

are the facts?" We will look and see.

The apostasy referred to by the professor is the story of the making of the golden calf. Moses is in the Mount with God, where Horeb lifts her seamed and riven heights amongst the clouds. There God tells Moses of the idolatry of the people, the people, let us remember, that God had chosen to be a holy nation of whom He was to make a channel of Divine revelation to the world. This was the object of their selection out from amongst other peoples. Their apostasy renders them worthy only of rejection. God says to Moses, "Let Me alone. . . that I may consume them, and I will make of thee a great nation." This is the declaration of God. He will consume them, and supplant them by a nation to spring from Moses.

Against this Moses pleads with God, and He who calls Himself the hearer and the answerer of prayer, responds to the whole-souled pleadings of Moses, and in this 14th verse, in which Professor McFadyen, retelling the Criticism of his German masters, says, "The apostate people are forgiven by their God" we find these words: "And the Lord repented of the evil which He said He would do unto His people." The "evil which He said He would do unto them," was that He would "consume them," and in their place He would put another nation. The evil spoken of then was their destruction and their supplanting by another people. This evil, this obliteration of the people, God "repents" of. But I do not find a single word that implies that when He has decided to still keep the people for the purposes for which they had been chosen He says or hints that they are not to receive some kind of punishment to bring home to their consciences their grave iniquity and sin. It is not stated at all, but the narrative makes clear what common-sense would expect, that some suitable punishment would take the place of the complete obliteration of the nation. All had sinned, therefore when Moses goes down he makes all drink of the bitter water. In all apostasies there are ringleaders who are specially deserving of punishment. In this case these had by their apostasy threatened the very national existence. Their crime is so grave their menace to the nation so serious, that nothing but their execution seemed adequate. Who they were, Moses on the ground could tell much better than we can from this distance and with the brief narrative before us. There is no reason to suppose that he did not use some sense in the execution.

However, the wisdom or unwisdom, the right or the wrong, of such execution is not the point. Prof. McFadyen says that in this chapter God forgave a people, then punished them; and that such contradictions are indicative of different authors in the chapter. There is not a single word to justify Prof. McFadyen's statement.

The difference between blotting a nation out for its sin and so completely overlooking its sin as to give it no punishment at all, is polar in its divergence. The repenting of the thought of blotting a nation out does not in the faintest degree involve any such complete overlooking of its sin. Yet that is the false logic, and the still more faulty exegesis, upon which Professor McFadyen's whole argument is based. Surely the Princeton professor who said, "If you are looking for samples of bad logic amongst the writings of the higher critics, you are safe to put your spade in anywhere," had just such writings as this in view, though he spoke the words before "The Messages of the Bible," had appeared. Not only do the words FORGIVE and PARDON not appear in verse 14, as the Professor implies; but there is not a single phrase in it to justify the assumption that it was God's intention to do something that would express His view of their iniquity.

A father who thought his child's conduct so vicious that he first of all determined to cast it off and disown it, would barely think that in repenting of that determination he placed himself under obligation to administer no reproof or punishment of any kind for the sin committed. Whatever plea Mercy might present to him on behalf of the child, Consistency (which is the question at issue in this Bible narrative) would not compel him, in receiving back his child, to overlook the seriousness of its fault. There is no such conflict between the statement of verse 14 and those that follow, as Prof. McFadyen contends. His argument, based on it, that there must have been two different authors of these different parts of the chapters, is baseless as a dream.

His analysis of the subsequent part of the chapter is perhaps even more palpably unsound. He says: "In verse 25 God actually punishes them Himself, after having in verse 34 suspended the punishment for the second time." This is his next pair of contradictions.

Verse 34 reads thus: "And now go, lead the people unto the place of which I have spoken unto thee; behold mine angel shall go before thee; nevertheless in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them." That is verse 34, in which the professor states that God "suspended the punishment for the second time." On the contrary in complete harmony with the whole chapter, it most explicitly affirms that while God is faithful to His promise to keep and lead the people, He will not overlook their sin, but will visit it with punishment as occasion demands.

Prof. McFadyen says, "The detail is not only OBSCURE—it is CONFLICTING." A careful reading of the chapter will show that while the detail is meagre, as all compressed narrative must be, it is as clear as the noon-day, and there is not a conflicting sentence or phrase in the chapter from the beginning to the end.

Again on page 9 Prof. McFadyen says, "Sometimes the contradictions are not only implicit as here" (some that he has quoted), "but expressed in so many terms." Now we are intensely interested. Surely here there is no room for questioning the correctness of the professor's Scripture teachings. We are to come face to face with a "contradiction" which is "expressed in so many terms," one which he must again and again in these past years have taught to the students for the Presbyterian ministry in Knox College. Here is the first one, and they are all of a kind: "For example in Numbers 20:14-21 the Edomites REFUSE to allow Israel to pass through their country; in Deuteronomy 2:1-7 they CONSENT."

If you will turn up these two passages of Scripture, you will find that Professor McFadyen is quite correct; that the former passage describes Edom's refusal and the latter Edom's consent to the Israelites passing through their territory. Now if the two passages of Scripture are describing the same incident, the Bible has that explicit contradiction of itself which the professor has been teaching to his students and to the world.

Let us ask ourselves the Professor's question: "What are the facts?" The facts are that the passage in Numbers is describing the time when the Israelites stood on the threshold of Edom shortly after their departure from Egypt. On that occasion the narrative says that Edom REFUSED to allow them a passage, and the rest of the narrative shows that Israel did not go through; but that on the contrary they were tied up in the wilderness as the neighbors of the Edomites for nearly forty years more. Every Sunday School child is supposed to know this. At the end of the forty years the Israelites are about to make their second, and as it transpires, their successful attempt, to go into the land of

Palestine. By this time the Edomites have become fully seized of the fact that Israel's objective is Palestine, and according to the Deuteronomy statement, when they now, nearly forty years after the record in Numbers, make application for leave to pass through Edom, the Edomites consent. If an enemy had risen up and said that the professor confounded these two entirely different occasions in his teachings in Knox College, I would not have believed him. But the professor has written it himself, and published it to "enable every reader of the Bible to appreciate and to obtain a mastery of the essential facts and teachings contained in it." So we cannot deny that it is the teaching of a Presbyterian College professor, however much it compels us to hang our heads in shame for the once boasted scholarship of our Colleges.

Secular history teaches that Britain and France were locked in a death struggle against each other at Waterloo in 1815. The same history affirms that their gallant troops died side by side as allies in the trenches of Sebastopol in 1854, just about the same difference in time as that which lies between the Numbers and the Deuteronomy accounts of Edom's refusal and consent to Israel's going through their land. Yet such is the CONTRADICTION that the author of this volume of the "Messages of the Bible" finds to be "not only implicit, but expressed in so many terms."

When Presbyterians get as much faith in the Bible as they have tried to have in their professors, they will mak' some o' them gang hame tae their mothers to be better taught.

Any one who will read over the chapters quoted by Prof. McFadyen will see how important it is for his theories that his students should be fairly ignorant of the Bible. In his preface Prof. McFadyen tells us about those to whom he is specially indebted in writing these "Messages of the Bible." The first writer mentioned is Steuermann's "Einleitend in den Hexateuch." Had his debts to him and his Introduction been less, and his obligations to Moses and his Pentateuch been more, the "Messages of the Bible" would have been a lot better worth reading, and would have been disfigured with fewer German-made contradictions which have no existence in fact.

Levis, Quo.

FAVORITE HYMNS.

Just now when there is a merry war over hymns and hymnals, it is interesting to note that the King's favorite hymn, "Nearer, my God, to Thee," was sung as a solo by the Anglican Church at Marienbad, the other day. It is the favorite of a lifetime and it has some solemn associations for his Majesty. Some years before he came to the Throne the King informed Mr. Stead that he liked "Nearer, my God, to Thee" better than any other hymn. At the same time Mr. Stead succeeded in getting some interesting opinions from other eminent people about hymns. The favorite hymns of Queen Victoria, in whom the domestic instinct was peculiarly strong, were marriage hymns and funeral hymns. The Duke of Argyll's favorite hymn is "O God of Bethel." Mr. Asquith, like the late Mr. Bright, is partial to "O God, our help in ages past." Lord Rosebery, when invited to mention his favorite hymn, declined what he called "confession in general" on such a subject. The favorite hymn of the Duchess of Sutherland, who compiled a private hymnal for use in Trentham Church, is "And now, O Father, mindful of the love." The only hymn the late Duke of Cambridge cared much for was "Onward, Christian soldiers!" When Grant Allen was asked to mention the hymn of hymns that had "helped" him, he made a characteristic reply. "I never needed help," he said, "other than physical or monetary. My own philosophy has always amply sufficed me."