

facilities for. Six hundred dollars would be adequate salary for him; he would need from \$150 to \$200 for travelling expenses to the field. He could teach English; if possible, drawing and music; book-keeping, Christian ethics; give lessons in pedagogy, and take charge of athletics. In short, we could keep such a man, without a knowledge of any of the languages of the country, thoroughly and most usefully busy; and it would be a great blessing to us. It would be a glad day for me and for the work here, and for the man himself, if some friend or friends of Queen's could be found to furnish the funds to send out one from your next year's class. I know that you are sorely driven with appeals for advice and help, and I hope you will feel free to pay no attention to this appeal unless you see both the opportunity and advisability of giving it attention. I know your interest in the work and in me personally, and no answer to this is needed to assure me of it.

R. CHAMBERS.

BRUCE'S APOLOGETICS.

To attempt within the limits of an article in the JOURNAL a review of a work which is so largely a compendium reminds one of the philosopher, who having a stone house for sale, carried a pebble from the wall in his pocket as a sample of the house. Readers will therefore please make the necessary allowances, and if the pebble leads to a closer examination of the house it will have done its work.

Dr. Bruce divides his work into three books, and it may be convenient to give the subject of each book and the result reached in it, adding a suggestion in the way of criticism.

Bk. I. deals with "*Theories of the Universe*," and in it the author develops his "theory of knowledge," or in other words his proof (or absence of proof) for the existence of God. He examines some half dozen theories and the conclusion he reaches is that "the idea of God is a hypothesis which all we know tends to verify." Dr. Bruce then does not attempt to prove that God is, he assumes it, and goes on to enquire what he is. Now, whatever value this method may have for Apologetics, it will strike many as being perilously near Agnosticism. They will feel like saying "If the fundamental fact of the universe is only a hypothesis, then every other so-called fact must also be hypothetical, and hence our knowledge is after all illusive." Book I. is, in my estimation, the least valuable part of the work.

Book II. deals with the "Historical Preparation for Christianity," and this in Dr. Bruce's hands becomes practically an attempt to show that the results of modern criticism, so far from weakening the evidence for the inspiration of the Old Testament, really strengthen it. Explicitly he refuses to commit himself to the Development theory, either as applied to nature or as applied to Revelation, but implicitly he accepts the general results of that theory as applied to both nature and Revelation, holding that in this way the most satisfactory explanation of the phenomena can be given. This part of the work seems to me more satisfactory than either of the other parts.

Book III. deals with "Christian Origins." In this he discusses with comparative fulness Jesus, Paul and the Gospels, holding virtually the traditional view, though he is disposed to regard the miraculous as having comparatively small apologetic value in this age. He also admits considerable limitation in Paul's view of the Gospel, or at least in Paul's teaching as compared with the Synoptics. In regard to the Gospels, he takes up what will seem to some an extreme position. In answer to those who claim that the Gospels (though not strictly historical) do give us in large measure the spirit of Jesus, he says (page 352)—"But if the Jesus of the Gospels be a devout imagination, then the right of reform and the obligation to conform cease. The fair Son of man belongs to the serene region of poetry; real life at the best must move on a much lower level." Which seems to mean that the Gospels are either literal history or nothing. But this, in view of present tendencies, is more like the petulance of a spoilt child than the decision of a patient investigation. For—to take a somewhat extreme case as illustration—suppose it could be made out that Dr. Martineau is right in claiming (Seat of Authority in Religion, Bk. II.,) that the Gospels as we have them record only one-thirteenth of the public life of Jesus, that they contain so many verbal coincidences as to make it manifest that they have been drawn from a common source, and that they must have required three or four generations to grow into their present shape. Suppose all these conclusions justified. Would that deprive the Gospels of their spiritual power? Would it prove that the ideal set before us in them is not from God? If the spiritual ideas conveyed are congruous with the nature of man, does not the inspiring power and binding authority of the Gospels remain, even though we admit that it is their spirit rather than their letter which is true to the Original? Surely every man is bound to live up to the highest ideal he knows, whether the ideal be presented in the "*Pilgrim's Progress*" or in "*The Saints' Everlasting Rest*." The weakness of this part of the work lies in the fact that Dr. Bruce tries to find religious certainty in historical evidence.

But, notwithstanding defects such as the above, the book as a whole will do good. The spirit of it is eminently fair. One feels that the author does not wilfully misstate the views which he criticises, and it may be said that the spirit of the book will carry one beyond the letter of it. Written by a man in a state of mental transition it will be helpful to many who are moving in the same direction.

J. S.

MR. EDITOR:—Your earnest appeal to various of the muses in your last issue has been taken to heart by mine and this P.M. the gentle Lady dropped into my study