

have arisen if the haste with which it was issued and the tone which characterizes its close had not given some color to both stories. Congress caught the contagion from the President. There was absolutely no need of haste. There was the very greatest need for careful deliberation. Grant that it was necessary to protect our interests by warning England off from Venezuela; grant that it was our duty as a chivalric nation to protect Venezuela from aggression. It needed no special wisdom to see that such a course might involve the gravest possible results, and ought, therefore, not to be taken without the most serious consideration, nor then except in the wisest possible way. But the House of Representatives gave the matter no consideration whatever, and the Senate practically none. Republicans who had alternately derided and denounced the report of the Commissioner whom the President had sent out to investigate affairs in Hawaii vied with each other in their eagerness to give him authority to appoint Commissioners to investigate affairs in Venezuela, without even requiring him to submit the appointment to the Senate, and under circumstances which implied a readiness to go to war with England, if need be, to enforce whatever decision the Commission might reach. The very men who heaped epithets of contempt on one Commission were ready, apparently, to go to war with England if she did not submissively accept the decision of an analogous Commission appointed by the same President.

The press was not all equally precipitate. Yet, on the whole, there was comparatively little indication of deliberation. With a few noteworthy exceptions, the peace journals were as hot for peace as the war journals were hot for war. Editors who, twenty-four hours before, neither knew where Venezuela was nor what was the Monroe Doctrine were far more positive than if they had studied the problem for half a century, that the Monroe Doctrine left us no option but to interfere on behalf of Venezuela. The journals were few which said, Let us wait; let us consider the matter; let us learn what Venezuela is, what is British Guiana, what is the question at issue between them, and what our expert constitutional scholars tell us is the meaning and application of the Monroe Doctrine to the issue. A weekly paper like *The Outlook* had an advantage over its daily contemporaries. It could not speak for several days. It was compelled to be deliberate.

Even when the authorities did speak, their utterances were, in certain quarters, contemptuously disregarded. Dr. Von Holst, of Chicago University; Professor Burgess, of Columbia; Professor Woolsey, of Yale; Professor Hart, of Harvard, have all spoken. They are all expert scholars in International Law. They have all told their students, and, directly or indirectly, the public, that the Monroe Doctrine does not apply to such an issue as this disputed boundary line between Venezuela and British Guiana. And the answer is, in some journals, an outcry against them as un-American, and against the universities in which they teach as dominated by English influence. In at least one case the resignation of the offending professor has been hotly demanded, for no better reason than that he does not make historic precedent support popular passion, and that he has been indecorously warm in denouncing ignorance and precipitancy where knowledge and deliberation might have been expected and demanded.

We recall the saying of a wise counselor, If the house is on fire, and you have three minutes in which to save anything, take two minutes to decide what you will save. A warm heart is a great deal more efficient when it is mated to a cool head. If President Cleveland had written his message one week, discussed it with his Cabinet the

next week, and issued it on the third, and Congress had taken two weeks to discuss it, and the public teachers had studied the Monroe Doctrine before trying to teach other people as ignorant as themselves what it meant, we should have shown ourselves quite as valiant a people and a great deal wiser. The experience of the past two weeks will be worth something if it teaches us the wisdom of applying in exciting times the motto, Make haste slowly.



## The Measure of Citizenship

These are the days when we make up our minds that we will live in peace with all men. We think that patient endurance is a virtue that outweighs in value all others. There never was a greater error. Endurance is often so contemptible as to rank with cowardice. Evil is the enemy of progress in manners and morals; the enemy of national prosperity. The endurance which tolerates evil is a defect worthy of the strongest effort to overcome. It takes courage, time, patience, faith, to take a stand and make a fight against evil, whether that evil is threatening the Nation's prosperity or individual rights and comforts. We have in all communities laws that exist for the protection of the law-abiding citizen—his protection not only of life and property, but of comfort, of health, of morals. These laws are for the whole community, for all ages, and each sex. They are constantly violated. Why? Because endurance, not in the guise of virtue, but in its common every-day garb of weakness, indifference, and laziness, permits these violations, refusing to see the moral degradation that ensues. We have municipal laws which forbid the admission of drunken or disorderly passengers in our street-cars. This law is constantly violated. Children are exposed to sights and sounds that cannot have any other effect than to degrade, dull, and finally deaden their senses to that which is degrading. Endurance of this evil is criminal in the eyes of God. In every State the selling of liquors to children is limited by law. We see children, almost babies, leave saloons again and again with pitchers and pails. We weep, we mourn over this evil, but how many take the time to fight it—to use the law that exists to protect the child from degradation and temptation, the community from the cost of that degradation and its evil results? Evils are tolerated that cost men and money because of the indifference, the laziness, the criminal sentimentality of men and women who call themselves righteous. The man whose blood does not reach fever-heat in the sight of wrong needs to be converted; even if the evil does not touch his life, there is danger for those who have not his protection from this evil.

Righteous wrath that would express itself openly would put down many evils in their first stages which, endured, create and strengthen themselves and allied evils, compelling the expenditure of men, money, and years of time to overcome.

Sin has strength as well as weakness. Fight the strength of sin with the strength of righteousness.

It takes brains to make criminals, persistence to make sneaks, and versatility to make even the petty offender. At the beginning a wholesome fear of law, not in its uniformed expression, but in the eye, the heart, the brain, the life of the fellow-citizen who loves his God and country well enough to stand for righteousness, would crush the evil that is never other than a growth, an accumulation of the years. To quote a close observer of life, what the world needs is "formative, not reformatory work." The first is secured through an active, intelligent public sentiment, the latter is the last resort of law after the waste of life.

# Prophets of the Christian Faith

## III.—Clement of Alexandria

By the Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.

The Rev. Dr. Marcus Dods, of Edinburgh, is one of the recognized religious leaders of Scotland. He was born in 1834, graduated from the Edinburgh University in 1854, and was ordained ten years later as minister of Renfield Free Church, Glasgow, where he remained until appointed Professor of New Testament Exegesis in New College, Edinburgh, in 1889. This chair he still occupies. In Scotland he is known as a vigorous and effective preacher, though with none of the arts which are supposed in America to belong to the orator. In this country he is best known by his contributions to the press, especially by his Commentaries on the Book of Genesis and on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (both in the Expositor's Bible Series) and by his work on the Gospel of John. His spirit is essentially conservative. He is by nature cautious and constructive, but this has not saved him from charges of heresy, which were preferred some years ago by some of his Free Church contemporaries because he took the view of modern critics in his interpretation of Genesis. The charges, however, came to nothing, and his position was rather strengthened and his influence increased by the unsuccessful attempt to subject him to an ecclesiastical trial. The article which he contributes to this week's issue of *The Outlook* illustrates alike his breadth of scholarship, his spiritual insight, and his singular clearness of style. No man ever ought to misunderstand what Dr. Marcus Dods means. Previous articles in this series, by the Rev. Lyman Abbott and the Rev. Dr. George Matheson, will be found in *The Outlook* for December 14 and December 21. Following articles in the series will be by Professor Adolph Harnack, Dean Fremantle, Dean Farrar, Principal Fairbairn, Dr. A. V. G. Allen, Dr. T. T. Munger, and Professor A. C. McGiffert.



Rev. Marcus Dods, D.D.

**T**ITUS FLAVIUS CLEMENS, commonly known as Clement of Alexandria, may be accepted as the representative of Greek Theology. In some respects either Origen or Athanasius might more suitably stand as its exponent, but Clement has the advantage of being earlier than either of these great theologians, and of being Origen's teacher and predecessor as head of the catechetical school of Alexandria. "He stands in the same relation to those that came after him that Augustine sustained to the Latin theology of the Middle Ages, or Luther and Calvin to the later Protestantism."

Of his personal history little is known. He wrote in the reign of Severus (193-211 A.D.), and the probability is that he was born in Athens about the middle of the second century. In quest of truth he traveled in Italy, Syria, and Asia Minor, until finally he "caught the true Sicilian bee," Pantænus in Alexandria. In a year or two afterwards he was ordained a presbyter of the Church, and succeeded Pantænus as Master of the Catechetical School. His residence in Alexandria undoubtedly had a great influence, not only on the form of his writings, but on his thought, and especially on his attitude towards philosophy. In this magnificent, busy, and dissipated city, every vice of heathenism and the most sumptuous and seductive idolatrous worship were daily obtruded on the notice of Clement. Everything that paganism had to attract, to delude, to bind, was matter of familiar observation to the man who was destined to become, not only the most voluminous, but in many respects the most sagacious and convincing, of Christian apologists.

In Alexandria Clement had also opportunity to acquire that learning which was essential to qualify him to meet the mental condition of religious inquirers in the second century. It was at least as important to gain to the new faith the philosophers and scholars of the museum as the mechanics of the docks and building-yards, or the warehouse porters. His office as teacher of the Christian school exposed him to the interrogation of all who had difficulties about the new religion. The cavils which were concocted by the wits of the museum, the theories which were broached in the dining-hall of the professors, would naturally find their way to the ears of Clement. And so he drew around the young plants which were under his charge the hedge, as he calls it, of a learning superior to that of the assailants. Excepting Athenæus, probably no ancient writer could be named who cites four hundred authors, but a larger number than this must measure the reading of Clement. This great learning he used, not for display, but as a missionary engine. His three great books, the "Protreptikos," the "Paidagogos," and the "Stromateis," written respectively for the heathen, the catechumen, and the Christian Gnostic, all bear witness to his zeal no less than to his knowledge.

In the apologetic of Clement we become aware that his

conciliatory attitude is the result not merely of geniality of disposition, but of principle—the principle, to state it in his own words, that "there is one river of truth, but many streams fall into it on this side and on that." He believed that Philosophy had been in its measure a "school-master" to the Greeks, as the Law had been to the Jews; and that even after the Advent it served as a preparatory training which might lead men to Christianity. By "philosophy," as he is careful to explain, he did not mean the teaching of any particular school, the Platonic, Aristotelian, or Epicurean, but whatever had been well said by any sect "which teaches righteousness along with science." As Justin had taught that the Logos had been the revealer of truth to the heathen philosophers, so Clement maintains that philosophy is God's gift to men "for the sake of those who not otherwise than by its means would abstain from what is evil."

This catholic tendency which is so marked a feature of the second century was no doubt stimulated, if not wholly caused, by the universalism of the Empire. As Professor Allen says, "The necessity of enforcing one common method of legal procedure upon a variety of peoples, each with its own conception of justice and of its practical administration, gave rise to the comprehensive spirit of Roman law and the endeavor to ground it in the nature of man. A similar necessity gave rise to similar efforts in the sphere of religious thought." The necessities of Clement's position also drove him to adopt his liberal views and methods. He expressly affirms that he felt himself impelled to become a Greek to the Greeks, and that in order to remove their difficulties he must first feel them, must recognize the truth they held before he could add to it, and must see their error from their own point of view. Never, on the other hand, does he allow it to be supposed that he considers philosophy to be a sufficient guide. Christ alone possesses the whole truth. There is only One who can perfectly satisfy, only One who can heal, purify, and restore to God.

In this teaching Clement is the type not only of one of the most remarkable phases of early Christianity, but he is the representative of a tendency or mental attitude which reappears in all ages of the history of Christendom. It would appear from unmistakable signs, in our own day, that the Church has not yet made up its mind to adopt Clement's theory of the relation of non-Christian religions and philosophies to Christianity. The Bampton Lecturer for 1894 (Mr. Illingworth), speaking of the non-Christian sacred books of the world, says: "With all their imperfection and manifest inferiority, there is that in them which we can well believe to have been a vehicle of divine teaching to the nations they addressed, and, if so, to have been inspired, as their possessors believed." And in confirmation of his statement he quotes Clement, who speaks to the same