

ceived at least one-half of the money grant attached to it.

The charter of the East India Company was never renewed again, for there broke out in 1857 the terrible Mutiny of the Sepoys, and when it closed in 1858, "the government of India was, by Act of Parliament, taken out of the hands of the East India Company and vested in the English Crown. Since this transfer, the Indian Government has been conducted on the principle that 'English rule in India should be for India,' and within the last twenty years the country has undergone in every respect a surprising transformation. Life and property are now as secure in India as in England. The railways begun by the East India Company have been extended in every direction, and now bind together the most distant provinces. All the chief cities are united by telegraph. Lines of steamers are established on the Indus and the Ganges. Several hundred newspapers, about half published in the native dialects, are sowing Western ideas broadcast among the people. The introduction of European science and civilization is rapidly undermining many of the old superstitions, particularly the ancient system of caste."

Great strides have been made in educational affairs too, for the failure of Sir Charles Wood's measure led in the end to the appointment of a "Commission on Education in India" by the English Parliament in 1882, whose labours have resulted in the following recommendations:

1. The establishment of a thorough system of primary education.
2. Secondary education to be made self-supporting, and facilities offered to colleges, so that they may be placed under private management.
3. Every encouragement to be given to the spread of religious instruction in the schools, the Bible may be taught at any hour of the day, free from any denominational limit or conscience clause.
4. The system of "grants in aid of education" to be developed and made the means of spreading education throughout the country.
5. Female education to be warmly encouraged, and the conditions of grants to girls' schools to be made easier than to boys' schools, more especially in the case of those established for poor or low-caste girls.
6. That grants from public funds be made for zenaana teaching and to associations for the promotion of female education.

These recommendations have been sanctioned by the Governor-General in council, and a minute adopted by the "General Council" on "Education in India," in which it is stated that female education is to be pressed on and fostered on the liberal principles so well laid down by the commission.

There was some female education before the British Government took the matter in hand. There are stories in the non-historic period of learned women. At the time of Britain's conquest a few women received instruction as to household matters. The wealthier ladies know the legends of their sacred writings and their religious epic poems. In the poorer households the head female kept the daily accounts. In some native States women have proved excellent rulers. They can manage properties. Through agents they succeed in commerce. Many of them have intellectual abilities and administrative talents of a high order; but until recently they have had nothing that could be called a school education. So naturally clever and astute as they that they have great power. In India, as in our country, wise men are ruled by clever wives. Keshab Chandra Sen said that "while in theory man is a noun, and woman simply an adjective that agrees with the noun, in practice man is a noun, a noun of the masculine gender, but in the objective case, governed by the verb *woman*."

The results of the Government measures are of course not yet to be seen. But, after all that has been done by the Government, the proportion of girls attending school to the whole female population of British India is one in 849, so that their influence is still on the side of ignorance. The picture is dark and there is yet a great work to be done. Still, difficult though the task be, it must be faced.

But it is important to observe that in female education of recent times, the missionary has preceded the Government.

In 1854, the year of Sir Charles Wood's great despatch, three thousand girls were already attending mission-schools in Southern India, and a similar work was going on in Bombay and in Western India.

All this, however, is true only of British India, for the native states, such as Indore, have entire control of their own educational affairs.

But we are glad to see that the efforts recently made by the Education Department of British India are affecting the policy of important native States.

In a recent issue of the *Bombay Gazette* it is stated that his Highness the Maharajah of Baroda is giving his earnest attention to the question of female education and social progress in his own State of G. which adjoins Indore, and of which Baroda is the capital.

Not long ago his Highness delivered a speech at the prize-giving ceremony of the Poonah Girls' School, in which he stated his opinions and intentions on this subject, which he is now carrying into effect, having drawn up a comprehensive scheme in which the education of girls and of children of the lower classes is specially provided for.

This endeavour on the part of his Highness to raise the masses by general education is in keeping with his known character as one of the most enlightened of Indian princes.

It is earnestly to be hoped that all the native Indian States will follow the example of Baroda.

#### A CRITICISM CRITICISED.

MR. EDITOR.—I read with care a "criticism," by Dr. Jardine, that lately appeared on "that one element" in the polity of our Church—the eldership. There are radically two theories about the elder—one, that he is a layman; the other, that he is not a layman in any sense at all, but a clergyman. Dr. Jardine holds the latter. He says the only office which is valid or of perpetual authority in the Church is that of the elder, and of the deacon. He also says that for the distinction we have been accustomed to make between the elder and the minister, he is not able, with all his diligence and impartiality of research, to find the trace of a warrant or example in the Word of God. The functions of both are identical. There is but one order, not two. The elder is a minister, and the minister an elder. The elder has a right, or is officially competent, to perform every one of the acts which are regarded as exclusively the acts of the minister—such as to ordain, and to administer the sacraments. Ability for "word and doctrine," a gift or aptitude for teaching, is then a mere gratuity, so to speak; only an accident of the office.

It appears in the light of this "criticism" that the Church has been for a period of "two hundred years" completely in the dark about the office of the elder, and that she has illegitimately sunk the office to a low and subordinate place, and stripped it of its essential attributes by a sort of spoliation on the part of her ministers, and that the Church is made to suffer most seriously in all her energies, and over the whole sphere of her usefulness, by reason of the policy that has hitherto so disastrously marked her treatment of that "most important arm of her service." He says that there are "but two permanent office-bearers" in the Church, "the elder and the deacon"; that this is "the Presbyterian system," and that nothing else is; so well known too, that it is "scarcely necessary" to remind his readers of this distinctive feature of our Presbyterian polity, and yet, in another part of the "criticism" he says that for a space of two hundred years the Church has been uniformly teaching a very different doctrine indeed—that there are not two but *three* distinct classes of office-bearers, ministers, elders and deacons. The *laity* is a word for the people as distinct from the *clergy*. The elder is one of the laity. A clergyman is a man who is regularly ordained to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments. These are Presbyterian definitions, familiar to us all.

Dr. Jardine takes the ground that the "presbyters" of whom we read so frequently as officers of the highest perpetual rank in the apostolic Church, were all and unexceptionally elders, and the only class of whom there is any mention in the New Testament; and that the officer whom, by way of conventional distinction, we call "the ruling elder," is an anomaly in the Church.

But what, in the first place, does the late venerable Dr. Hodge say in opposition to all this? It will be refreshing to hear his opinion. He says that to clothe the elder with the official dignity or *status* of a clergyman "is entirely contrary to the doctrine and practice of all the Churches of the Reformation, and especially

of our own"; that "in those churches the ruling elder is a layman"; and that "his office is not to preach the Gospel, but only to take part in the discipline and government of the Church." He also says that "it destroys the *value* of his office"; for that it is precisely because he is a layman and not a clergyman, but one of the people, engaged in the ordinary business of life, that he is a real power, a distinct element in our system. "The moment you dress him in canonicals; you destroy his power, and make him ridiculous." Again he says that to take the elder out of our Presbyterian polity is to erect the Church into a "clerical despotism," "as complete a clerical domination as the world has ever seen." "It would deprive the people of all substantive power," "the doctrine is completely revolutionary."

For all I know, or for aught that appears in this "criticism," that may be the very thing which Dr. Jardine is aiming at—a hierarchy! But whether so or not, the road he is going on will in the end inevitably lead to it. Who are the aspirants among us that are willing to follow?

The article referred to is not strictly in accordance with the title which it bears. That title is a misnomer. There is no lack of mere assertion, often, too, of a kind that startles by its novelty, and by the peremptory or dogmatic tone of the writer. The "criticism" is a blow at the integrity of a system that, on his own acknowledgment, has been in force for the last two centuries of our ecclesiastical history.

I do not sign my name. What does it matter? There is nothing, I hope, that might be called a breach of courtesy or of literary etiquette in the visor that I wear.

PRESBYTER.

THERE is, it is said, considerable discussion and anxiety in the British Foreign Office, and the various departments of the Government specially concerned with India, over the tenor of the strange manifesto to the Punjab, which Maharajah Dhuleep Singh has issued. The animadversions on Christianity, his own renunciation of it, and sundry political innuendoes are points in it that look as if the Maharajah would not mind heading a general rebellion against the English control.

THE correspondent of the *Philadelphia Presbyterian* says: "Order reigns in Chicago. The strikes are over and business is rapidly settling down into its old methods. The arrested red-flag and bomb-throwing Anarchists have been indicted by our grand jury. Some will undoubtedly be hung as fully as the law allows, and the guilty ones whom the law does not allow to be hung will have an opportunity to exercise something beside the mouth at useful labour, which their hands so much abhor. But it will take some time for our people to recover from the losses resulting from derangements and suspensions of business."

The *Interior* concludes an admirable article on "Paul the Aged," with these words: One of the great and growing evils in our day is want of reverence for age. The young men are crowding the old men to the wall. They are claiming place and power in Church and State, because they are young. This is the spirit of heathenism, and not of Christian civilization. Let the young men be patient. There is room for them, without disparaging or displacing their elders. And let churches and communities remember that experience is worth something—that the man who has studied God's Word for half a century, and seen its power tested in revivals and in pastoral work, may be a more useful minister than the theological fledgling.

IN certain quarters we sometimes hear about the decadence of Christianity. There are facts constantly coming to the surface which show how little truth there is in the assertion. Dr. Gideon Draper, writing from London to the *New York Observer*, says: The London Church Missionary Society rejoices over an unprecedented incident. Within twelve days after the sad news of the untimely and violent death of Bishop Hannington arrived, the society received applications from twenty-six candidates for the perilous foreign service. Fresh recruits vie with each other to fill up the thinned ranks, aflame with Christ's love to brother-man. London, with its much salt that has not lost its savour, is not the Babylon of the nineteenth century.