

Church has regarded herself as the parent of the only educational institutions worthy of recognition, and has long monopolized this exemption. Protestant rights, however, have slowly made an effort to assert themselves. Congregational and similar claims were pressed and successful, and private schools have wakened up to a sense of their duty. The Protestant mind became sharpened by success, and much interest has quite recently been aroused in a claim from Mrs. Lay's Seminary for Young Ladies, for the restitution of taxes to the extent of \$1,000 paid in ignorance of the statute. The case was lost on a technical point in the Superior Court, but has secured a reversal of verdict in the Court of Appeal. *On dit* that a movement is on foot in McGill College in favour of a similar restitution of all the taxes paid by all the Professors. If this be successful we shall expect to hear of an important reduction in the future salaries of these gentlemen.

Sir William Dawson is lecturing on "The Relations of the Prophecies of Daniel to Modern History."

The appointment of Mr. George A. Drummond to the Senate, as successor to the late Hon. James Ferrier, meets with very general approval. VILLE MARIE.

### SYMPATHY.

WHEN crushed beneath the dread expectancy  
Of ill, by fault or fortune brought, how sweet  
If listless hand or heavy eye should meet  
Soft touch, kind glance from one who yet must be  
Just, even to sternness. Then the penalty,  
If come it must, comes robbed of half its fear;  
We know that one who feels with us is near—  
That thought has power to soothe our misery.  
Then if a trifling kindly act can bring—  
When with perplexing doubts thy mind is riven,  
Or with despair—such blest relief to thee,  
With kindly act cheer thou the suffering,  
And give as freely as thou wouldst have given  
The precious balm of healing—Sympathy.

M. M.

### THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A STORY is current in literary and ecclesiastical circles, which is of some interest to all who take note of the currents of religious thought in these days. It is related that at the Lambeth Conference, a committee was appointed to draw up a report on the subject of the Old Testament, that the Chairman of the committee was a strong bishop of somewhat "advanced" opinions, and that, when his report was read, it was received with something like dismay by the other Episcopal members of the committee—in fact, it was not, in the proper sense, "received" at all; and, as the bishop refused to modify it, no report on that subject was presented to the Conference.

Whether the story, as it stands, partakes of a mythical or legendary character, we cannot say. But we have no doubt that there is a measure of truth lying underneath. In the first place, such a story is not very likely to have been invented; and, in the second place, a comparison of the Encyclical letter sent forth by the Conference, with the reports of the committees, will show that there is a history in the latter.

If the facts are as they are represented, they contain nothing derogatory to the Conference as a whole, or to the particular bishops who would none of their chairman's report. It can hardly be doubted that the Church has been wisely guided in abstaining from defining the nature of the inspiration of the Scriptures, and from determining the comparative value of the books in the Canon. She has been contented to declare these books as divine—as containing a divine record of the divine government of the world, a divine record of the revelation which God has made of Himself to man, of the way in which He wills that man shall live and work in this world. Whatever the Church ordains, she must ordain nothing contrary to this testimony. This is agreed upon by all—Romans and Reformed—however much they may differ as to the method of interpretation, or the importance of tradition.

In spite, however, of the wisdom and moderation of the Church at large, it can hardly be doubted that many persons have been considerably disquieted by the manner in which some of the books of the Old Testament have been handled, in recent times, by some of the representatives of the "higher criticism." Attempts have been made, as all the world knows, to show that the Pentateuch was not only not written by Moses, but that the greater part of its enactments were of much later date than the era of the great Hebrew law-giver; that the only portion of the Jewish code which could be attributed to Moses, was the ethical, and that all the sacrificial and sacerdotal ordinances belonged to a much later period—to a period so late that it was at least not earlier than the captivity.

There are three ways in which these criticisms may be met. First, there is the way of dogmatism, the way of the late Dean Burgon, who laid it down in the University pulpit at Oxford that not only was every sentence of the Bible inspired, but every word and every letter—perhaps, we might say, a good many of the various readings. And there are still some who follow in this way. It is, however, needless to remark that however short and easy this method may be with those who accept the principle involved, it would have no success either with the advocates of the critical method, or with Christians who were disquieted by their arguments.

A second method is that of basing the authority of the

Old Testament upon that of the New. Many persons who feel themselves incompetent to pronounce upon the difficulties which have been discovered or invented in connection with either the historical truth or the authorship of the books of the Old Testament, have been contented to fall back upon the use made of those books by our Lord and His Apostles. If they could quote them as authoritative, these critical difficulties need occasion no perplexity to those who are contented to be guided by them. Such a method appears to ourselves eminently sound and reasonable. If we can satisfy ourselves of the authority of the New Testament, then we may safely accept its guidance in the interpretation of the Old.

There is, however, a third method, which is also useful, but which is open to a much more limited class of readers—the method of following with care the criticisms of the assailants of the authenticity and genuineness of the Old Testament, and of showing that the facts before us do not bear out their conclusions. This method has been taken by writers in Germany and in England, who have assailed the position taken by Wellhausen and Kuenen on the Continent, and by Robertson Smith in Great Britain.

We have recently had our attention directed to a book of this kind, which we confidently recommend to our readers, not as conclusively settling any of these questions, but as showing that a good deal may be said in behalf of the traditional and conservative view of the Old Testament, and a good deal that the advocates of revolutionary opinions will have to take into account. The author of the book is the Reverend Alfred Cave, Principal of a Theological College supported by the Congregationalists, in England a highly educated and influential body; and the book is a series of Congregational lectures, set up by that religious body in imitation of the Bampton Lectures at Oxford. The title of the book is, *The Inspiration of the Old Testament inductively considered*.

Principal Cave is a man who, from his previous studies and publications in connection with the Old Testament, has proved his qualifications to deal with these subjects. His work on the Christian doctrine of Sacrifice is very highly esteemed by theological students. In his new book he takes the Bible just as it stands, and proceeds to examine its contents with constant reference to the conclusions of the critical school. Leaving alone the textual criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures and the interpretation or exegesis as well, he devotes his attention to what is called the "higher criticism," that is to say, generally, the criticism of the contents of the books as a means of ascertaining their date, their origin, and authorship.

It may surprise many who have accepted as conclusive the decisions of men like Robertson Smith to know that Mr. Cave insists upon the substantial Mosaic character of the Pentateuch. As regards its historical character (or "historicity," as the author barbarously calls it), he brings forward a number of considerations from ethnic tradition and from results in science in illustration of the story of the flood, and the derivation of the different nations of the earth from the sons of Noah. The English *Spectator* has been very severe upon Mr. Cave for the use of this argument; and we must acknowledge that, to ourselves, it does not seem to be quite of the importance that he attaches to it. But in spite of the criticism to which this part of his argument has been subjected, we consider that it is not without validity, and we advise our readers not to pass it by.

With regard to the authorship of Genesis, after setting forth the various theories of its composition which have, at various times, been advocated, and which are more fully illustrated in an Appendix, the author shows that, after the adoption and rejection of theories which supposed two or three or more documents to be combined in the narrative, recent opinion is coming round to a belief in its unity; and whilst he does not deny the work of two writers, an Elohist and a Jehovist, he considers the former to have been the earlier writer, and the latter Moses himself. Mr. Cave works out this conclusion with care and announces it with confidence. Whether he is right or wrong, the other side can hardly afford to treat his arguments with contempt or neglect, and they will have to answer him.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is the fifth lecture on the "Origin of the Law," in which he opposes the evolutionary theory of Wellhausen, to which we have already referred. According to this writer, the Law consists "of three constituents of very different dates, the latest having been written a thousand years after the death of Moses," the third part, the so-called Priestly Code, being "written in the interests of the priesthood," and the whole of it being produced "not earlier than the closing years of the Babylonish exile." It is no wonder that these astonishing conclusions should have excited opposition and criticism. But what will seem more surprising to many persons is the fact that some considerable portion of the theory has been adopted by scholars of unquestionable orthodoxy.

We cannot follow Mr. Cave in his refutation of this theory; but we will mention his contention that, while the evidence on either side is scanty, there are facts sufficient to show conclusively that the so-called Priestly Code was known in the history of Israel long before the period of the Captivity. As examples, he gives quotations not only from the Book of Joshua, which is excluded from the domain of external evidence by being connected with the Pentateuch, so as to form a Hexateuch, but also from the Book of Judges and from the later historical books of the Old Testament. This is a part of the argument which any ordinary careful reader can quite easily appreciate, so as to judge of the weight of evidence either way. We con-

fess that Mr. Cave's marshalling of the facts produces a considerable impression of his being in the right.

Having established the Mosaic origin of the Law, he proceeds to prove its Divine origin. And this is evidently a comparatively easy task, if the success of his previous attempts is conceded. The real battle is fought in the earlier chapters. Yet, to many, the last three will prove the most interesting. After having established the Divine origin of the Law in the sixth chapter, in the seventh he gives a very clear and comprehensive account of the nature of Old Testament Prophecy, in which he strongly asserts its proper predictive character. The last lecture gives a very interesting discussion of the inspiration of the Old Testament, to which the whole book has been leading up. The author's argument is derived neither from the decisions of the Church, nor even from the testimony of the New Testament, but from the contents of the books themselves.

WILLIAM CLARK.

### THE NORTH-WEST FARMER.

THE first house we stopped at on our return journey from Mr. Sanders was that of Mr. Smail whom we saw in the distance making black earth out of golden stubble. Mrs. Smail received us in a large well built house and her daughter smiled her welcome. We were introduced to Mrs. Smail's father, a Highland Scotchman, ninety years of age, wonderfully well preserved. She told us he never had had a day's illness, but that he felt much better since he came up here five years ago. He and his daughter liked the country, liked the prairie, though in their old home in Stirlingshire each morning when they got up they could see rising from its girths of mead and wood the historic battlements of Stirling Castle. Mr. Smail soon came in. Meanwhile I learned from Mrs. Smail that they had twelve stacks of grain: 2,000 bushels of wheat, and 1,000 of oats, and 800 of barley. "I never fetched bigger sheaves," said Mrs. Smail, "and the oat sheaves are heavier yet." Great and worthy pride she took in calling my attention (which however had been spontaneously attracted) to the heavy weighted string of corn cobs which stretched across the room. As much more were stored away, "and all grown in the open air." A few of the cobs were black and red. This reminded Mr. Annable of the husking bee in Ontario, and how anyone who got a red ear could go round and kiss the girls. I expressed the hope that justice was so far in the ascendant that when a young girl, or even an old one, got a cob she could go round and exercise an analogous privilege, and was assured this was so. Mr. Smail could not understand how it was that the barley grown in stubble was better than that on the ploughed land, the former being the best he ever saw, of which he expected to have 800 bushels from twenty-five sown.

Of the homestead Mr. Smail has 145 acres under crop—about ninety under wheat. This is the farmer who succeeds, not the man who grudges every acre he cultivates beyond what is called for by the Act. He entered in 1884 and next year had thirty acres under crop. The next year, 1886, the year of the drought, burned up everything, and he took only 124 bushels of wheat off the land. In 1887 he had 660 bushels of wheat, about 500 of oats and 60 of barley. His son lives over on the other quarter section. He has 85 acres under crop. Between them, since 1884, 230 acres under crop. When Mr. Swan, the homestead inspector, was out, he said: "If you don't quit you will have the whole country under crop." "I knew by the land," added Mr. Smail, "that it was certainly made to produce something better than dry grass. I was determined to cultivate."

Like Mr. Sanders, Mr. Smail had made experiments. He had got three pounds of Ladoga wheat from Mr. Saunders of the Experimental Farm. It had produced two bushels at least. It is very hard and will ripen from eight to ten days earlier than "red fyfe." We visited the stables and saw the heavy team which had taken the prize.

Having eaten a truly hospitable North-West dinner, we started for the residence of Mr. William Watson, a well-known man in these parts.

As we drove by a faded shock, "That's a church," said my lively and well-informed companions, "at least that is one of the stations of Mr.——," a student of the Queen's University, whose really remarkable fluency made in these regions a deep impression. In the towns they build nice little edifices with an imitation of ecclesiastical architecture like a rustic maiden's efforts at reproducing the latest Parisian fashions—but in this country they have to utilize a neighbour's house, or transform a deserted shock, everted perhaps by some claim-jumper, into the Zion of the hour. In an edifice hardly more imposing it was my fate in 1883 to hear a lay preacher hold forth on the text—"Set your affections on things above." He had a week before scandalized the few who knew by jumping a poor man's claim who had gone down east to bring up his wife. Will you believe it? He had the hardihood to say with unctuous fervency: "Take, my brethren, a homestead in the skies where no man can jump your claim." Democracies are not favourable to grandiose ecclesiastical structures. In architecture, as in other walks of art, we owe the choicest products to periods and places when and where one will be ruled whether ostensibly or not. One reason no doubt is that it is easy to be liberal with the money of others, and David I. would never have been canonized for raising Melrose, Kelso, Dryburgh and Holyrood if he had earned the money lavished, not in vain, on those exquisite piles which our eyes can only see in majestic ruins, whose