

size of a Dutch hat worn by an early burgher, "man hat on." Many are the stories told to explain why a famous London highway is called Rotton Row (Route en roi)."

The verb "motivate" on page 51 has what has been called the generous authority of the Century Dictionary but it is not an elegant or forcible English word; "Deuteronomic" seems to us to be a better form than "Deuteronomian" (page 107). These, however, are very small details.

The spirit and purpose of the book is well set forth in the following passage. "But the important point is and will remain the poetic tone of the narratives. History, which claims to inform us of what has actually happened, is in its very nature prose, while legend is by nature poetry, its aim being to please, to elevate, to inspire and to move. He who wishes to do justice to such narratives must have some aesthetic faculty, to catch in the telling of a story what it is and what it purports to be, and in doing so he is not expressing a hostile or even skeptical judgment but simply studying lovingly the nature of his material. Whoever possesses heart and feeling must perceive for instance in the case of the sacrifice of Isaac, that the important matter is not to establish certain historical facts, but to impart to the hearer the heartrending grief of the father who is commanded to sacrifice his child with his own hand, and then his boundless gratitude and joy when God's mercy relieves him from this grievous trial. And every one who feels the peculiar poetic charm of these old legends must feel irritated at the barbarian—for there are pious barbarians—who thinks he is putting the true value upon these narratives only when he treats them as prose and history."

"The conclusion, then, that one of these narratives is legend is by no means intended to detract from the value of the narrative; it only means that the one who pronounces it has perceived somewhat of the poetic beauty of the narrative and thinks that he has thus arrived at an understanding of the story. Only ignorance can regard such a conclusion as irrelevant, for it is the judgment of reverence and love. The poetic narratives are the most beautiful possessions which a people brings down through the course of its history, and the legends of Israel, especially those of Genesis, are perhaps the most beautiful and most profound ever known on earth."

"A child, indeed, unable to distinguish between reality and poetry, loses something when it is told that its dearest stories are 'not true.' But the modern theologian should be further developed. The evangelical churches and their chosen representatives would do well not to dispute the fact that Genesis contains legends—as has been done too frequently—but to recognize that the knowledge of this fact is the indispensable condition to an historical understanding of Genesis. The knowledge is too widely diffused among those trained in historical study ever again to be suppressed. It will surely spread among the masses of our people, for the process is irresistible. Shall not we evangelicals take care that it be presented to them in the right spirit." One difficulty in the use of this word is pointed out, "The senseless confusion of 'legend' with 'lying' has caused good people to hesitate to concede that there are legends in the Old Testament. Bible legends are not lies; on the contrary they are a particular form of poetry."

The author accepts the common theory of four main documents in the Pentateuch,

but he believes that these early stories circulated in oral form a long time before they were gathered up into books, so that some of the material in Genesis goes back to as early a period as 1200 B.C. To discuss this theory would require more space than we have at our disposal; two remarks may suffice, this work of one of Berlin's most distinguished professors does not show any sign of the "re-action" that we read of in some journals; on the other hand it does not take the direction recently indicated by Dr. Cheyne in his remarkable article on "The Turning Point of Old Testament Criticism," but indeed distinctly declines to travel the old road of solar and Lunar myths. This is decidedly what is called "an advanced" book, but whether we accept its central principle or no there is much to be learned from it.

### FIFTY YEARS AGO.

BY J. J. BELL.

In the month of March, just fifty years ago, instrumental music was introduced for the first time in the services of the Presbyterian church in Canada. St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, was the scene of this innovation. Though the use of instrumental music was not authorized by the authorities of the church, the circumstances of St. Andrews seem to have been exceptional. The session records for 1852 are incomplete, and I cannot find any reference in what records there are to the introduction of an instrument, but as far as can be ascertained a melodeon was placed in the old church on the corner of Church and Adelaide streets, and used "as an aid" to assist the choir, the session assenting and no one in the congregation seriously objecting. But seven years later the church was greatly agitated by the organ question. St. Andrews replaced its melodeon with an organ, and forthwith a protest was raised. At a meeting of the Toronto Presbytery held Nov. 15 and 16, 1859, a memorial and complaint was presented from Mr. John Robertson (father of John Ross Robertson, publisher of the Toronto Telegram) against the use of instrumental music in St. Andrew's church. After long discussion it was moved by Mr. Barker, seconded by Mr. Douglas, "that music into the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, is an innovation, even as an aid, yet in the peculiar circumstances in which the melodeon has been introduced into St. Andrew's Church, and because of its long continuance therein, the Presbytery deem it inexpedient to disturb existing arrangements in said congregation. At the same time the Presbytery embrace the opportunity to exhort the members of the congregation to cultivate vocal music to the utmost extent of which their circumstances will admit." An amendment was moved by Rev. Mr. Campbell, seconded by Mr. Turnbull, "that inasmuch as instrumental music has been excluded from the Church of Scotland in every age, and has thereby become illegal by prescription, if not by enactment, that the Kirk Session of St. Andrews are hereby enjoined to give all diligence to the cultivation of church music, in order that they may dispense with the use of said instrument as soon as possible."

The Presbytery appear to have sympathized with the circumstances of St. Andrews, for Mr. Barker's motion was carried on a vote of eight to five. Rev. Dr. Barclay, on behalf of the session, acquiesced in this decision, but Mr. Robertson appealed to the Synod, before whom the matter came at its meeting in Kingston the following June. The appeal was sustained and the Presbytery enjoined to see that the musical instrument was removed. Rev. Dr. George, on whose motion this decision was arrived at, declared that instrumental music in the services of the sanctuary, so far from being essential or subservient to a healthy devotion, was both unnecessary and pernicious, and that any encouragement to its continuance by one congregation, or its introduction by others, would give great offense. I find that besides Rev. Dr. George, then minister of Scarborough, afterwards professor at Queen's University, Rev. Dr. Cook of Quebec, and Rev. Wm. Snodgrass, of Montreal Synod clerk, afterwards Principal of Queens, were opposed to the organ. It was not long before a melodeon was introduced in St. Andrew's Church, Quebec.

Neither the Session of St. Andrews nor the Presbytery of Toronto appear to have obeyed the injunction of the Synod, for in 1861 another motion was adopted instructing the Presbytery to carry out the order of the Synod. Still it was not done, and in 1862 a memorial was presented from Rev. Dr. Barclay and Chief Justice Maclean (the minister and ruling elder of St. Andrews), praying for a re consideration, and asking the Synod not to interfere with existing arrangements. A motion to that effect was carried. In 1863 an overture was presented praying the Synod to give a clear deliverance on the subject of instrumental music, either to forbid or tolerate it, with or without exceptions. The overture was, however, rejected.

So St. Andrews went on using its organ, and other congregations soon followed its example. Now few congregations, however remote, consider their service of praise complete without the use of a melodeon, or some other instrument.

It may seem strange that no serious objection appears to have been made when the melodeon was first introduced, and that when a better instrument was substituted a protest should have been entered, but this may be explained by the fact that the melodeon occupied only a subordinate place in sustaining the voices of the choir, while with the introduction of the organ it was given a leading place, and a fear was felt that the instrument would have a tendency to displace the voices of the people in the service of praise.

What a change has taken place in these fifty years.

Says the United Presbyterian of Pittsburgh Pa.—"There is danger that the old time custom of regular pastoral visiting may pass away. Write many pastors it is already a thing of the past." This is sadly true of Canada as well as of the United States. Cannot the good old custom be revived in a form modified to suit the changed conditions of modern life?