

## Our Contributors.

### CONCERNING DATIVE CASE MEN.

BY KNOXONIAN.

We have all heard of the dying linguist, who said he was sorry that he had not given his life to the study of the Dative case. Who that man was, and why he selected the Dative case instead of any of the other cases, are questions that we cannot answer. The one thing clear is that the man was a specialist. Had he been allowed to live his life over again he would have been an expert on the Dative case. Had he been called to give expert evidence against a boy who had injured the Dative case in any way his evidence would have led to the punishment of the boy.

Specialization is one of the features of modern life. In every department of human activity labour divides and sub-divides and divides again. Advanced civilization demands specialties. Not one man in a thousand who rides in a top buggy has the slightest idea of the number of experts required in the making of a modern covered buggy. Medicine has sub-divided marvelously within a few years. There is a specialist now for every part of the human body from the hair of the head down to the bunion that adorns the foot.

Educational work of all kinds is being cut up into specialties.

Whether so much specialization is a good thing or the reverse is not a question that need be discussed. The specialties are aere in every line of human activity. Sensible people deal with men and things as they find them.

Has specialization come to stay? We cannot tell. It may be nothing more than a craze. It may pass away and come again like wide trousers or small toed boots. One thing we know, the trend is here and there is no more use in arguing against a vigorous trend than against a mania.

The trend towards specialties in theological education nominated two professors in Knox College the other day. It goes unsaid that any member of the College Board would rather have nominated a home man. Indeed, it might be said with perfect safety that a large majority of the Board would, other things being equal, have preferred a graduate of Knox College. It was a clear case of the good, all-around home man, against the outsider who had given his time and labour to one or two lines of study. It was the generally well-equipped man against the Dative case man and the Dative case man won. If Knox is to keep in line with other theological institutions and retain her hundred students the Dative case man had to win.

It is easy to ask do Dative case professors turn out better preachers of the gospel than high-class all-around men who have a fair knowledge of their specialty, and fair teaching ability combined with the breadth and strength of character that moulds the character of students. Personally we do not believe they do. It has never been shown that Princeton and Union with all their specialties have turned out better preachers than the graduates of Knox College—an institution in which each professor has for half a century been expected to do the work of two or three specialists. But what is the use in arguing against a mania? There is a universal demand for specialists in theological as well as in every other branch of education. The college that does not try to meet that demand will soon have no students, and a college without students is made in vain. Let us hope that the new men along with their expert knowledge in certain lines, may have the rare power of kindling enthusiasm in students for all branches of theological study, and above all have the power to stimulate them to become enthusiastic preachers of the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

Why have we not more specialists among

our own ministers and students? Mainly because the conditions in which specialists are produced do not exist in this young Church and young country. To pursue a special line of study up to the point at which a student becomes fit to teach his specialty in a college he needs money, and comparatively few Canadian students have money or rich friends willing to give them money. A post-graduate course is expensive, and entirely beyond the reach of a student who has had hard work to pay the expenses incurred before graduation.

But supposing a student has finished his course with a decided liking for some special line of study, how many congregations have we in the Church in which he can pursue his studies up to the point at which he is qualified for a professorship. We know of only one kind of congregation in which the thing is more than barely possible. It might be done in a small, quiet, rural congregation, composed of Scotch or Ulster people who go to church as a matter of duty, and consider it a privilege to do so. To expect any man to become a specialist in any line of study, and at the same time meet the demands of a large town or city congregation, or of a rural congregation, composed, perhaps, of three stations, and scattered over one or two townships, is to expect that which is an utter impossibility for most ministers. One pastor in five hundred may do it but certainly the number must always be small.

Of the thousand ministers in our Church how many find time and strength for any work over and above their pulpit pastoral or professional duties. The number can almost be counted on one's fingers. The demands on a minister's time and strength increase every year. As a rule the unreasonable demands do not come from his own people. They come from people who have no more right to his time or labour than they have to the small change in his pocket. But the fear of being described as "unsociable," or branded as a "bigot," or denounced as being opposed to "the cause," coupled too often with the fear that his own people may not stand by him if he does not go to all the meetings, sometimes leads ministers to squander precious hours that ought to be given to study.

When the conditions under which Canadian ministers and students work are improved there will be no difficulty in finding within the Church suitable professors for every chair.

### THE CHURCH SERVICE SOCIETY: A REJOINDER.

BY AULD KIRK.

Kindly permit a few words of frank criticism on the article from the pen of the Rev. G. H. Smith, entitled "The Church Service Society," and which appeared in a late issue. At the outset it is to be feared Mr. Smith has confounded two entirely distinct organizations, viz., "The Church Service Society" and "The Scottish Church Society." Both exist in the Church of Scotland. The former embraces many of the most famous divines in that body. It has existed about thirty years and judged by its fruits has been anything but iniquitous. Its best known publication is 'Εὐχολογίων—A Book of Common Order. This book, it is well known, has been favorably received everywhere and is sufficiently indicative of the aims of the Society. The Society has never advocated vestments, though many clergy in Scotland wear their degree hoods in addition to gown and bands, nor has it ever advocated prayers for the dead. A Society on exactly similar lines also exists in the U. P. Church in Scotland. The Society has disowned any sympathy, and refuses to have any association, with "The Scottish Church Society." This latter Society, one likely to pass into well-merited oblivion, was organized, I think, less than ten years ago by a few cranks, not one of whom is well known. Its aims are somewhat ritualistic and a few of its members,

not the Society as such, have advocated "prayers for the blessed dead." It is not fair because of the vagaries of this obscure association to hold up the older one which was never more vigorous than to-day, to ridicule. I may say I question very much whether the Church Service Society publishes any periodical literature.

With regard to the pulpits adorned with carved images I presume Mr. Smith does not wish us to believe such images are worshipped. If they are not what more harm is there in having figures carved on the side of a pulpit than having them in a stained glass window, such as may be seen any day in many a Presbyterian Church in this country. If Mr. Smith sees such terrible danger in a stone communion table, does he see any in a stone baptismal font? If we can have a stone church, a stone font, why not a stone table? What worse ritualism can there be than to believe that the material a communion table is made of affects the nature of the service? If it be a wooden table the service is a sacrament, if it be a stone table the service is a sacrifice akin to the mass! Surely this is too much to be asked to swallow? Mr. Smith seems to have hunted for altars. He found six of them. Was he told they were altars or did he assume because, as in St. Giles, Edinburgh, the communion table was placed in the ancient chancel of the church, it was therefore an altar and was called such? Where did he find crucifixes and crosses common? On communion tables? I doubt it and would like definite information as to the position of such common objects.

As to old Grey Friars, in which end of it did Mr. Smith worship? Two separate congregations meet there. Perhaps the spiritual agony which Mr. Smith felt there was owing to the investigating mood he seems to have entertained as much as to anything else. Because he felt the service chilling there, need we assume it is the same everywhere in the Old Kirk? Three statements of Mr. Smith's I emphatically deny. He says there is a visible hastening of disestablishment. Perhaps the wish may have been father to the thought here, but if we look at the result of the last general election in Scotland the hastening seems to be the other way. Scotland, judged by that test, was never truer to the National Church for over a century than to-day. Mr. Smith says the spiritually minded are being driven from the Old Kirk. Who told him that? It is too sweeping an assertion to be accepted on his simple authority. More than that it cannot be established by the facts. In missionary activity, in the care of her young people especially, in the preaching of such men as Dr. Matheson, Dr. Lang, Dr. Flint, etc., there is ample proof of the spiritual-mindedness of the Kirk. Whatever be the case with the Anglican body to say that there is a suspicion that Jesuits are in the Church of Scotland is a statement worthy only of contempt. If such statements, or rather misstatements, are to pass for the truth about "The Church Service Society," it will be a pity. If arguments for or against the positions taken up in Mr. Fleming's communications are to be based on calumnies on the Church that is the mother of us all, it will be a still greater pity.

It would seem that in his sojourn in Scotland Mr. Smith has imbibed the spirit of the reckless school, whose chief luminary is the notorious minister, Rev. Jacob Primmer, of the Townhead Church, Dunfermline. Perhaps in his church, if he visited it, Mr. Smith found his ideal realized.

March 27th, 1896.

A young woman Endeavorer of Santiago, Ohili, the president of her society, last year raised more than a thousand dollars by her own efforts, for missionary and benevolent purposes.

A Christian Endeavor society of ninety members exist among the soldiers at Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, Texas. Out of it have come a Sunday school, and a mid-week gospel meeting. Many conversions have also been affected.

### THE HOME MISSIONARY: A SUGGESTION.

BY REV. D. D. McLEOD.

With regard to the prosecution of our Home Mission work would you allow me to make a few observations.

The summer session was adopted, wisely or unwisely, not I understood as a permanent measure, but for the present distress. If it is not accomplishing all that was expected, we should not regret it. Because it may be found there is a better way of getting the work done. I have always thought there is; I believe that better way will yet be discovered by the Church and adopted. That way is pointed to in the interesting letter of Mr. Buchanan in your last issue. It is to place the home missionary on an equal footing with the foreign missionary. Equal in this respect, that upon the Home Mission Committee deciding that a competent missionary is needed at such a point, they shall ask for such missionary, and send him there as well provided for and secure of his salary as the man that is sent to India. The Church would support them in such a policy. The present policy of laying the burden on the students of propagating and building up our Church will never be as successful as the employment of ordained men would be. It injures the student and it injures our future ministry. A Home missionary appointed as above would have some hope and comfort in his work. I believe also that he would be much more successful. It is necessary to have regard to the contributions of the stations. But to apportion a grant in proportion to these contributions is not in every case a just principle. Because it is when a station most needs supply, that it is often least able to pay for it. I have myself labored in such a field, and speak not from theory, but experience. I would therefore respectfully submit that the Home Mission Committee should look into this subject still further, and claim for our home missionaries, a standing as well provided for as is claimed for our foreign missionaries. I feel confident the Church would respond to such a claim. Send a man like Mr. Buchanan, or others of our able home missionaries, through the Church to speak to our people and the people will respond. We will not do less for foreign missions, but much more would be done for our home missions, and with ordained men placed in a position to work with a measure of domestic comfort, with some sense of security as to their livelihood, our Church would advance in a more satisfactory manner. I have long felt we exact too much from, and do too little for the comfort of our home missionaries, whose labors and sacrifices for the cause of Christ are quite equal to those of our foreign missionaries.

Barrie, Ont.

### THE CHURCH SERVICE SOCIETY.

BY R. O. S.

In a late number of the THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN a paper on the Church Service Society appeared, which is grossly unfair to that praiseworthy association, which has many sympathizers, and some members in the Canadian Church. What I most strongly object to is the statement, "It is acknowledged by all that the intellectual men of the Church do not belong to the Society, but a few affected faddists." This I deny in toto. The Society has a large membership, and he must be a man of prodigious intellect, must be on a plane which is simply out of sight to us poor ordinary mortals, when such men as the late Very Rev. Prof. Milligan, the late Prof. Dobie, the Very Rev. Marshall Lang, the Right Rev. Dr. MacLeod, Dr. Cooper of Aberdeen, Dr. MacLeod of Inverness, Dr. McAdam Muir, convener of the Colonial Committee, and others appear to be men of no intellect. I have no doubt there are extremists and faddists in the Society—what