

THEOLOGICAL OPENING.

THAT interest in the progress of the Theological department of the University is not abating is evident from the very fair audience of both citizens and students that gathered to hear Dr. Watson's opening lecture of Nov. 2. This is very encouraging when we compare it with the two or three dozen people that we have sometimes seen meeting in a class room to hear the opening address.

Principal Grant presided, and after announcing the results of the matriculation and supplementary exams, and the names of the scholarship-winners (which we publish in another column), made a few remarks on the number of freshmen registered in the different Faculties for the current session. The number is, in Arts, 94; Medicine, 35; Theology, 15; Practical Science, 5; Extra-Mural, 20; total, 169. The Principal said that a quarter of a century ago this would have been considered a respectable total attendance in Queen's or Toronto University. If this year's class represents what is to be the average attendance in future years, Queen's must enlarge its class-rooms. Even as it is, Prof. Cappon has to use Convocation Hall as a class-room, and Prof. Dupuis the hall in the science building. What is needed is a separate building for the Faculty of Theology, with which might be combined committee rooms for the students, a room for refreshments, and a gymnasium. In that case, two or three rooms in the present building could be enlarged to accommodate the junior classes in Arts.

He then called on Dr. Watson to deliver his opening lecture, entitled :

SOME REMARKS ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

The function of a teacher of Moral Philosophy, in these days of progress and contention, is not very well defined, especially on this continent, and more particularly perhaps in this University. So far as Queen's is concerned, this is partly due to the remarkable expansion of her whole corporate life, an expansion of which I can speak with some authority, having followed and shared in it almost from the first. When I came here twenty-two years ago the subjects committed to my inexperienced hands were what was then called Logic, Metaphysics and Ethics, and I was expected to throw in as a sort of make-weight, such comparatively light and airy subjects as Rhetoric and Political Economy. We have changed all that. The Logic and Metaphysics have been transferred to Professor Dyde; the Rhetoric has been merged in the wide and varied domain of English Language and Literature, now one of the most important and delightful studies in the curriculum; the Political Economy has grown into what we call Political

Science, comprehending on the one hand a historical and systematic discussion of Society and the State, and on the other hand a full treatment of the principles underlying the industrial organization of the modern world, and more particularly of our own dominion; and the Ethics—well, there are ill-natured people who have asked: the Ethics where is it? I am not complaining of ill usage. The Ethics has not disappeared, though it is now called Moral Philosophy, and if any outer Barbarian imagines that the Professor of Moral Philosophy is able to lead the life of a lotus-eater, he had better consult one of the honour students in that department of thought. It is enough to say, that the greater division of labour in the staff of the University permits, and indeed demands, increased care and study on the part of every teacher, and not least in the teacher of Moral Philosophy.

However, I am not here to magnify my office. I am merely trying to explain why I appear before you to-night at the opening of the Divinity Hall. Two years ago I consented to superintend some of the studies of the Theological Alumni Association, and last session, by the kindness of our Chancellor, I gave a series of lectures on *Dante and Medieval Thought*, which are now dragging their slow length through the pages of our University magazine, the "Queen's Quarterly." It is not one of the specified duties connected with the chair of Moral Philosophy that its occupant should speak to Divinity students on any of the subjects which they are accustomed to study. It even used to be thought that the less he knew about Theology, or at least the less he said about it, the better for his own peace of mind. I confess that I do not share in that feeling. Nothing is said in the class of Moral Philosophy which it is not open to the whole world to hear, not excluding General Assemblies and other Ecclesiastical Conferences; and I hope nothing is said that does not tend to promote a healthy religion and an enlightened theology. The truth is, that the division between Arts and Theology, which from historical causes has become stereotyped in our Universities, is artificial and misleading. All men are, or ought to be, interested in the development of Theology, and the theologian who, in these days, when men are "swallowing formulas" with a good deal of avidity, is unfamiliar with the results of the best science, literary criticism and philosophy, is not likely to keep the confidence of the young and ardent generation which is soon to push us from our stools. The teacher of moral philosophy at any rate cannot avoid dealing with theology, in the large and liberal sense in which alone a University is justified in viewing it. Theology is the systematic statement of our best thoughts about the Eternal and the destiny of man; and as the aim of philosophy is to