

The Presbyterian Review.

Issued EVERY THURSDAY, from the office of the Publishers, Rooms No. 20, 21, 22, 25 Aberdeen Block, South-East corner Adelaide and Victoria Streets.

TERMS, \$1.50 per annum.

All communications for either Business or Editorial Departments should be addressed PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Drawer 2464, Toronto, Ont.

T. R. CLOUGHER, Publisher and Proprietor.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Under 3 months, 15 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1.00 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line; 1 year, \$3.00. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None others than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

Toronto, January 3, 1895.

What Is to Be Done?

Entering on a new year it is fitting that we take a new view of our opportunities and duties. Times are hard, money is scarce, the world's need is crying, What is to be done?

What have we to do with the world's need? That depends on who we are. If we decide to write ourselves down with Cain, or with him who lived to self, choosing luxury as his God, giving his neighbor only what he could not himself enjoy, then it may be no affair of ours. But if we wish to be found followers of Him who gave up His own honor and pleasure to save men from sin and woe, then it is one of the biggest of all realities to us.

Physical need? Yes, surely. Yet we must remember the relative importance of things, and also that the wisest kindness looks even more to removing the causes than to relieving present distress. Men's greatest need is spiritual life. How great is that need, even in our own favored land with its armies of ministers, elders, deacons, local preachers, Sabbath School teachers, class leaders, Christian heads of families, and young men and maidens; with its Bibles and catechisms and other good books and papers! And if so, how overwhelming the need in other lands, and even in other parts of our own great empire. Look at India with its 1,000 souls an hour, or so, passing into eternity without that, which we, their fellow subjects, declare we count more precious than all our earthly advantages—most of them its indirect results. Villages, towns, cities, whole districts without one minister or even one Christian, the most ignorant, to tell the glad tidings which we have at this season been specially remembering!

Men try to soothe their own uneasiness about them by refusing to believe that those people are perishing. Even if not, are they as we would wish to be? Sunk in superstition, ignorance of the true God, and fear of the false, worshipping beings of scandalous character, and without those spiritual advantages which we prize so highly for ourselves and our families, what does the golden rule require us to do for them? But are they not perishing? What else are they? What is it to perish? True they are not under equal condemnation with those who reject greater light. A man's "stripes" are conditioned by the knowledge against which he sins. But though a famished man may be guiltless of suicide he is dying all the same. "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law;" there is a matter of fact, involved in the very nature of things. "And as

many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law;" there is in addition, guilt and condemnation commensurate with the opportunity neglected. "This is eternal life, to know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent." The lack of this is death.

Then what is to be done? Plainly more of us must go to make Him known, and those who cannot or will not go must "hold the ropes,"—must provide the means. And as money is so scarce in these hard times, if we are in common humanity and obedience to our Lord, to make known to those perishing souls so rapidly passing out of our reach the good news of salvation, it is clear that (1) those that have plenty must give royally, and (2) those who have not must deny themselves many indulgences which though harmless are yet unnecessary, and surely less to be desired by imitators of Jesus than God's glory in men's salvation. Let every follower of Christ begin by giving a tenth of his income, and then day by day in the exercise of self-denial save what more he can, and on the Lord's Day, as a part of worship, offer to the Lord whatever he is thus able to give. In one envelope let him give for congregational expenses, and in another (on which is written or printed the purpose for which he devotes it) let him give for the Lord's work elsewhere. And let the officers of the church apply it accordingly.

Have our prayers that God would "open doors" and "send forth laborers" been but words with which we deceived ourselves and mocked God? Now that He has answered, and the doors stand open and the labourers wait, is the Church to shrink back from the self-denial to which her answered prayers summon her?

D. FRASER CAMPBELL.

A Slashing Criticism.

PROFESSOR BRIGGS' latest book has roused the ire of able antagonists among whom Rev. Dr. A. J. F. Behrends is prominent. In a recent number of the *Christian Advocate* he deals with the book in no uncertain manner. The book, he says, is a strange medley, consisting of several documents of earlier publication, which have been amended, expanded or contracted, with numerous interpolations of sentences and paragraphs, and with equally numerous reversals of previous judgments. Ten years his judgment of the composition and authorship of the Pentateuch was stated in these words: "There is nothing in the variation of the documents as such to require that they should be successive and separated by wide intervals, or that would prevent their being very nearly contemporaneous. There is nothing in the distinction of the documents as such that forbids the Mosaic age as the time of their origin." On the date of Deuteronomy Professor Briggs declared, in 1883, that De Wette's theory was 'exceedingly precarious.' He claimed to have disproved, against De Wette, the location of Deuteronomy in the age of Josiah, and to have shown that its origin must be thrown back into the Mosaic age. As to the post exilic origin of the priest code, he maintained that there 'were insuperable objections' to such a theory, and he presented his reasons in detail. He admitted the order of development, for which Kuenen and Wellhausen contended, but he denied 'that it was necessary to postulate a thousand years for this development' and he suggested that 'if we should suppose that Eleazar or some other priest gathered these