

it is not the bishop's letters—formal and mistaken and irritating very often—that are needed; but his fatherly, brotherly, loving presence to advise and harmonize and adjust and amend. Surely those upon whom this solemn responsibility rests have no time for long absences from their dioceses, or long holidays in them, or for engaging in school work, or domestic or personal occupations or interests. Not one in twenty of the clergy who are engaged in the thick of the battle can afford even a few weeks in this way; and the bishops, who are foremost in honor, ought to be foremost in all self-denying activity. Their lordships have it in their power, if they will only take trouble, to control every appointment in their dioceses, and to prove to the world, as no arguments can, the Divine origin and abiding need of the apostolic office which they bear.

Very important action was taken at the last meetings of the Toronto Mission Board towards the realization of the concluding recommendation of the report adopted at the last Toronto Synod. It was resolved that the Mission Board would give \$400 per annum to the first Rural Deanery—that would secure \$400 more for the stipend of a travelling missionary within its bounds. Which Deanery will secure the help? Here is work for the Women's Auxiliary; eleven such missionaries are wanted at once. Will not some of our rich men come forward and pay the \$400 needed to provide for one and then another of these Deaneries? This is the first practical step that ought to be taken. This is the paramount duty of the Church.

THE EVOLUTIONARY QUANDARY.

The Evolutionists of the present day are in a quandary. Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace, judging by his article in the October number of the *Fortnightly Review*, specially so. They have been forced to the conclusion that the two great factors which it is claimed secure perfection in each animal race—sexual selection by which the fit are born, and natural selection by which the fittest survive—are not working properly in the case of man. Something has gone wrong, the machinery is plainly out of gear; it works well enough with the lower animals, but at present, at all events, it is not doing what it ought to do for humanity. The trouble is a fundamental one, and it is no wonder that these gentlemen are perplexed about it; for talk as they will, lecture as they will, write as they will, the scum persistently rises to the top of society, instead of waiting, as it ought to do, to be clarified and made fit for a front seat in the theatre of the world.

Mr. Darwin saw the trouble coming, and Mr. Wallace faces it. He endorses wholesale the principles announced by Mr. Bellamy in his renowned book, "Looking Backward," and claims that when mankind lives as one family, when all receive a like State education, and the same amount of public credit is given to all—then the future mothers of the coming race will take the law into their own hands, and a regular boom will set in for the improvement of the human stock. The coming woman will select her partner for life as the highest social duty she can perform; and as she will have plenty to live on, she will be in no hurry about making her choice. She will seldom marry before her twenty-fifth year, and as a rule not before thirty, and thus two important results will be produced. First, selecting her husband largely on physical grounds, her children will be healthy, and secondly, not marrying until somewhat late in life, her family will not be large.

All this, however, does not touch the real question. Perhaps if natural selection worked successfully, this might be the harvest, but the bother is it is not working at all, the scum rises, it is getting power. Natural selection has no play, the fittest are not surviving, and is it likely that the scum, or the unfit, will get off the high horse to oblige Mr. Bellamy? The whole fault, from an evolutionary standpoint, must be laid at the door of natural selection, that has failed in the case of man, and as natural selection is a law of nature, nature has failed.

Messrs. Galton, Stanley and Grant Allan propose to help natural selection out of its difficulty in different ways. Galton proposes that there should be a kind of competition in connection with health, intellect, and morals; that the young men and women who gain prizes should be endowed by the State, and that marriages between the prize winners should be encouraged. Stanley apparently proposes that scamps, tramps and drunkards, etc., should in some way be prevented from marrying; and Grant Allan, flinging all decency overboard, advocates temporary husbands and wives until a pair are so mated as to become the parents of healthy children—in other words, he proposes universal prostitution under the name of marriage.

The writer of these words proposes a way out of this difficulty which seems obvious, but has not apparently occurred to any of these gentlemen, namely, that of openly acknowledging that however natural selection may work amongst plants and animals, that it is not applicable to man, and that it is not fair to apply the law to a sphere in which apparently it was never intended to work. For really there is nothing new in the scum coming to the top. The aboriginal tribes of India, no doubt, looked on the Aryan Hindus as scum; the imperial Romans regarded Alaric and Attila in the same light; and viewed from a French Royalistic standpoint, the first Napoleon was an upstart representative of the canaille; and not a few of the first families of Virginia regarded Abraham Lincoln as an intrusive Vulgarian fit only to split rails. But spite of these centuries of bitter criticism uttered by one class against the other, some way many of the greatest legislators, generals, professional men, scientific leaders, and—begging Mr. Grant Allan's pardon—first and second and third-class novel writers, have come to the top out of at least partial depths, and will no doubt so come to the end of time. Therefore, instead of providing crutches for natural selection to limp with, as it pretends to pick and choose amongst the sons of men, it would be far better to relegate it at once to the vegetable and inferior animal world, and allow it to do its work there without the aid of crutches. As for man, we may yet find that there are, and have been, thousands of whom it might be said, as once it was said by god of Cyrus, "I have raised him up."

STUDIES ON PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. DR. GAMMACK, EAST TORONTO.

No. 2.

S. JOHN IV. 35.

Many comments have been made and sermons written upon the spiritual condition of the Samaritans in the time of our Lord, and the incident of His conversation with the Samaritan woman at the well of Sychar. But there is always an unpleasant ring in their touching S. John iv. 35, and there is something wrong about it. With little variation between the Authorized and Revised

Versions, the latter reads, "Say not ye, There are yet four months and then cometh the harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields that they are white already unto harvest." This, if it has any meaning and is put into common phrase, is "This is now seed-time, and after the four months of summer growth have passed away, then the harvest will come: that is the usual order, but if you look across the fields at this moment you will see them already quite ripe for the harvest." We can hardly imagine any other meaning to be given to the words, but it puts us into the awkward dilemma of believing either that our Lord makes an assertion that barely has possibility on its face, or that He uses a strange mixture of words that are partly natural in their meaning, and partly parabolical or spiritual. Let us observe that an unusually early harvest is much to be deplored, as the seasons must come in their own sequence: in 1826 the harvest was general in the north of Scotland in June, and to obtain the grain the people had to pull the stalk, but there ensued a famine to man and beast in consequence. We must therefore state our conviction at the outside that our Lord never said or intended to convey such an idea as is ascribed to Him, and that S. John is no party to the misconception. Both of these say what they mean and mean what they say, and it is not this in the least. The Greek is open for any one to examine, and there is but the slightest textual variation.

We must start with no preconceived idea to which our translation has to be adapted. The Greek stands before us, and our only desire is to know what it says: we do not seek a paraphrase but a translation. There is no doctrine to uphold or traverse, and our object is to reach a plain matter of fact. What does our Lord say? We may briefly look at the circumstances. Jesus has been conversing with the woman at the well, and she has then hurried away to the city with her news. She has spread abroad her report of Him, and at her suggestion some men have come out from the city. They are drawing near as He sits on the well, and Jesus is in converse with His disciples, who have brought provisions from the city. He declines their food because He has greater objects in view. His anxiety is, as meat and drink, to do His Father's will. He shows how pressing His work is, and the approach of these men from the city may be accepted by Him as a proof of how near and urgent it is. He then makes a double assertion in an interrogative form: it seems to be both natural and full of reason, and it probably has a spiritual as well as a natural reference, but there is no collision or rapid and violent change of front. "Say ye not, that *eti tetrameenos* [or *tetrameenon*] *esti, kai ho therismos erchetai*: lo, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes," etc. "Say ye not (quite truly) that it is still (even now) the season called *Tetrameenos*, and the harvest is approaching? but I say unto you that you have only to raise your eyes and see how near the harvest is already," etc. The whole passage is strictly present, whereas the A.V. and R.V. give both clauses a future aspect. *Yet* is a translation of the Greek, but should not be in a futuristic sense: *tetrameenos*, as adjective or noun, is a season or particular period, and not a mere lapse of time: *then* is a gratuitous insertion to give the present tense, *erchetai*, a future colouring. There is no necessity for having any contrast to show that the Samaritans were so much riper and readier than the Jews. The whole world at that time was in expectation of a deliverer, and if there was this woman at Sychar having strong spiritual aspira-