

vinced—as by the growth of popular ideas she will soon be convinced—that she has to choose between federation and disintegration; let the people of England be really aroused to the value of retaining the empire in its entirety, and that power of adaptation that is possessed by the Saxon race in so large a degree will make itself apparent, and a way will be found. And popular feeling on the subject is steadily growing in the old country as well as in the colonies. Ten years ago there was scarcely a man of note in England who raised his voice in favour of Federation, now scarcely a week passes but notable words are spoken in its behalf. The making of the Imperial Parliament will be a slow and gradual process, bristling with many difficulties, and probably in the first instance some such scheme as an advisory board, composed of colonial representatives, may be attempted. The difficulty in England is in the removal of local questions from Parliament, and in the formation of a competent chamber to deal with them. Strong sentimental feelings would be roused against tampering with time-honoured institutions. But in the end, arguments showing the necessity and value of the change would prevail, and the modifications necessary in England's system would be effected. What has been done in Germany within the last twenty years, in the federation of the German Empire, is an example of what might be done in England. And the material advantages that have accrued to Germany are small compared to those that will accrue to England and her colonies under federation.

Toronto, Feb., 1889. GRANVILLE C. CUNNINGHAM.

A QUESTION.

How feels the night when her stars forsake her?
Fair is the new day—yes I know—
And conquering in its youth's first glow;
But where does the fainting night betake her?
What memories haunt, what strong fears shake her?
Wonderful is the day, but oh,
How feels the night when her stars forsake her?

How feels the singer whose fancies forsake her?
Clear is the light of knowledge I know,
Strong, and needed, and fair, but woe
To the sweet singer! for what can shake her
Thirst for enchantments, that used to make her
Reel with the deep night's overflow;
How feels the singer whose fancies forsake her?

Idle questioner, naught can forsake her!
Somewhere the night is reigning, and lo,
Down in the singer's heart, hiding below
The everyday thoughts on which she must stake her
Everyday life, the stars awake her
To midnight's fathomless mysteries; no,
Idle questioner, naught can forsake her.

ETHELWYN WETHERALD.

A LAYMAN ON THEOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES.

ON Sunday week I heard the Rev. W. Herridge, at Ottawa, preach on the Third Beatitude—"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." He found great difficulty in dealing with this text, though he preached with his usual power, for it is hard to see the relation between meekness and getting possession of real estate either by inheritance or in any other way. But though I could not follow his reasoning, yet it set me thinking on this curious feature of the New Testament, that while on the one hand it presents difficulties by reason of utterances like this, which may be literally described as transcendental, on the other hand men stumble because processes of thought and feeling are attributed to God which closely follow the line of our own experience. And yet this last peculiarity fits in with the words used in the Elohistic chapters of Genesis—"And God (Elohim) said: Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness, and let them have dominion, etc." As thought, contriving-power, plan-making differentiate man more strikingly from "the beasts that perish" than even his own erect body and countenance glowing with intelligence, it would be absurd to think that "after our likeness" referred to his body, especially as the words which follow, "and let them have dominion," is a purpose which is only accomplished by man's mind. It is true indeed that his frame, so perfect, though in every function weaker than the corresponding function in the lower animals, lends itself to the designs of his mind with beautiful adaptability, yet it is by thought he succeeds in exercising dominion. It should not, therefore, be surprising or puzzling or scandalizing if we find the teaching of the New Testament, on the hypothesis of its inspiration, anthropomorphic. As science advances we see that all creation more and more exemplifies plan, purpose, wise adaptations of means to ends, giving evidence of a mind akin to man's, though of course infinitely more powerful.

Assuming that the New Testament is a revelation (I do not discuss the various theories of inspiration nor deal with the objections to the theory of any special inspiration) I say the theologians are greatly responsible for scepticism. Take for instance the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Everywhere throughout the New Testament this is assumed, just as life is assumed. We know nothing of the origin of life or in what it consists. You cannot attempt to define it without being betrayed into vague

rhetoric, which analysis shows to be only a cover for ignorance. Yet on a subject infinitely more removed from observation the earlier theologians dogmatized, influenced, curiously enough, by Pagan writers. Origen maintained the pre-existence of the soul, a doctrine closely allied to the theory of emanations of the Gnostics, and which Wordsworth's famous ode has made familiar to people who never read Plato and never heard of Origen. Some of the "Fathers" dogmatically declared the relation of the soul to the universe and Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement, and if I remember, Origen also, held that *ψυχή* is the medium between the spiritual and the animal, while a sect of the Gnostics divided men into *χοϊκοί*, *ψυχικοί*, and *πνευματικοί*, and Irenæus, Clement and Origen made the light dark by distinguishing between the *image* of God and *resemblance* to God—between *εἰκόν* and *ὁμοίωσις*. It is worthy of remark that while schools and theologians differed and dogmatized the Catholic Church has all along held by the safe proposition as to the origin of the soul, that "it derives its existence from God," and frowned on the emanation of the Gnostics, the pre-existence of Origen, and the traducianism of Tertullian. Such speculations and controversies have not yet been set at rest. It is enough to say we know nothing and can know nothing of the origin of life and the origin of the soul is still more abstruse, if there can be a more or less in such a comparison.

It is worthy of remark that the intellectual qualities of man which so strikingly resemble those of the Being who made the universe are not those which struck the early theologians as furnishing the basis of likeness with the divine mind. They fixed on two attributes, liberty and immortality. Liberty I think essential, but not immortality, to form a basis of similitude. The Greek Fathers, Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus; the Latin Fathers, Minucius Felix, and the Alexandrians, Clement and Origen represent the *ἀνθρώπου* of the human soul as the main feature of the *ὁμοίωσις* or resemblance to God. The imputation of sin which has played such a prominent part in the history of theological controversy is unknown to them apart from voluntary self-determination. Even Irenæus and Tertullian strongly assert this liberty.

Resemblance (*ὁμοίωσις*) can only, according to Origen, be obtained by a mental conflict in which the Will asserts its self-determining power on the side of virtue or as a gift of sovereign grace by union with Christ. I do not stop here to point out the sad havoc Jonathan Edwards makes of this phrase, "self-determining power," in his great book on the Will, after reading which all a man can do is to say, "Your argument is irrefragable, yet 'Our wills are ours, we know not how.'" And you can even say this without disagreeing with Edwards. Our wills can never be free from motives, but they can from compulsion.

How does the soul acquire immortality? Here is a question never asked in the New Testament. It is, of course, impossible to answer it. If you attempt it you only add difficulty to difficulty. If you shrink from annihilation at death, you had better either take the New Testament authority as conclusive or fall back on man's moral and spiritual nature, as Tennyson does in *In Memoriam*. But the early theologians could tell you all about it. Justin, Tatian, and Theophilus thought the soul acquired immortality by union with the Spirit; Tertullian and Origen, that it was essential to the soul; Lactantius that it was the guerdon of virtue.

Now, surely it is a very remarkable thing that neither our Lord nor Paul, nor any of the other apostles, troubled themselves with this question. It must have been constantly present to their mind, because the Sadducees did not believe in immortality. I hold this reticence to be one of the things that surprise us in the New Testament, and which will make a candid mind feel that, account for it how you may, the letters and histories and vision which make up the volume are like no other writings penned before or since their time.

The doctrines of the duration of future punishment and of the atonement are great stumbling blocks to modern thought. We all sympathize with the cry of Tennyson in his immortal stanzas, commencing:

The wish that of the living whole
No life may fall beyond the grave.

But we see he is staggered by his own reasoning until he falls dazed and bewildered,

On the great world's altar stairs
That slope through darkness up to God.

I have, however, no sympathy with those who think they can hold by the New Testament as inspired and yet deny the doctrine of future punishment for sin, or even dogmatically question that it endures for such a period that to our minds it may be properly described as eternal. It is to be observed that the strongest statements of the extreme severity and long endurance of future punishment came from the mouth of our Lord (John v. 29; Mark xvi. 16; Matt. xiii. 40-50, xxv. 41-46). The apostles are not less explicit (Rom. ii. 12-16; 2 Thess. i. 8, 9; Heb. x. 27; 2 Peter ii. 9; Jude 15; Rev. xx. 13, 14). Now no stronger phrases are known to the Greek language to express duration than those used—either *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* or *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τοῦ αἰῶνος*. This language, be it remembered, is used by Christ, who certainly was not behind any modern in believing in and depicting the goodness of God.

Nor can I see that it is contrary to reason. "We punish those who sin against us. Most of us go on sinning all our lives, and the religion of some is itself the worst sort of iniquity. The man must be a happy man who is not conscious that he has gone on from year to year acting contrary to the dictates of his conscience—to the prompt-

ings of what is best in him. And though one may grievously sin and yet remain a good man, the leaning of his will being towards, and his sympathies with, goodness, yet in numbers of cases a character is formed perfectly hateful even to a man whose moral character has remained erect. How, then, could it be tolerated by God? The phrases used to describe the character of the happiness of the righteous are clearly figurative, and those used to describe the misery of the condemned are not less clearly so. But an abandoned man or woman's condition, even in the eye of ordinary human goodness, will, without adding material fire, seem miserable enough, and may properly be described as one of "utter darkness." If the God of the moral and spiritual world is the God of the material world, then we shall inherit our characters.

I had intended to say a few words about the atonement, and especially as presented by Paul, but I have already taken up too much space, and perhaps the remarks jotted down after hearing a very striking sermon may have little of suggestion for the readers of THE WEEK. But if the fear thus indicated should prove unfounded I will return to the subject in another article.

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN.

THE PROGRESS OF CANADA.—I.

THE progress of Canada during the last twenty years in the development of its material resources, the consolidation of its internal unity, and the extension of its national influence and power, is a question which should arouse the enthusiastic interest and devoted attention of every admirer of our noble Dominion.

Canadians have much to be proud of. Devotion to the political principles of centuries of constitutional progress; adherence to the forms and usages of the freest system of government upon the face of the globe; possessors of an unbroken continuity of historic greatness and heroic deeds coming down through the centuries from their British ancestry; having within the confines of their own territory a land teeming with reminiscences of the stubborn endurance and hardy valour which so strongly characterized the Canadian pioneer, and that loyalty to Crown and Country which places such a distinctive stamp of honour upon the early Canadian settler, possessors, in short, of all the conditions essential to the development of a great nation: viz., a noble ancestry, a grand history, an immense territory, and an increasing population.

But Canadians have even more than this to be proud of. They have a boundless extent of land and lake and river, of fertile fields and farms, mines and forests and fisheries, teeming with all the natural riches which a bountiful Providence could bestow upon a highly favoured people.

All the coal mines, forests, and fisheries of the Maritime Provinces, the farms of Quebec, the agricultural wealth, the live stock, mines and forests of Ontario, the rolling prairies of Manitoba, the wheat-fields of the North-West territories, the undeveloped riches of the Mackenzie Basin, the gold and coal of British Columbia, form but links in the chain of evidence which points to the day when this fair land of ours will be greater and more prosperous than we can even dream of at the present time, and which should make every inhabitant of the Dominion proud of the fact that he is by adoption or birth a Canadian as well as a British subject.

Twenty or thirty years ago the position of a Canadian colonist was very different from that of a Canadian citizen of to-day.

It was in 1849 that the famous Annexation manifesto, issued from the press in Montreal, describes the state of affairs as follows:—

"In surveying the actual condition of the country what but ruin or decay meets the eye? Crippled and checked in the full career of private and public enterprise, this possession of the British Crown, our country, stands before the world in humiliating contrast with its immediate neighbour, exhibiting every symptom of a nation fast sinking to decay."

Signed, as it was, by many of the leading business men of the day, this circular bears sufficient evidence of the then lamentable position of the Province. In the succeeding year a usually well informed English paper, *The Illustrated London News*, referring to the turning of the first sod of the Northern Railway by Lady Elgin, said: "The inhabitants of the frozen and hitherto imperfectly understood region of Canada have not until recently availed themselves of the modern advance in public improvements."

So great was the lack of knowledge concerning each other's resources and requirements amongst the British colonies in North America previous to Confederation, so intense were the jealousies and feuds, so hostile were the apparent interests of the different Provinces that it is easy to appreciate the strong opposition which that great measure met, both in the House of Assembly and in the country. We can even understand the sentiments of a prominent member of that House, Mr. J. B. E. Dorion, when he said, during the Confederation debate of 1865: "This scheme of Confederation, this scheme of an independent monarchy, can lead but to extravagance, ruin, and anarchy." Even these dire forebodings were excelled by the Hon. L. H. Holton, in the same debate, when he gravely stated that if "this scheme which threatens to plunge the country into measureless debt, into difficulties and confusions utterly unknown to the present constitutional system, is adopted, I anticipate for my country a period of calamity, a period of tribulation, such as it has never heretofore known."