since this style of preaching is demanded to-day, the study of Chrysostom will be profitable to the preacher. Greek writers give the following description of his appearance: "He was short with a large head, ample wrinkled forehead, eyes deep-set but pleasing, hollow cheeks, and a scanty gray beard." The austerities of his youth left their mark upon his frame. Frequently he would preach sitting in the ambo. His voice was of superior quality, and has been described thus: "He had a tongue which exceeded the cataracts of the Nile for fluency."

John Chrysostom was born (A.D. 347) at Antioch, Syria. His father's name was Secundus, and his mother's name was Anthusa. His father served in the Imperial army of Syria, where he won distinction. His mother was a woman of deep piety. Chrysostom was not many days old when his father died, leaving Anthusa a widow of twenty. This young mother was very careful in training her son. The task was a difficult one, because the Christianity of that day had absorbed much paganism. Then, too, most of the churches in the large cities were tainted with the sins of the time, such as avarice, luxury, and sensuality. Anthusa labored faithfully to save her son

from these pitfalls. Her part of the work was well done. Years later, when Chrysostom's enemies sought to injure his fair name, they examined carefully into his early record, thinking to discover a profligate youth. But they found his character to be irreproachable.

At the age of twenty, Chrysostom attended lectures under the noted sophist Libanius. He was being prepared not for the clerical, but for the legal profession. He entered upon the legal profession, and doubtless saw worldly honor before him. In those days the law profession opened to high governmental positions. But the clerical profession was the one for which he seemed best adapted, and for which Providence had prepared him.

He gave himself up to the Christian life. In those days a holy life was one entirely separate from worldly pleasures and pursuits. Chrysostom desired to leave home and become an ascetic; but, on account of the earnest pleading of his mother, he remained at home for some time, possibly until she died. At his home in Antioch, he lived the life of a monk. He excluded from his life all worldly amusements and occupations, seldom going out of the house. He slept upon the hard ground, often fasting and spending much time in prayer. Later he entered a monastery, joining a community of monks who resided in the mountain heights south of Antioch. But Chrysostom was such an ardent ascetic, that he went into solitude alone. Under this strain his health broke down, and he was compelled to return to Antioch.

Chrysostom was ordained deacon about 381 A.D. by Bishop Meletius. Five years later he was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Flavian. Chrysostom preached at Antioch for ten years, and thence went to Constantinople, where he was made archbishop. Soon he began a vigorous reformation of the

clergy, deposing many from office. These reforms made him unpopular. He also directed mission work in Syria. His many duties as archbishop did not lessen his zeal in preaching—he is always Chrysostom the preacher. The pulpit was his throne.

Chrysostom, on the preparation of sermons, says :—

“It might seem strange, but in truth study was even more indispensable for an eloquent than for an ordinary preacher. Speaking was an acquired art, and when a man had attained a high standard of excellence he was sure to decline unless he kept himself up by constant study. The man of reputation was always expected to say something new, and even in excess of the fame which he had already acquired. Men sat in judgment on him without mercy, as if he was not a human being, subject to occasional despondency, or anxiety, or irritation of temper; but as if he was an angel or some infallible, who ought always to remain at the same high level of excellence. The mediocre man, on the other hand, from whom much was not expected, would obtain a disproportionate amount of praise if he said a good thing now and then. The number of persons, however, in any congregation, who were capable of appreciating a really learned and powerful preacher, was very small; therefore a man ought not to be much disheartened or annoyed by unfavorable criticisms. He should be his own critic, aiming in all his work to win the favor of God. Then if the admiration of men followed, he would quietly accept it; or if withheld he would not be distressed, but seek his consolation in honest work and in a conscience void of offence.”

He thus expresses himself on preaching :—

“To become an effective preacher two things were necessary: first, indifference to praise; secondly, power of speech; two qualities, the one moral, the other intellectual, which were rarely found coexisting. If a man possessed the first only, he became distasteful and despicable to his congregation. For if he stood up and at first boldly uttered powerful words which stung the consciences of his hearers, but as he proceeded began to blush and hesitate and stumble, all the advantage of his previous remarks would be wasted. The persons who had secretly felt annoyed by his telling reproofs would revenge themselves by laughing at his embarrassment in speaking. If, on the other hand, he was a weighty speaker, but not indifferent to applause, he would probably trim his sails to catch the popular breeze, and study to be pleasant rather than profitable, to the great detriment of himself and of his flock.”

We are chiefly interested in (1) the material of his sermons, (2) the application of the truth, and (3) the effects it had upon his hearers.

THE MATERIAL OF HIS SERMONS.

All fields of knowledge are open to the preacher. Chrysostom knew this, and drew his material from many sources. This gave variety to his preaching.

1. *The Scriptures*—The Scriptures were the highest court of appeal, as he laid no stress on tradition. He based his arguments on Scripture, as is seen in his controversy with the Arians. He frequently dilated on such themes as Creation, Providence, Divinity of Christ, Nature of Man, and Death, quoting abundantly from the Scriptures.

With rare ability he applied the truths of Scripture to the lives of the people. He found here a remedy for sin. In order to produce a higher type of Christian life, he held up biblical characters; his favorite men being Abraham, Job, David, Paul, and Peter. He would also take up books of Scripture, explaining verse by verse, and following that up with argument, closing with an appeal for a nobler life. That Scripture was at his command is evident from the fact that after his enemies had condemned him to exile, just before departing from Constantinople, he appeared before the people, and expressed his feelings thus:—

“Many are the billows, and terrible the storms, which threaten us; but we fear not to be overwhelmed, for we stand upon a rock. Let the sea rage, it cannot dissolve the rock; let the billows rise, they cannot sink the vessel of Jesus Christ. Tell me, what is it we fear? Death?—‘To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.’ Or exile?—‘The earth is the Lord’s and the fullness thereof.’ Or confiscation of goods?—‘We brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out’. . . Was not St. Peter on the point of sinking, not because of the uncontrollable onset of the wave, but of the weakness of his faith?”¹

¹ Rev. W. R. W. Stephens, *St. Chrysostom*, p. 331.

2. *Similes from Nature.*—Chrysostom was a great lover of nature, as is shown by his sermons:—

“The infinite varieties of flowers and herbs, trees, animals, insects, and birds—the flowery fields below, the starry fields above—the never-falling fountains, the sea receiving countless streams into her bosom, yet never overflowing,—all proclaimed a Creator and an Upholder, and drew from man the exclamation, ‘How manifold are thy works; in wisdom hast thou made them all!’”¹

The light-heartedness of birds is an example for us. The bee he used to enforce the lessons of industry and self-sacrifice. He thought the spider ignoble on account of its fine-spun web employed for its own selfishness.

3. *Literature.*—It is known that he quoted from the “Republic of Plato.” To him Plato held the first place among heathen philosophers, but Chrysostom found nothing in the teaching of Plato to regenerate men. We find the following expressions coined by Chrysostom: “the sublimity of Plato,” “the weight of Demosthenes,” “the dignity of Thucydides,” “the smoothness of Isocrates.” Here we see familiarity with Greek literature.

4. *Human Nature.*—As to his conception of human nature, Chrysostom believed that our first parents fell through moral negligence. Infants were not sinful, but had a tendency or weakness to sin. He believed that man could hear and obey the call of God. We must not think that Chrysostom overlooked the evil of sin; he did not. “Sin,” he says, “is like a terrible pit, containing fierce monsters, and full of darkness.” Again he compares sin to fire.

Chrysostom emphasized the freedom of the will. A pernicious belief of his day was that men were abandoned to the power of demons, and held hopelessly in the iron grip of fate. In order to refute this error, Chrysostom insisted upon

¹ Stephens, *op. cit.*, p. 170^b

the freedom of the will. He taught that man was free to choose the evil or the good.

In his sermons, Chrysostom dwelt upon the religious needs of man, and pointed out to what extent these needs were neglected. He exclaims, "Will you let your soul grovel in the mire while you are taking care of your boots?" This great preacher would often denounce the craze for the chariot race and the theater. His speech was direct and forceful against those pleasures which hindered the growth of the Christian character. Many would offer excuses for non-attendance at church—a very common fault in our day. Business, poverty, lameness, ill-health, did not keep them away from the hippodrome, and why should they absent themselves from the house of worship?

We see that Chrysostom was a careful student of human nature. This is indispensable to the preacher, for he who preaches to men must know men. This is not an elective but a required study.

THE APPLICATION OF THE TRUTH.

The application of the truth to the lives of men is one of the most delicate tasks the preacher has to perform. Men do not doubt the power of Christ to save; but what they want to know is, how to apply the truth to their everyday lives. Herein the preacher can be of special service to them, if he so presents the truth as to awaken the emotions and move the will. Some knowledge of Chrysostom's preaching is of special value to the preacher, because his application of the truth is a work of art, as we may see from the following quotations from some of his sermons:—

"Nothing can be more chilling than the sight of a Christian who makes no effort to save others. Neither poverty, nor humble station, nor bodily infirmity, can exempt men and women from the obligation of this great duty. To hide our Christian light, under pretence

of weakness, is as great an insult to God as if we were to say that he could not make his sun to shine."¹

We are informed that his exhortations were generally based on some passage read in the lesson of the day.

"What have we heard to-day? "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded." He who says "the rich in this world," proves thereby that there are others rich in regard to a future world, like Lazarus in the parable.' Wealth of this world was a thankless runaway slave, which, if bound with thousands of fetters, made off, fetters and all. Not that he would quarrel with wealth; it was good in itself, but became evil when inordinately desired and paraded, just as the evil of intoxication lay not in wine itself, but in the abuse of it. The Apostle did not charge those who were rich to become poor, but only not to be high-minded. 'Let us adorn our own souls before we embellish our houses. Is it not disgraceful to overlay our walls with marbles and to neglect Christ, who is going about unclothed? What profit is there, O man, in thy house? Wilt thou carry it away with thee? Nay, thou must leave thy *house*; but thy *soul* thou wilt certainly take with thee. Lo! how great the danger which has now overtaken us: let our houses, then, be our defenders; let them rescue us from the impending peril;—but they will not be able. Be those witnesses to my words who have now deserted their houses, and hurried away to the wilderness as if afraid of nets and snares. Do you wish to build large and splendid houses? I forbid you not, only build them not upon the earth; build yourselves tabernacles in heaven—tabernacles which never decay. Nothing is more slippery than wealth, which to-day is with thee and to-morrow is against thee; which sharpens the eyes of the envious on all sides; which is a foe in your own camp, an enemy in your own household. Wealth makes the present danger more intolerable; you see the poor unencumbered and prepared for whatever may happen, but the rich in a state of great embarrassment, and going about seeking some place in which to bury his gold, or some person with whom to deposit it. Why seek thy fellow-servants, O man? Christ stands ready to receive and guard thy deposits—yea, not only to guard, but also to multiply and to return with rich interest. No man plucks out of his hand; men, when they receive a deposit from another, deem that they have conferred a favor upon him; but Christ, on the contrary, declares that he receives a favor, and instead of demanding a reward, bestows one upon you.'"²

¹ Stephens, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

² *Ibid.*, p. 164.

"As in Antioch, so also and with greater vehemence in Constantinople, the voice of Chrysostom was incessantly lifted up against those vices which specially beset a large mixed population living under a corrupt despotism. Here, as there, the avarice and luxury of the wealthy are the themes of his indignant invective; the wrongs and pitiable poverty of the poor the occasions of his pathetic appeal. One day lamenting the paucity of worshippers, he exclaims, 'O tyranny of money which drives the greater part of our brethren from the fold! for it is nothing but that grievous disease, that never-quenched furnace, which drives them hence; this mistress, more ferocious than any barbarian or wild beast, fiercer than the very demons, taking her slaves with her, is now conducting them around the Forum, inflicting upon them her oppressive commands, nor suffers them to take a little breath from their destructive labours. . . . May you derive great good from the zeal with which you listen to these words, for your groaning and the smittings of your foreheads prove that the seed which I have sown is already bearing fruit.'"¹

Concerning the worldliness of parents he says:—

"How can children escape moral ruin, when all the labor of their fathers is bestowed on the provision of superfluous things—fine houses, dress, horses, beautiful statues, gilded ceilings—while they take no pains about the soul, which is far more precious than any ornament of gold?"²

Eutropius the public minister had fallen into disgrace, and in his flight sought refuge in the church where Chrysostom was preaching.

"When the curtain which separated the nave from the chancel was partially drawn aside, and disclosed to the view of the multitude the cowering form of the unhappy Eutropius, clinging to one of the columns which supported the holy table, Chrysostom, pointing to the visible example of fallen grandeur, burst forth, 'O vanity of vanities!' words how seasonable at all times, how preëminently seasonable now. 'Where now are the pomp and circumstance of yonder man's consulship? where his torch-lit festivities? where the applause which once greeted him? where his banquets and garlands? where is the stir that once attended his appearance in the streets, the flattering compliments addressed to him in the amphitheatre? They are gone, they are all gone; one rude blast has shattered all the leaves, and shows us the tree stripped quite bare, and shaken to its very

¹ Stephens, *op. cit.* p. 233.

² *Ibid.*, p. 83.

roots. . . . These things were but as visions of the night, which fade at dawn; or vernal flowers, which wither when the spring is past; as shadows which flitted away, as bubbles which burst, as cobwebs which rent. . . . Therefore we chant continuously this heavenly strain: *Ματαύρης ματαύρηων και πάντα ματαύρης*. For these are words which should be inscribed on our walls and on our garments, in the market-place, by the wayside, on our doors, but, above all, in the conscience of each should they be written, and constantly meditated.' Then, turning towards the pitiable figure by the holy table: 'Did I not continually warn thee that wealth was a runaway slave, a thankless servant? but thou wouldst not heed, thou wouldst not be persuaded. Lo! now experience has proved to thee that it is not only fugitive and thankless, but murderous also; for this it is which has caused thee to tremble now with fear. Did not I declare when you rebuked me for telling you the truth, "I love thee better than thy flatterers; I who reprove thee care for thee more than thy complaisant friends"? Did I not add that the wounds inflicted by a friend were to be valued more than the kisses given by an enemy? If thou hadst endured my wounds, the kisses of thy enemies would not have wrought thee this destruction.'"¹

EFFECTS OF HIS PREACHING.

Many pagans were converted under Chrysostom's preaching, and united with his church. One interesting event which occurred during his residence at Antioch prepared the way for the truth to lodge in the hearts of many. The city was under the ban, and the baths, theaters, circus, and hippodrome were closed. The people were panic stricken, but the church was daily open, and thither they went to offer prayer and to hear the sermon.

It is related that under Chrysostom's preaching the people applauded, wept, and were smitten with the sense of sin. At the moment, the great preacher felt gratified at the effect his words produced; but he confesses that, when he went home and reflected on the benefit his hearers received, how that all might end in empty applause, instead of permanent helpfulness, he wept.

Chrysostom fully realized that, while men were impressed

¹ Stephens, *op. cit.*, pp. 263-265.

by the truth at church, nevertheless, when they were immersed in business or pleasure his work was largely undone. He expresses this thought in the following language, "Like that of a man who attempted to clear a piece of ground into which a muddy stream was constantly flowing."

Chrysostom's personal life added much to his message: his earnestness, purity, and courage are very impressive. He labored, preached, and suffered for the cause of Christian holiness. In this age of the world, when much is said about crowding out the preacher, may we not learn a valuable lesson from Chrysostom? Is not the preacher indispensable to the elevation of society? If Christian holiness is the cause for which the preacher labors, we should have no difficulty in deciding this question. As expressed by a recent writer:—

"If the Christian minister is not in some deep sense a messenger of God, there seems to be no special reason why he should survive in highly civilized communities. There was a time when all education was included in the formal circle of the church's life; and the clergyman or priest was the chief or only teacher. By fierce revolution or slow development all that has been changed. The schoolmaster, the journalist, the novelist, and many others have acquired a share in the teaching function, and to some it seems as if the preacher was to be driven into a corner, and that a very small corner. Indeed, there are not wanting voices to cry that it is time he was superannuated, and some even to suggest that it is an impertinence for mortal man to speak to his fellows concerning the deep things of God. More than ever do we need to realize the words of the great apostle, 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.' If we would face this bold attack, there must be strong conviction not only that we have a great revelation to expound, and a fair equipment for the handling of it, but also that we have a living vocation, and stand in the line of an honorable succession, that this is as true to-day as in the supreme moment of Isaiah's great vision; the Eternal King needs men to speak for him; men, it may be, to deliver an unpopular message, to provoke a deeper thoughtfulness, and to break up the stagnation into which all organized religion is prone to settle."¹

¹ W. G. Jordan, *Prophetic Ideas and Ideals*, p. 353.