

ifestations of God's power may account for the tremendous impression that he makes upon his audience, for is not man impressed by ruggedness?

And his language is undignified, they say. Well, it is unusual at times. He uses slang phrases, but a phrase that begins as slang often earns a place in our language by its forcefulness. The purpose of argument is to persuade, and how can an argument persuade unless it is understood? Some people speak over the heads of their auditors. What shall it profit a preacher if he use the whole dictionary and lose the soul that he is trying to save? Shall we put a higher estimate upon form than upon substance? Language is intended to convey thought; if a sinner can be aroused by a slang phrase is it not better to use the phrase than to delight his ears with euphonious words while he walks the road to ruin?

If Mr. Sunday's language seems abrupt at times, and even impolite, it must be remembered that the Master in whose name he preaches used strong language. "Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites," were not eulogistic terms nineteen hundred years ago; "whited sepulchre" was not a conciliatory description; "ye serpents, ye generation of vipers," was not even then a customary salutation at social gatherings. The twenty-third chapter of Matthew alone furnishes enough epithets to shock any minister who considers it his duty to palliate social sins and sooth the conscience of the evil doers in his congregation.

Even "hell," in referring to which Billy Sunday sins most frequently against so-called dignity and alleged good taste, does not sound as bad as it would feel. It is better to hear of it here than to endure it hereafter. He gets the word from the Bible, where it is frequently mentioned, and mentioned quite pointedly, too. Christ asks: "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" We are even told that it is better to pluck out an eye or cut off a hand, if they offend, rather than that the "whole body should be cast into hell." "Liar" is not a complimentary term, but there is Bible authority for the use of it to describe the man who says that he loves God but hates his brother.

But why give so much attention to the thorns upon the stem and so little to the rose? Mr. Sunday's critics are so busy finding fault with an occasional phrase that they have no time left to consider the message that he delivers to his audience. What if he does jump too high, or run too fast, or come too near exhaustion in the expenditure of physical energy; should that blind any reasonable person to the beneficent influence of his sermons?

And what if he does use language that grates upon the ear, if by the use of it he can tear his way through the outer covering of the heart and touch the life spring? To take an illustration from the diamond: What if he does twist the language and curve his sentences, if by so doing he can make the devil strike out? Those who overlook the good that he does and see in him only an acrobat and a slang monger should read what was once said of certain blind guides "which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel."

BILLY SUNDAY'S COMPENSATION

Before taking up the message which the great evangelist is bring to Boston it is worth while to consider another objection which is made by unfriendly critics, namely, as to the compensation which he receives.

It is a compliment to Mr. Sunday that, as a rule, his critics insist upon measuring him by a higher standard than they apply to themselves—a compliment which he doubtless appreciates. He can not object to scrutiny. It would be not only a reflection upon him, but a hindrance to the work in which he is engaged, if those who find fault with him could bring a just accusation against the plan which he follows in the collection of his remuneration.

There is but one economic law for the measuring of rewards, namely, that the individual can rightfully draw from society a reward commensurate with his contribution to the welfare of society. He is entitled to this much and no more. If one receives less than he earns he suffers injustice; if he receives more than he earns he is receiving that which belongs to some one else.

If Mr. Sunday's compensation is not to be measured by this law; what law shall we invoke in his case? That the laborer is worthy

of his hire is an axiom in the economic world; and "Muzzle not the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn" is Bible authority which has never yet been called in question.

Will any one say that one who devotes himself to spiritual things is not entitled to compensation? By what process of reasoning can one reach the conclusion that while the feeding of the body and the training of the mind furnish a legitimate claim for reward, the instructor in morals and the adviser in spiritual affairs is to be denied compensation for his work? And if he is entitled to any compensation at all, how much? Just enough to live on, or what he actually earns?

If it is conceded, as it must be, that Mr. Sunday is entitled to some compensation, how shall the amount be determined? What is his plan? He goes into a community and labors—no one can complain that the work is not sufficient in quantity, and results prove that it is abundantly satisfactory in quality—and remember that he does the work without exacting any promise of any specific compensation.

The big corporations state the compensation of their leading officers in contracts, and the recipient of the salary is often the most influential man in the group which fixes the amount. In the case of government officials the remuneration is named in the statute, so that the man who enters the office knows just how much he is to receive. The school teacher's pay is specified when the employment is accepted; and even the minister is usually informed in advance as to the amount he is to receive, although it may be increased by donations or decreased by failure of the church to collect the amount necessary.

Mr. Sunday's pay is more precarious. He depends upon voluntary contributions, and these contributions are made, not in advance, but at the end of his labors. What fairer plan could be devised? How many of those who find fault with him as a "money maker" would be willing to serve an individual employer or even the public upon the same terms and risk having the compensation depend upon the satisfaction given? If anyone's money is clean, Sunday's is. It is not only earned by "doing good," but is in the form of a "thank offering" gladly given for work actually done. And it must be remembered that his compensation includes pay for the very valuable services rendered by his wife, and covers the unusual executive ability displayed in bringing together and organizing a large group of assistants, among whom are the indispensable Rodeheaver and other efficient workers.

But the rule above stated, namely, that each individual member of society is entitled to draw from the common store in proportion as he contributes to the common welfare, is economic only, and relates to the acquisition of wealth. There is, however, a moral law that runs parallel with it; namely, that no matter how much one is able to earn, he holds it all as a steward and is responsible to his Maker for the proper use of that which he has a moral right to collect. No matter how blameless one may be in the amassing of a fortune, he can not escape moral responsibility for the use that he makes of his money.

Mr. Sunday must obey this law also. Does he do so? It is known that he devotes a tenth of his income to religious and altruistic uses. If this is not enough, let those who do more bring accusation against him; criticism can not come with propriety from those who do less. We have Christ's own assurance that it is more blessed to give than to receive, and the fact is verified by all who have made the experiment. Why should an evangelist be denied the gratification that comes from the distribution, according to his own pleasure of an honestly earned income as he sees fit to devote to the causes that appeal to him? Surely criticism can not come in good conscience from those who are themselves drawing pay for religious work, unless they are receiving less in proportion to results actually accomplished; and it can not come from those who collect for service less important to the individual and to society.

THE SERMON TO MEN

Before considering the Sunday message in its broadest and most fundamental aspects, it is worth while to take the two practical applications of Christian principles upon which Mr. Sunday lays the greatest emphasis, namely, per-

sonal purity and total abstinence. The first of these subjects will claim all the space at our command today.

"Chickens come home to roost," is the title which he gives to the sermon, which is only an epigrammatic way of paraphrasing numerous passages in the Bible conveying the same thought. The warning is conveyed in the commandments: "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me."

No man has ever elaborated this thought more carefully than Mr. Sunday or fortified it more forcefully. In the course of this address he inveighs vehemently against swearing, and Boston will hear less profane language because of the Sunday campaign. When he has finished his indictment of the oath there is nothing more to be said. His plea for cleanness of speech is alpha and omega on this subject.

His attack upon the sin of the libertine is a complete indictment, the counts including the scars upon the body as well as the blots upon the soul. The comparison which he draws between the Jukes family and the Edwards family is a classic in rhetoric and a battering ram in energy. If anyone doubts that Mr. Sunday possesses oratorical ability of a high order he should hear that sermon, and learn how skillfully an argument can be built up—how artistically a climax can be constructed.

Perhaps in no sermon does he display a wider range of humor, pathos and invective; and that the blows tell is proven not only by the applause which punctures the address, but more conclusively by the stream of men who are brought to a decision by his appeal. A picture on canvas could hardly depict more vividly before a father the crime which he perpetrates upon his children, born and unborn, by licentiousness and debauchery. Many an auditor stands aghast as he looks upon this verbal photograph of himself. He sees that what he has regarded as "manliness" is but miserable weakness, and that a profession of faith which he has regarded as "weakness" is really a manifestation of manhood and moral courage. It is the kind of a sermon that closes the avenue of retreat and compels surrender. Mr. Sunday makes religion a practical, everyday thing—not a visionary something vaguely related to a future life.

What does it mean to a community to have hundreds, not to say thousands, of its citizens startled into conviction and driven to repentance and an upright life? What does it mean in dollars to this generation and to the generations that follow? And, if it is difficult to cast up the account in dollars, who will undertake to estimate the moral value of such an appeal delivered to seventeen thousand men in an afternoon, and then repeated at night in order to accommodate a new audience?

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

If Mr. Sunday did nothing else, his visit to a city would be epoch-making because of the converts he makes to total abstinence and prohibition. His coming into a community always spreads consternation among those peculiarly interested in the sale of alcoholic beverages. In Omaha they tried to restrain the local committee from using the vacant ground that seemed most available. In Kansas City it was found that representatives of the brewing interests had undertaken a systematic campaign of personal slander. And, if devotion to a righteous cause can earn for a man the hatred of those who profit by the encouragement of vice, Billy Sunday deserves the hostility of those who have their money invested in the liquor traffic, for he is not only their sworn enemy but he has proven himself a very expensive foe.

On this as on other subjects his attitude is uncompromising. He makes no distinction between occasional drinking, moderate drinking and drunkenness—they all come under his condemnation—because "occasional drinking leads to moderate drinking, and moderate drinking to excess. Those who begin know—or ought to know after they hear him—that there is no excuse for either beginning or continuing.

There is no word in his vocabulary that will describe a drinking-Christian, because the two words can not be brought near enough together to be linked by a hyphen. According to his logic a man may be a drinking man or he may be a Christian, but he can not be both at the same