

Our Contributors.

THE PRINCIPAL CAUSE OF CLERICAL RESTLESSNESS.

BY KNOXONIAN.

The principal cause of clerical restlessness is genteel poverty. Any man feels restless when he is pinched. Any man with a heart in him feels restless when his wife is weak and overworked and his children are in rags. Any honest man feels restless when he is in danger of getting into debt. A man that could feel perfectly restful under these conditions would be more or less than human. Most ministers are human, and therefore they feel restless in genteel poverty and some of them look out for a better place. Who dare say that there is anything wrong in so doing?

No generous, large-hearted, humane Christian will say that a minister has not as good a right as any other man to do the best he can for his family. There is no law, human or divine, which tells a minister he must pinch his family on \$500 a year if he can get \$1,000, and do as much good when receiving the larger salary as when receiving the smaller. The Synod of Dort never said so. The Westminster Assembly never enacted that Calvinistic ministers must wear greasy alpaca coats. There is nothing in the Confession of Faith about living on gruel. The men who made the Confession lived on more substantial diet, or they never would have made such a substantial book. There is nothing in that noble compendium of theology—the Shorter Catechism—which teaches that a minister must work without a library if he can put himself in a position to get one. If the men who made the Shorter Catechism had all been compelled to live on \$500 or \$600 a year and drive twenty miles every Sabbath over a mud road, behind a lean horse on an old sulky, we never would have had a Shorter Catechism.

There is a higher authority than any of these. The Good Book says: "If any man provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." The minister, like every Christian, is bound to make suitable provision for those dependent upon him. Paul says he would be no Christian if he didn't, and yet there are canting hypocrites who say he is no Christian if he does! Paul did not belong to that class. Some ministers prefer Paul as a guide, and when they cannot provide for their own in one place they look out for another. Paul would say they do exactly right.

The same high authority tells us to "provide things honest in the sight of all men." How can a minister do that if he has not a sufficient salary to support his family? Providing "things honest" requires a good deal of money these times, and if a minister cannot get the wherewithal in one place, so that he can live as an honest man, he must just look out for another.

But what is the use of hammering at a point that every generous man admits. Scores of times have we heard large-hearted Presbyterians, when losing their minister, say: "Well, we are sorry he is going. He was a good, faithful man, but a minister has a right to do the best he can for his family as well as any of the rest of us." One might go a little farther, and say he is bound to do the best he can for his family as well as the rest of us. The obligation to provide arises naturally out of the relation of the head of a household to his wife and his children. The marriage contract implies the obligation to provide for the wife. It is also implied in the relation of parent to child, and the man who does not recognize this obligation as binding is unfit to be a minister. Recognizing the obligation and feeling unable to meet it makes a poor minister restless, and being restless he tries to get a place where he can meet his family obligations like a man and a Christian. In the name of everything sacred, is there anything wrong in that?

There are a few people who think so. Here is one of them.

Mr. Skinflint is selling a bushel of peas. The scales are so evenly balanced that one pea does a little more than bring down the beam. Mr. Skinflint takes a pea off, splits it, puts one half on the scales and takes the other home. Mr. Skinflint always did contend that it was wrong for a minister, however poor, to move to a place where he was promised a

larger salary. Of course he did. The Skinflints are spiritually minded men, far removed from such carnal considerations as salaries—but they split à pea all the same.

Here is another who always contends that it is a grievous sin to accept a call with a larger salary. He had some potatoes so small that he could not sell them on the market. So he presented them, generous soul that he was, to the minister. When the treasurer asked him for his pew rent he credited himself with the small potatoes, and in this way squared his account with the church. This esteemed brother often groans over the increasing worldliness of the clergy. His heart is deeply pained when he hears that any minister has been offered and has accepted a larger income. The increasing worldliness of ministers exercises him almost as much as the operation of turning his small potatoes into cash.

A third representative man who abuses poorly-paid ministers for seeking an income on which they can live decently is almost beneath notice, but we may put him in here to keep company with the two friends already described. We refer to the roving Plymouth evangelist who throws dirt at ministers when conducting his meetings. This gentleman sometimes begins his work in the Spirit and ends in the flesh, but however he begins or ends he is always sure to have a fling at the hiring clergy. He takes no stated salary, but he always keeps his dish hekl'out so that if anything falls he can catch it. Don't mention salary to him. Oh, dear no, but if you give him \$500 at the close of his term he'll take it like a little man. Of course he says it is not a stated salary, it is just what the people give. Any salary, large or small, is just what the people give. There is no moral difference between taking money as a so-called gift, as this gentleman does, and taking it in stated sums at regular intervals. Some of these gentlemen travel incessantly, cross the Atlantic oftener in five years than most ministers do in a lifetime, and yet they expect people to believe that they take no money. They ride over the continent on first-class cars and cross the Atlantic by Cunard steamers by faith! Very likely story. There is one thing they may be trusted never to do. They never go into the back settlements, ride over corduroy and live on a pork and green tea diet. They prefer to operate in towns and old settled parts of the country where the traveling is by rail and the board fairly good. If you don't mean any one of them to take a roll of bills, never offer it to him. If you do you'll be the worst sold man in this country two minutes after the offer is made. The good man will give a sanctimonious whine and say "he takes it from the Lord." In the next breath he would abuse a minister for taking his salary from the Lord. If you call yourself an evangelist and stand with your hands behind your back so that your friends may slip a roll of bills into them, it is all right. If you take your cheque from your treasurer in an open manly way, it is a sin. Out upon such wretched cant.

The principal cause of clerical restlessness is clerical poverty.

Moral: Give Augmentation a good lift in your Presbytery, and an end will be put to perhaps two-thirds of the restlessness.

COREAN MOUNTAIN LORE.

BY THE REV. JOHN MACINTYRE, M.A., NEWCHWANG, MANCHURIA.

This title is suggested by the familiar subject of folk-lore. I wish to string a few facts together, bearing on the language of the Koreans, gathered partly from Mons. Ridel's *Corean Dictionary*, and partly from conversations with Koreans, to show how largely mountains have influenced the national life in Corea.

Originally the mountains were evidently associated in Corea, as elsewhere, with "wildness." The outlaws who preyed upon society had their homes or their fastnesses there, and a man of the mountains was supposed to be of wilder aspect than the dwellers in the plains. We see this idea represented in the mummies of to-day, who in spring and autumn amuse the children by their disfigured faces, wild dresses and wilder antics, and who are known as the wild men or the fantastic men of the mountains. In those days mountain residence indicated stress of circumstances, and, in fact, the same word means mountaineer and

tiger—the tiger being the mountaineer *par excellence*, and styled also the king of the mountains. A change came when the population overflowed in the plains. There was nothing for it but to take to the hills, as the pressure of warlike tribes made emigration impossible. The first beginning was, of course, made by the very needy: and we find a word which means the "toil or travail of the mountain," and which tells us of fuel-cutting, of herb-gathering, and of laborious efforts in the way of earning a livelihood. Then came deliberate farming, and we find names for the little plots of arable land, perched sometimes in seemingly inaccessible places, where only necessity, and the most determined industry born of it, could induce a settlement or win a living from the unpromising soil. There were still inaccessible parts, and parts too barren to repay even this most poverty-stricken industry, and these soon began to be consecrated to religion. With the instinct of beauty, which in almost every creed has been more or less associated with religion, the Buddhist priest built his temple as it were an eagle's eyrie. With the temple came the hermit, clothing coarsely and faring on herbs, a student of nature and sometimes even a bookworm. Mons. Ridel (*Cor. Dict. p. 373, san-rim*) gives an interesting illustration of the natural declension which has taken place all the world over in this respect, and the ultimate connection between hermit and humbug. Originally the hermit was indeed a philosopher who had seen something of the hollowness of life in cities, and who retired to the wilderness to muse over the mysteries of mind and matter, and above all to construct a life on a true ideal. Then came the day of make-believe, when books were paraded and lofty airs assumed and philosophic jargon indulged in. Finally, the thing became a "profession," and the sons of the rich took to it and made it ridiculous; till in modern Corea, hermit, which means simply "mountain and forest," has become a soubriquet for the good-for-nothing son, the dilettante of the family. In process of time as trade arose, and towns became centres of wealth, we find the town population itself overflowing upon the mountains—not as settlers, however, but as pleasure-seekers. The Koreans have something to show for their extraordinary conceit. They were civilized long before we were; and—some Westerners will be slow to believe it—they do not stand second to us even now in what we deem one of the most indisputable blossoms of civilization, a love of nature and of beautiful scenery. They have a perfect wealth of words which go to prove this. Thus you have all manner of terms for the residences of these summer tourists—the lodge, the villa, the hall, the prospect, the belvedere, the peak, the pavilion, and such like. You have all manner of poetical combinations, as mountain and water, and mountain and forest. You have rich choice of words for the green of spring and for the wondrous glory of crimson which marks their autumn as it does ours, in the Manchurian hills; while you have a special word for winter sight-seeing, where the glory lies in the virgin snow. You have a rich vocabulary indicating their familiarity with every conceivable feature of mountains in their almost perpendicular cliffs, in their beetling brows, in their "one myriad one thousand" jagged peaks, in their deep, dark shadows, in their countless ramifications. While the wilder features clearly impose most on the imagination, the cool shade of the dells is not forgotten, nor the beauty and quietness of those sequestered flowery spots where nature surpasses herself to show her wealth. Ultimately we find not only hamlets and villages, but even cities with the prefix of mountain. Then all through their history there was the mountain fort. The men who have given their name to Corea began their national existence by the conquest of this province of Manchuria, the southern part of which they held securely for many centuries. They have left abundant evidence in the number and position of their fortresses that they must have cost the Tane Emperor some trouble to drive them out, and they did not forget their art on the other side of the Jaloo. But indeed the country, now named from them—Corea—was a fighting country before they saw it; and the several kingdoms into which it was anciently divided have quite as "famous" a page to show in this respect as the Westerners themselves. But the fort in the wilderness—in the wilder parts of the mountains—has always been in requisition as a place of refuge in days of defeat and civil war. To one of