

an impression on Christian thought as none after him. The former found Christianity in what he considered a crude state and set about to "develop" it. He explained the relationship of the Son to the Father, laid the foundation to the theory of universalism and the relation of that doctrine to children dying in infancy. This led him to the pre-existence of souls and the fate of mankind after death. He believed that faith was the saving principle; that knowledge rests on divine revelation; that God created matter of nothing; that Jesus was a dual being and that salvation is universal. It is plain enough that he in many things was in possession of truth, while in others he was in total darkness.

Augustine built further upon the foundations laid by Origen and to the latter theology is mainly indebted for an explanation of the necessity of infant baptism and the doctrine of Trinity. There is no doubt that Augustine had a master mind, but whether he had the Spirit of the Lord to direct this mind is a grave question even among some Protestant teachers.

It is probable, however, that the great church fathers alone would have been powerless to perpetuate their ideas had it not been for the ecumenical councils. One of these was the important one at Nice, 325, and its history is particularly instructive. At the time Constantine had succeeded in establishing himself as emperor of the west, while Licinius claimed the east. The latter was soon defeated in a war and the former united the empire under his own scepter. The haughty emperor now had several of his rivals assassinated in true oriental style, and concluded to establish himself on the confidence of Christian subjects. He found, however, that these were continually squabbling about doctrines, and as they, in order to be of any use to him, must be united, he convened the council at Nice where all controversy should be settled. Here for the first time, the state and the church met. Historians tell us that the emperor clad in purple and jewels looked upon the 318 bishops assembled in disgust because of their cringing attitude, all bent upon the gathering up a few crumbs of his munificence. But he wanted a united church.

The matter of controversy was the Arian heresy. The famous Elder from Alexandria taught that if Jesus is the Son of God, His father must be older than He, and that consequently there must have been a time when the second person in the Deity did not exist. He further maintained that Jesus was a free agent, capable of doing wrong as well as right. Orthodoxy as represented by the majority of those Bishops condemned Arius and his doctrines. Later, however, Arius submitted a written confession of faith which the emperor declared orthodox and on the strength of which he ordered the Bishop of Constantinople to admit him to Church fellowship.

It is hard to tell what would have happened, had not Arius just then conveniently died, some say by poison. Possibly his heresy would have prevailed and Athanasius been declared the heretic.

This is a fair sample of the councils that from time to time in ecclesiastical

history have directed the tide of orthodox theology. This was born in an uncritical age and often helped along by political or personal considerations. Before the light of revealed truth as before the criticism of true philosophy it cannot stand. Its exponents have, of course, a perfect right to their views, but they certainly exceed the boundaries of their moral right when in a spirit of boastfulness and from their own assailable position, they brand as heretics those who strive to attain to truth beyond the cloudy atmosphere of ancient church fathers and ecumenical councils.

COAL MINE INSPECTION.

The question of the validity of the State coal mine inspection law has been raised and it is said will be tested in the courts. The general proposition presented is that there is a discrimination against the coal industry in providing regulations therefor such as do not attach to any other industry, and which operate as an additional tax upon the mine owners. One particular as to how this is done is the fee of ten dollars required for each quarterly inspection and the maps of the mine to be furnished the State. This, it is said, makes a tax of \$60 to \$70 to be paid to the State treasury in maps and fees, annually, which tax is not required in any other business.

The probability is that the question of constitutionality here has been brought forward as a result of the suggestive action of Illinois coal mine operators. Last February the mine owners of Illinois banded together to test the coal mine inspection law in that state on precisely the same grounds. The cost of inspection, etc., there is somewhat less than in Utah, ranging from \$24 to \$40 annually. The Illinois case is yet undetermined, so far as we have information.

About one thousand operators are affected in Illinois and about twenty-five in Utah; but few or many, the principle involved is the question. In Utah the constitutional provision differs somewhat from that of Illinois; the labor article in the Constitution of this State specially directs the Legislature to pass laws to provide for the health and safety of employees in factories, smelters and mines, and the State coal mine inspection law was passed in conformity therewith. Whether the fact that it singled out coal mines alone for inspection, and taxed fees upon the operators of such mines only, infringes on the letter or spirit of the Constitution, is one of the points the courts must decide. There seems to be no doubt, in view of the provision of the labor article referred to, that the Legislature of this State can provide for such mine inspection and regulation as it deems essential to the safety of employees therein.

LANGUAGE OF CHRIST.

The question, What language did Christ speak? is again being agitated, and Dr. Arnold Meyer, of the university of Bonn, Germany, has just issued one of the best discussions of the subject yet given to the public. A con-

densed translation is given in Literary Digest, which presents a fair idea of the reasoning of the German professor. Dr. Meyer cites that the church fathers accepted the view that Jesus spoke in the language employed by Matthew in the preparation of his gospel, and which Papias declares was Hebrew; and the current opinion was that the Lord employed the Syriac as His vernacular, which term was used interchangeably with Hebrew and Chaldee. This view was questioned in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the Jesuits expressed the idea that "the Lord's vernacular must have been the Latin, as this was the language spoken by the saints in heaven," and the official bible of the Roman church was in that tongue; but skeptical minds insisted that the Savior spoke a mixed dialect current in Palestine, while some Protestant scholars maintained that he spoke Greek, the language of the New Testament, and others that He used pure Hebrew, which was rigidly taught in the schools of Palestine. Dr. Meyer departs from all these views, and makes the following findings as the result of his exhaustive researches:

The facts in the case, especially as seen in the words of the New Testament other than Greek, show that the Lord spoke an Aramaic language, and of this language again a Galilean dialect. The Aramaic is a branch of the north Semitic and as such a sister tongue of the Hebrew. Long before the close of the Old Testament canon the Aramaic had supplanted Hebrew in popular use in Israel and had become the language of trade and business between the peoples of Syria and countries farther east. Already a Jeremiah and an Ezekiel show the influence of this tongue; the same is true of the later Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and especially Ezra and Daniel, both of which contain portions written in this dialect. During the Maccabean period the Aramaic had virtually supplanted Hebrew in Israel. It is used in the Talmud, and its general use is reported by Philo, a contemporary of St. Paul, and by the historian Josephus, who calls it the "language of the fatherland."

Only in one respect the old Hebrew maintained its hold. It was the language of the sacred writings of Israel and the official tongue of their Scriptures. In the synagogues their books were read in the original Hebrew, but were interpreted to the people through Aramaic paraphrases called Targumim. Testimonies abound and agree that such was the case regularly, so that the common people could no longer understand the sacred tongue of their fathers and of their Scriptures. The current language of the day was accordingly the Aramaic, and this language beyond any reasonable doubt was the tongue employed by Christ in His discourses with His disciples and with the people. The Hebrew as such was known well only to the learned, but was not understood thoroughly by the common people.

Dr. Meyer brings the New Testament as a witness to the correctness of his conclusions, citing the fact that therein the names of persons taken from other sources than the Greek are Aramaic in form and sound, as are also the terms found in 1 Cor. xvi: 22, the citation from the Psalms spoken on the cross, and others. From these, and the conditions known to exist in Palestine at the time of the Savior's ministry there, Dr. Meyer reasons that it is only fair to conclude that Christ spoke the language of His people; that in fact