

ferent interests, which finds its outcome in legislation, is not fairly carried on; and it is this feeling that is separating the popular interests from the money interests, politically, and setting them in sharp antagonism. The blindness of moneyed interests is proverbial, but there never was a greater stupidity than the failure to perceive that, under a democracy, capital must scrupulously avoid creating the suspicion of inordinate selfishness and unfairness. Honesty is not only the best but the only policy, and absolute fair dealing toward all interests in legislation is fundamental in this country. The capitalists who subsidize parties, corrupt individuals, secure unrighteous legislation, violate laws, and evade the burdens of government by ignoble subterfuges to escape taxation, are making common cause with rioters and anarchists. They are all and equally enemies of society.



Through Christ to the Father

If one desires to be presented to Queen Victoria, he must present an application beforehand, must obtain a fitting introduction, must be trained in the etiquette of the court, must learn how to conduct himself in the presence of royalty. So men have imagined that God hedges himself about, that court etiquette is necessary. He is the greatest of all great sovereigns: if we must approach with due deference and with proper etiquette a human sovereign, how much more the Divine and the Infinite! So it is supposed that there is but one Door by which we can enter, but one Mediator through whom we can come to him; that he shuts off all other ways; that we should be glad indeed that he allows even one possible approach to him.

But that is not the way in which a father treats his children. It is not necessary for a boy to go through a course of teaching in etiquette before he can come to his father; it is not necessary that he should come in a particular form, by a particular door, or through a particular mediator. If the relationship between God and us is the relationship between a father and his children, it cannot be that Jesus Christ means to teach any such doctrine as that all other doors are closed: you must come this way or not at all.

Nor is that what he says. He does not say, "I will permit no man to come to the Father except through me." He does say, "No man does come to the Father except through me."

How else is it possible that man should come to know God except through a manifestation of God in human life? Is it said that we may know him through nature? How much does nature tell of Divine Fatherhood? How much does any work of art tell us of the artisan that made it? What does a watch tell of the watch-maker? That it was made by a clever workman—ingenious, enterprising, skillful. But does it tell whether he is a kind father or a cross father? does it tell whether he is an indulgent and a generous-minded man, or a sharp and grasping and narrow-minded man? whether he is drunken or sober, honest or dishonest, truthful or lying? does it tell one solitary fact about his moral qualities? Stand before the grandest picture that ever was painted; bow in admiration before it; nevertheless, when we are done, we know nothing about the moral quality of the man who painted this picture. How often, in reading a book or a great poem, we have said, "What a magnificent man this must be!" and when we have read his life, or come in personal contact with him, we have felt disappointment and disgust in the man. His work was admirable, but he was repulsive. We cannot tell the moral quality of a man from the work he

makes. Neither can we come into any personal acquaintance with God from the works he makes.

It is said, we can come to the Father through all his children; we can look for the divine in human nature everywhere. Every hero manifests God to us; every mother shows us some side of the divine nature; all human pity interprets divine pity. That is true. God is forever manifesting himself through the lives of men. But how do we know what is the divine in man, and what is the un-divine, unless we have some standard that interprets divinity to us?

If we would know whether men can come to God except through Christ, we must ask the history of the world, the nations unto whom there has been no Christ-revelation. Now, no nation has ever believed in the Fatherhood of God except a Christian nation; no religion has ever woven on its banner the motto "Fatherhood of God" except the Christian religion. Confucius knows no God; primitive Buddhism knew no God; Brahminism knows a God, indeed, but a God that is far away, remote, dwelling in perpetual unconsciousness, unmanifested; Mohammedanism knows nothing but incarnate Law. And although in pagan literature you will find sometimes the word "Father" applied to God, it is always to God as the author of our being, not as the kindly guardian, the personal counselor, the individual friend, the protector.

No man cometh to the Father except through Christ. It is as we see the divine in Christ that we draw near to the divine in nature, the divine in history, the divine interpreted in our own hearts. This is the glory of our Christian faith. It brings the Divine Father close to us.



Editorial Notes

—Bishop Huntington, the twenty-fifth anniversary of whose consecration as Bishop of Central New York was duly commemorated on Wednesday of last week, is not only one of the foremost men in his own Church, but one of the finest religious natures of our time. He combines in an unusual degree intellectual power, literary skill, and spiritual insight.

—The selection of Mrs. Julia Josephine Irvine as acting President of Wellesley College advances another young woman to a very influential and important position, for Mrs. Irvine graduated from Cornell University only nine years ago. She has since studied at Leipsic, she has taught in this city, and four years ago she became Professor of Greek at Wellesley. She is a woman of thorough scholarly equipment, and, it is believed, of unusual executive ability.

—There ought not to be the slightest difficulty in securing the fund of \$25,000 for the George William Curtis memorial, to be expended in part in the erection of an appropriate artistic monument in this city, and in part for the endowment of an annual course of lectures upon the duties of American citizenship and kindred subjects, under the title of the Curtis Lectureship. The treasurer of the committee, Mr. William L. Trenholm, 160 Broadway, this city, will receive and acknowledge all subscriptions. New York has never had a citizen of finer mold or nobler aim than Mr. Curtis, and the rich and elevating influence which he constantly exerted ought to be perpetuated in every possible way. A fitting artistic memorial and a continuing course of lectures contributing to the elevation of public life would form an almost ideal memorial of his pure and inspiring career.

—In a recent news article on the meeting of the alumni of the University of New York, the New York "Evening Post" remarked that "the most interesting feature was a reminiscent address by the venerable President of the Council, William Allen Butler, ninety-four years old, followed by a forecast by his son, Charles Butler, who is seventy years old." This gave Mr. William Allen Butler an opportunity of correcting that infallible journal in this sprightly manner:

"I am not the President of the Council, but only the Vice-President; I am not ninety-four years old, but only sixty-nine; I am not Mr. Charles Butler's father, but only his nephew; second, in respect to Mr. Charles Butler, he is not my son, but my uncle, and he is not seventy years old, but ninety-two; and, third, in respect to both of us, neither is ninety-four years old. These corrections are not of much consequence to the public, but with so many undeserved honors heaped upon me at once, candor compels this disclaimer; and Mr. Charles Butler wears his ninety-two years with so much grace and vigor that they ought not to be attributed to any one else or increased except by the due advance of time."

A Reply to Mr. Mozoomdar

By Robert A. Hume¹



It is so important that the Christian Church should do its work thoroughly well that it ought to welcome and carefully consider criticisms and suggestions from any source on any part of its work. Especial consideration is due to criticisms on the foreign missionary work which is carried on in distant and new fields. At present missions to India are particularly under examination. Therefore, as one worker in that important and promising field, I welcome the paper of Mr. Mozoomdar in *The Outlook* for May 19.

I am gratified that he can say so positively that "India is daily receiving Christ in larger measures;" that, in addition to "the large and noteworthy increase of percentage of Christians," "the great millions of unconverted Hindus, the leading castes and classes of thoughtful, educated men, the reformers and torch-bearers of multiform Indian society, are steadily imbibing the spirit of Christ;" that "their honor for the character of Jesus is ripening into personal love and spiritual acceptance;" and that "the general respect for the majority of Christian missionaries is genuine, deepest always where the spirit of self-sacrifice is most prominent."

Next, I ungrudgingly admit that Mr. Mozoomdar has some occasion for every criticism which he has made. Indian missionaries have made mistakes. Some of them have not been men of large intellectual power, nor of sufficient spiritual sensitiveness to appreciate a real drawing toward Christ in many who do not own his name. Many have not studied or properly known the history of Hinduism, and hence have not understood its best sides, and so have not been able to make use of those sides. Many have not gladly recognized the truth which Hindus possess as from the Spirit of God, and as a prophecy and help to the fuller truth through Christ. Many have made Western theology—and that sometimes a mechanical theology—too prominent. Many have not sufficiently conserved those good or non-essential things of India which ought to be conserved. Some have not always been wise in their relations with Indian Christians. Among such the present writer humbly classes himself in many points.

Nevertheless, many Indian missionaries, both men and women, both European and American, have been splendid persons in attainments, in character, and in wisdom.

But when we ask why they have shown their limitations and made their errors, the answer is plain: (1) because such things characterize the home churches, and (2) because the home churches have sent some men and women who were not large enough or spiritual enough. Therefore, for better missionary work in India, three things are needed: (1) developing a fuller life in our home churches; (2) sending out the best-qualified men and women; and (3) enabling those now in the field to get all criticisms and helps in the best possible way—*e. g.*, send the Report of the Parliament of Religions freely to missions and missionaries.

But, after this ungrudging admission of occasion for criticisms, the friends of missions need to have some things stated which Mr. Mozoomdar did not say, either because he could not say everything in one paper, or because he was not aware of them. To begin with, the term "missionaries" includes not only the regular appointees of the principal missionary societies, but also not a few persons who go out independently, or in connection with minor societies which have narrow conceptions of what Christianity is and what a missionary should do. Some of such missionaries have had limited advantages, but are men and women of sterling piety and devotion, and have done excellent work among certain peoples, though they do not reach the educated classes.

As Mr. Mozoomdar has written of English officials, I

venture to offer an unpublished testimony of one of the very highest of these. The last Governor before the present Governor of the Bombay Presidency was Lord Reay. At the hill station of Mohableshwar, just before the close of his term of office, he invited to dinner at Government House all the missionaries of all societies who were in the place. He then made some remarks, of a part of which the following is a condensation:

Ladies and gentlemen, as I shall never again have the privilege of having you all as my guests, I cannot let this occasion pass without an expression of respect for you personally, and for the value of your work. I have now been in India five years, and am somewhat better qualified for expressing a proper judgment than the average globe-trotter, who, after a few weeks in the country, considers himself able to express a correct judgment on any point. I have had frequent and good opportunities of knowing about you and your work, and the longer I have known about you the more I have come to respect you and to value the results of your labors. I am convinced that we English cannot do for India what God expects us to do without your aid; because that work cannot be done without bringing moral influence—which is the greatest influence—to bear upon the people. And your influence is moral influence. The people may easily think that officials are here for pay, or place, or other things. They cannot think so of you, whom they and we see going about at great self-sacrifice for the good of the people.

Again, some of the things which are charged on missionaries as a class, in my judgment, the very great majority do not do. For instance, the great body of them—American missionaries, perhaps, without exception—are total abstainers, and are the chief temperance workers. Most missionaries do not desire Indian Christians to change their food—except that those from the lowest ranks are urged, and in some missions are required, to give up the eating of carrion. Some of us urge Christians not to eat what might separate them from their countrymen. While a few missions do give Hindus new Christian names when they are baptized—and those missions less now than formerly—the majority have Christians keep their old names. So also about many habits and customs. Some missionaries have been charged with opposing the elevation of the people because they did not sympathize with the desire of both Christians and non-Christians to take Western titles and ways.

Concerning hospitality toward Indian Christians, I could tell of many missionaries, certainly in western India, who gladly welcome Indian Christians at their tables at all meals, and as guests in their homes and tents and conveyances. The matter of cordial relations with Indian Christians is one of great importance. But human nature everywhere makes it difficult always to secure this. So when Mr. Mozoomdar says "the native Christian worker complains of inequality of pay between himself and his English colleague," that shows how, on matters where there is room for difference of opinion, it is hard to have all work smoothly, though very likely without any fault on the part of the missionary.

In regard to the translation of the Bible into the many vernaculars of India, it is true that the language is not as idiomatic or smooth as is desirable. But this is not because scholarly missionaries and Indian Christians have not most faithfully toiled at it and are not still engaged in revisions. It is due, first, to the fact that a literal translation of any book into any language is necessarily somewhat stiff and unidiomatic. And Christians have thought that literal translation of the Bible was essential. How many attempts for how long a time were necessary for a fairly satisfactory English translation of the Bible? Who is entirely satisfied with the English of the Revised Version? In India the difficulty of securing an acceptable translation has been increased by too great effort to follow the order of the verses in our English Bible, in order to retain the help of concordances, commentaries, etc. Paraphrases of

¹ Missionary of the American Board at Ahmednagar, India.