

and so the missionary has to stay." Surely such tactics are unworthy the church of Christ. If a man takes his family to a field where the privations and difficulties are such that he would not stay if he could get away, it must be because that field has been misrepresented to him. Otherwise he is not a fit man to be a father and therefore not fit to be a missionary and should not have been sent.

If the church cannot produce enough men without families, who are willing out of loyalty to Christ and love to man to bear the brunt of the battle and to serve in those places which are not fit for families, she had better leave the hard places alone and not man them with those who stay because they cannot get away.

* * *

One can hardly over-estimate the value of a Theological Conference such as the one recently held at Queen's.

Even apart from the intellectual life with which those who attend are brought into contact, there is the respite from interminable meetings and from the routine of pastoral work. Some of the members of the Conference had found time to read the works prescribed, and these no doubt received the most permanent benefit from the discussions which followed the reading of the papers. But even those who came to renew old friendships, and to linger for a few days round the halls of their loved Alma Mater, went away with a fresh conviction of the necessity of bravely thinking out the religious questions of our time.

The course of study was admirably calculated to bring theology from heaven down to earth, and give it some relation to the other departments of human thought.

Dr. Dyde lectured daily on the development of Greek thought through the great poets and the Sophists.

Profs. Cappon and Shortt dealt with Carlyle's works from literary, social, and economic points of view.

Rev. G. M. Milligan lectured daily on the Book of Job.

It goes without saying that these courses were all good, but the feature for which the Conference of 1894 will be remembered was the lecture on Dante by Dr. Watson, the Sandford Fleming lecturer for this and the two following years.

It would be idle to add any comment, for the lectures will appear in the *Quarterly* and then everyone may read them as slowly and as often as he likes; but it may not be amiss to say that the honest but sympathetic way in which Professor Watson dealt with the Theology of the Middle Ages must have encouraged all reflective hearers to face without fear the difficulties that are now in our way.

The evenings of the Conference were devoted to discussions on Bruce's *Apologetics* and Fairbairn's *Christ in Modern Theology*.

Altogether the Conference was very successful and we shall be glad to welcome the Alumni and friends of Queen's back next February.

* * *

On another page of this issue may be found a communication from "Conservative" on two or three questions suggested by the Conference recently held here. There is a show of fairness about this contribution, but it is evident that the writer is what he signs himself, "Conservative." He has no compunction whatever in administering a castigation to the "extremists" who apply the Law of Development to Religion as well as to Science and History. This gratuitous fling at modern philosophy is an indication of weakness, but after his prefatory remarks "Conservative" asks one or two questions which prove real troubles to sincere persons who still cling to theological formulas built on external authority. Towards the end of his letter, "Conservative" calls the theory of development a "force," and confounds the scientific theory of evolution with the whole thought of God's manifestation of Himself in the world. Such confusion is apt to put the critical reader into an uncharitable frame of mind, and does not invite a very meek reply. The import of the communication may be summed up in the question, "how does the theory of development explain Christ, Christianity, and the Christian life?"

Now, it would take too long to write a treatise on the relation of God and man, but we may indicate briefly a more rational way of looking at religious truths than the scholastic way of the middle ages, which still hangs like a body of death to many students of our own day, from whom better might be expected. The very essence of scholasticism was the unquestioned acceptance of the dogmas of the Church. This process safely over, reason might then play with the dogmas in a frolicsome fashion, and reduce them to order if possible, but it must never whisper a doubt of their infallibility, even though they contradicted one another.

At the Reformation the human mind awoke from its centuries of slumber, and cast off as an intolerable burden whatever could not be brought into intelligible relation with the inner life of man. This, at least, was Luther's guiding thread, although he himself, and his followers certainly, did not recognize the full meaning of the impulse which had led them to throw off the yoke of the Church. Now God has not been absent since the Reformation. He has not left the world to take care of itself during the last four hundred years. We see now that the principle of the Reformation has borne us with more or less consciousness of our destiny, past the lifeless words