

The Suffering Servant of Jehovah.

Moses Margolouth, in his beautiful commentary on "Isaiah LIII," tells us that up to the Rabbi Jarchi's time this chapter was invariably interpreted as describing the sufferings of Messiah. Messiah was "the suffering servant of Jehovah," in the opinion of all Jewish expositors before Christ and after Christ up to the time named. Bishop Lowth, referring to the same chapter said, "This chapter described the circumstances of our Saviour's sufferings so exactly that it seems rather a history of His passion than a prophecy." This chapter led the Ethiopian Eunuch to Christ, and Margolouth says it has been the means of the conversion of very many Jews. It was only when Christian divines continued to press this interpretation that Jewish doctors began to apply it to the Jewish nation, or to the Jewish prophets, or to certain individuals—prominent in Jewish history. In these days of criticism doubts are again cast on the messianic interpretation of God's "suffering servant;" and many professing Christians refuse to find Christ in the Old Testament. There are a few verses such as Luke 24:27, and John 5:46, which some of the critics appear either to have never read or never believed.

Destruction of the Haddock.

We recently drew attention to the depletion of fish food supply by the modern methods of netting and urged that this most serious feature should be prominently brought before the Court about to sit at The Hague to determine the rights of control of our Bank Fisheries. We have received another warning of the need of vigilance in conserving all our fishing, by reading that little doubt now exists that the haddock has disappeared from the Scottish firths. For several months past fewer have been caught until now practically none are being landed on the east coast of Scotland. The trawlers have cleared them out and the occupations of many fishermen have gone with them.

Was St. Peter Pope of Rome.

In an interesting little book, "The Making of a Churchman," by the Rev. Ernest Vincent Shayler, of Oak Park, Illinois, the author asks some pertinent questions and makes some observations concerning St. Peter's position in the early Church, which will help us to estimate the Roman allegation of St. Peter's supremacy. St. Peter was sent out by the Apostolic College to confirm a class at Samaria. Can you imagine (our author asks) the present Pope being sent out by the College of Cardinals to confirm a class at Venice? St. Peter was present and joined in the debate concerning circumcision, at the Council of Jerusalem, yet St. James gave the decision. Can you imagine (our author asks) the Pope of Rome present now in any important council and letting some other person pronounce in his own name the solemn decision arrived at? If St. Peter was Pope of Rome, how comes it (our author asks) that it is St. Paul, and not St. Peter, who writes the New Testament letter to the Roman Christians, and in that letter, where he names other Roman Christians, he makes no mention of St. Peter at all? Here are three simple, well-put questions that help to show St. Peter's true position in the early Church. He claimed no superiority over other apostles, but "stood up with the eleven," working with them, but not lording it over them.

The Spirit of Worship.

The Bishop of Birmingham, on Ascension Day, preached a special service at the Cathedral, when a choir of twenty-two clergy sang the service. The Bishop said that the congregation had been invited to join in the singing of the Creed to its proper melodies as it had been over Christendom for seven centuries. Their church services might be of various kinds. He went about to many

churches. In some places you felt that you were really joining in an act of worship, that the spirit and glory of God did rest upon it; in other places you felt there was more or less skilful music, but it was formal, there was no joy of heart that seemed to inspire it. The difference lay in the spirit behind it. Let them make their acts of worship what they ought to be, then their hearts would be full of the sense that their religion was true, for the spirit and glory of God must rest on them, and their acts of worship would then be great.

The Lash.

The police received an object-lesson when the lash was made a punishment for garroters: the crime went out of fashion. Crimes against society are constantly changing and new punishments are needed to fit the crimes. The most clamant at this day is some punishment to meet the case of men and women who treat the sanction of society,—needless to say, of God—as of no importance. Every week or so we read of men and women, especially men, who trade in marriage, and when arrested, are quite ready to go to a penitentiary where the conditions of existence are carefully adjusted and the convict is furnished with suitable employment. It has come to this, that to such people houses of detention are so many, more or less, comfortable clubs. It is strongly felt that appeals to such people's better nature are useless. For instance, Edith Sellers, in London, tells in Cornhill of her search for sons and daughters to take home a parent from the work-house with an old-age pension, and how few thought that a duty to honour their father or mother rested upon them. In the "Catholic Universe," Archbishop Glennon, of St. Louis, enlarges on other aspects of domestic neglect, the tendency to get away from the home, to throw children on public or private charity. When the divorce court gets through there is the ruined home, the cast-off wife, the well-filled orphan asylum. The question, as he says, is how to treat those worthless husbands and fathers who neglect their homes and fail to support their children, who work when they will, leave their homes on the slightest pretext, and are free. The thing we repeat such beings fear is physical pain.

Influence of the Preacher.

"Dr. Alexander M'Laren's death," says a contemporary, "has deprived the English-speaking world of one of its greatest preachers. The last to die, he was not the least of the famous trinity of preachers—Spurgeon, Parker, M'Laren—who adorned the pulpits of English Dissenting chapels during the latter part of the Victorian era. His sermons, like theirs, were expository; his appeal, like theirs, was evangelical; his congregation, like theirs, was multiplied a hundred-fold by volumes which, if they lack the pregnant humour of the one, or the ornate rhetoric of the other, equal each in penetration and surpass both in beauty of style and richness of suggestion. Preaching was the absorbing passion of Dr. M'Laren's life. Speaking at the celebrations in honour of his jubilee, he said:—'I began my ministry, with, and, thank God, I have been able to keep to that as my aim—I say nothing about attainments—the determination of concentrating all my available strength on the work, the proper work of the Christian ministry, the pulpit; and I believe that the secret of success for all our ministers lies very largely in the simple charm of concentrating their intellectual force on the one work of preaching.'" There can be no doubt of the power of the pulpit, when it is used aright. As an adjunct to our noble service it has its distinct purpose and place. Those who use it as a lecturer's stand or professor's platform, thereby proclaim to their hearers their own unfitness to occupy it. A church is not a lecture-hall. Nor is

a congregation of Churchmen in church to be treated as it were a class of college students assembled to hear a professor lecture.

Aid Your Rector.

Why is it that so many Church people, estimable and worthy though they be in the relations of domestic and social life, are to all intents and purposes ineffectual as regards the growth of Church life in their respective parishes? Is it not because they have never fully appreciated the noble ardour of spiritual self-denial—nor have they ever rightly understood, or definitely undertaken, the solemn and lofty duty of striving to extend the kingdom on earth of their Lord and Master in Heaven? Is not this shirking and shifting of direct individual responsibility one of the chief causes of discouragement to some clergymen, and of broken health to others? The clergy have their especial duties to do. The laity have theirs. Were the laity loyally and zealously to aid the rector in some definite way in building up the work of the Church in the parish, infinitely more good would be done and new life, zeal and enthusiasm would be imparted to the clergy.

EARL GREY.

Never since the late Lord Dufferin of happy memory left our shores, has there been such genuine and wide-spread regret as is everywhere manifested over the approaching departure of our present Governor-General. This, of course, is not said in disparagement of the intervening Governors, some of whom have been distinguished men, and all of them men of character and ability, and worthy and efficient representatives of the Crown. Canada, indeed, has been singularly happy in her Governors-General, not one of whom but has proved himself fully equal to the position in every respect. Every one of them has risen above the mere official and proved himself something more than a figure-head. But Earl Grey has been something more than a Governor-General. He has been a great popular leader, and herein he has preserved and exemplified the peculiar excellences of the British system of government. It has been possible for him, as it was for Lord Dufferin, of fondly cherished and deeply lamented memory, to be what he has been, because by his position he has been lifted above all suspicion of party affiliation and leaning. We once heard some one say, when speaking on the subject of the system of appointing the Governor-General, "Thank God, we have one man in Canada who is above party." And so it has been that our present Governor-General has been able to take a prominent part in certain public, and even semi-political movements, without arousing the faintest suspicion of hostility in any quarter. His counsel has been received by all sections of the community in the best spirit, and his lead has been enthusiastically followed by men of all parties, because everyone instinctively felt that he was animated by the best traditions of his office, and the august personage whom he represented, and that he stood for neither clique nor party, but for the whole country. Under any other system, especially under an elective one, which some advocate, this would be impossible. It is not in the "wit of man" to devise any scheme of electing a supreme executive head, who can be kept free from party complications. Of this we have a striking illustration in the United States. The framers of the Constitution, whatever they might have been morally, were intellectually men of exceptional power. They planned to secure a non-party system of electing the Chief Magistrate. And no sooner was it tried than it ignominiously broke down. The President became the nominee of a party, and ruled the country by the support