

sities, and as far as possible to add comforts to those ministers who have spent their lives in the Church's work, and have not been able to make provision for old age and infirmity. This is the first thought of the overture—the principle of *benevolence*. Surely no one will say this is not a right principle. During the last few years the ministers of our Church have been asked to contribute to this fund at the rate of one-half per cent. of their professional income; and failing to do so they forfeit entirely their claim upon the fund; or according to the milder terms of the remit they lose one-half of their claim. In this we recognize another principle—that of *professional union for mutual aid*. Now, these two principles, found in the scheme already in existence, are the principles of the overture. If they are liable to criticism in the overture, they must be subject to the same ordeal in the present scheme.

The details of the overture are few and unimportant. They were for the most part taken from the remit. I am sure the friends of the overture would willingly have them improved, so long as the principles are left intact.

Some of the changes to be effected by the overture are these: 1. The separation of moneys collected from different sources, and contributed on different principles, into two distinct funds. Congregational contributions are given on the principle of benevolence; while ministerial rates are forwarded on the principle of professional union. Hence will arise the two funds. 2. The administration of each of these funds according to the principle on which it was contributed. Surely there is no injustice in this plan.

In this way the funds contributed by the Church for the support of aged and infirm ministers will be given to those only who are in need of such contributions; and the funds contributed by ministers on the principle of professional union will be for those only who have contributed to this object.

One cause of dissatisfaction with the present system is, that while the mass of the people regard it as a benevolent scheme, some of the ministers regard it as one by which a certain *honourable pension* is given by the Church to her aged servants. If this latter be the true idea of the scheme, let us all know it, and let that be the ground on which contributions are sought from congregations. Let us not cherish this in our bosoms for the gratification of our sense of dignity, while we present a more popular claim to the congregations.

According to the present system, too, annuities may be, some say are, granted out of this fund to persons who are not in the slightest need of them. It is in this way that the scheme has not met with that favour which is due to it, and which it would receive from the Church were it administered on proper principles. And hence, we regard it, has arisen the need of the ministerial rate.

A MEMBER OF PRESBYTERY.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY REPORTS.

MR. EDITOR,—I see it rumoured that there is a probability of a general election in June. In that case we shall have very scanty reports of our Supreme Court. We have been chiefly indebted to the "Globe" for reports in the past; but when an election is near, the past tells us what happens.

But, election or not, could not such a large denomination as ours not do much better in this matter? The Church at large wants information about the real working of the Church—the substance of Reports, the principal addresses, etc., not the "scenes" and mere wordy debates. And when a deputy comes from a sister Church with a carefully prepared address, full of interesting information, it seems such a waste when we are simply told that it was "warmly received." It is not so at "election times" for a seat in Parliament. Every voter knows what is going on, and why, and he is accordingly interested.

B. C.

April 21st, 1882.

THE Bible is wholly put into eight African tongues, and partly into thirty-four more, and the thirty-fifth is being prepared for.

THE Earl of Shaftesbury, who recently completed his eighty-first year, still enjoys good health. He has been an active member in both Houses of Parliament for fifty-six years; but has been more active privately in seeking to advance the sanitary, physical, mental, moral, and religious condition of the lower classes in London.

PASTOR AND PEOPLE.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR ROBERTSON SMITH.—III.

BY THE REV. F. MELVILLE, A.M., B.D., MOFEWELL, N.S.

BIBLE INTEGRATION.

"To the wise a hint is sufficient." Such trust have I in the evidency of the truths I state, and in the sagacity of my attentive truth-loving readers, that I have given little else than hints and outlines, which they can fill up, expand, and corroborate at leisure. This will be to them a most sweet and sacred study, replete with richest instruction and improvement, mentally and spiritually, throughout life. Without wasting words on such trifling objections as any wise Christian can easily answer, I have solved only the principal difficulties set forth. And now we shall consider briefly the true view of the Bible in its integrity, as the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Annals.

(1.) THE LAW GIVEN BY MOSES.

The moral law of the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments, is the centre and supporting pillar of all the laws and revelations given to Israel, whether civil, ritual, or otherwise. In Deuteronomy it is summed up in the two great commandments of love to God and man, on which, as our Saviour taught, all the law and the prophets hang. He also taught that it is for all men through all ages, and imperishable as heaven and earth in its every jot and tittle. Its pre-eminence is shown by its delivery by God's own voice from Sinai, in thunder and in flame, and by its inscription by God's finger on the tables of stone, for the ark of the covenant in the holy of holies; signifying the very principles of eternal holiness in the heart of Christ (Ps. xl. 8).

The civil and ritual laws for Israel as a nation and a Church were also given by Moses; though some of them were old traditions from the fathers, such as circumcision and sacrifice. God did not INSTITUTE sacrifice by Moses, but PERMITTED it as a patriarchal institution, and so REGULATED it as to be "a shadow of good things to come," typifying Christ and His kingdom. But Israel was so spiritually blind that they would not perceive the good things foreshadowed, nor even the supreme End of the whole Law, which is Christ (Rom. x. 4, and 2 Cor. iii. 14). They idolized the ritual *letter* but despised its moral *spirit*, and rejected its Divine *life*. God warned them oft (as in Deut. xxix., xxx., xxxi., and xxxii.), but they would not learn. Besides these laws, the whole Pentateuch is often called "the Law," in which Moses has inlaid "mosaically" many passages from older seers and sages, as Adam and Cain, Lamech and Noah, Abraham and Melchizedek, etc. But we find the Divine style and spirit in the whole, and knowing God to be the author, we quibble not about the spokesmen or scribes.

(2.) THE PROPHETS, EARLIER AND LATER.

In the Hebrew Bible, the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings are called "Early Prophets;" while Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor books are called "Later Prophets." Daniel, too, is called a prophet by our Saviour. Moses himself, and Joshua, with Samuel and other Judges and Kings, were prophets, besides their kingly office.

Even the sceptical critics confess that Joshua corroborates the Pentateuch. To silence this witness, therefore, they join his book with the Pentateuch into a "Hexateuch," and impeach all the six, by trying to set the witness of the later books against them, chiefly in this, that the Levitical laws seem to be neglected or unknown in their time.

Is it not amazing that those critics cannot see that this was the very fate foretold by Moses to rebellious Israel—Lev. xxvi., Deut. xx x-xxii., etc.? And the books of Joshua and his successors record how it came to pass (Joshua xxiv. 31; Judges ii. 6-13): Israel had utterly broken the Mosaic covenant after the death of Joshua and his elders. The service of the tabernacle at Shiloh was dying out into a profane sham, till neither people nor priests knew the Lord (Judges ii. 10; and 2 Sam. ii. 12). The Levitical system failed, and its priesthood was changed, necessitating a change of law (Heb. vii. 11, 12). From that time its ritual is generally in abeyance, and the patriarchal order of Judges returns (Judges ii. 28), with its patriarchal priesthood, "after the order of Mel-

chizedek," the Prophet, Priest and "King of Justice and Peace" (Ps. cx. 4). This at once explains and removes almost all the historical objections. The ark of God was taken captive, and never returned to the tabernacle at Shiloh, but was privately secluded from Eli's death till David's days; in type of our Saviour's sojourn and rejection. Now, to say that the Levitical books are therefore of later origin, is as absurd as to say that the New Testament was invented since the American war, because the Churches tolerated "war," and "lawsuits," as well as "laying up treasure on earth," and having "two coats."

With the above explanation, let any man examine the book of Judges verse by verse and chapter after chapter, and he will be surprised to find how perfectly it confirms the books of Moses and Joshua by continual incidents and allusions. So also do the books of Ruth and Samuel, the Kings and the Prophets, the Psalms and the Annals throughout. They all agree with Isaiah that moral obedience is far better than ritual sacrifice, which becomes vain and disgusting without the former. They all agree with Jeremiah that the Levitical law was made in vain for Israel if they use it like a "den of robbers" into which they can escape from duty and justice (Jer. vii. all, and viii. 8). David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah tried indeed to restore the Mosaic ritual, in a modified form, with one temple and ark, typifying one Mediator by whom we can come to God. But their efforts were inwardly failures, for Israel's heart was far from God. Then came their captivity, as Moses foretold. Afterwards Ezra, Nehemiah, etc., tried to establish the entire Mosaic law among the returned exiles, in all its literality and iron rigidity. But still it seemed a piteous failure; for Israel would not perceive the spirit and end of the law, but only its letter and veil. Yet spiritually it was not a failure. For thus God's Word was written, "not for themselves but for us," to be the jasper wall of the New Jerusalem for ever and ever (1 Peter i. 12; Rom. xv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 11; 2 Peter i. 20, 21; Rev. xxi. 12-14; and Eph. ii. 20).

(3.) THE PSALMS AND THE LATER ANNALS.

All these unite to confirm this view. The historical Psalms picture Israel in the outward form of a Church, but inwardly not right in heart with God. To keep them from the grossest idolatry, God put the heavy ritual yoke on them which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. Still, they will not look to Him who is the promised Deliverer, bringing eternal rest, which the first Joshua had failed to give them (Ps. xcvi.; Heb. iii.).

In the closing annals of Scripture, the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah present a piteous picture of Israel under the legal yoke, striving among themselves within, struggling against the Samaritans and the Gentiles without, fighting against fate, yet dreading to write or speak the glorious name of JESU-VAH in which is all their help and hope, as the God of salvation!

Every book of the Bible is thus found to confirm the rest, despite some errors of scribes and some mistakes of expounders, which should not be ignored. But is it not ludicrous to see the same critics who reject as "an interpolation" every text that crosses their theory, yet greedily grasping at every straw of doubt or difficulty, with no doubt of its genuineness? As if some explanatory note might not get into the text by mistake of some copyist; or as if no "Dan" existed but Jacob's son; or as if Jordan itself were named after an earlier "Dan" or "judgment;" or as if Moses himself were not "King in Jeshurun" when he wrote of the earlier Dukes and Kings of Edom; or as if no Jew could speak of himself in the third person, although they constantly did so by the forms "thy servant" and "my lord;" as also Moses did, and his Divine Saviour too, who habitually calls Himself "the Son of Man;" or as if every ANCIENT PARABLE must be a DEAD LITERALISM!

But the Bible, properly understood, is supremely true and consistent. The sceptics may impeach Moses and Joshua as a Hexateuch, but it avails them nothing. On the same principle they must impeach Judges too, in a Heptateuch; then add Samuel, in an Octateuch; then add Kings in an Enneateuch; then the later Prophets in a Dekateuch; then the Psalms in a Hendekateuch; then the closing Annals in a Dodekateuch! Then they must do likewise with every book of the New Testament; and what then? Why, they will have proved the very thing they dread most of all—namely, that the whole Bible has one