

THE  
Knox College Monthly  
AND  
PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. IX.

JANUARY, 1889.

No. 3.

HERBERT SPENCER'S DEFINITION OF LIFE.

TO define life, or to state clearly wherein it consists, has always been found an exceedingly difficult task. Science and philosophy have both attempted to solve the problem as to what life really is, and both have found their resources taxed to the uttermost in the attempt. Philosophy, following the speculative pathway, has generally been inclined to posit some kind of an entity with which life must be connected, if not identified. Though there are elements of truth in this view on metaphysical grounds, yet the abuse of the doctrine of occult qualities in scholastic philosophy has brought it into disrepute in modern times. Science, on the other hand, taking the definite line of observation and experiment, and finding thereby nothing more in vital phenomena of all kinds than a certain physical structure and definite chemical forces, has been, perhaps, too ready to conclude that there is nothing more involved in these phenomena than this structure and these forces. Both science and philosophy have doubtless something to say in solving the problem. If we rely on one only we may be led to erroneous or one-sided conclusions. Thus, a purely speculative study may commit us to a

theory inconsistent with the facts, and so tempt us to the unscientific procedure of squaring the facts to fit the theory; whereas, a merely scientific enquiry may lure us on to the conclusion that in vital phenomena of all grades there is nothing that cannot be explained by merely mechanical principles and chemical processes. Both science and philosophy have their place and value in the enquiry. Science may gather the facts, enable us to classify them, and help us to understand them in some degree; then a sound philosophy may enable us to announce the underlying principles by means of which the phenomena of life, interpreted so far by science, may receive their rational explanation.

In this connection the views of Herbert Spencer have peculiar interest. Though he himself might not allow us to designate him as the English exponent of Comte, the French Positivist, he could not well object to be termed the modern upholder of materialistic evolution and scientific agnosticism. His opinions regarding life have been before the world in his *Principles of Biology* for nearly a quarter of a century; but interest in these opinions has been greatly revived during recent years by reason of the use made of them by Professor Drummond in his brilliant but defective treatise entitled "*Natural Law in the Spiritual World.*" It is worth while examining Spencer's doctrine with some care, so that we may have a proper estimate of it, and thus be in a position to value Drummond's conclusions in an intelligent manner. If we find that Spencer's doctrine is at fault, we may find after all that Drummond has been constructing an identity in mid-air, which, like gossamer, must be carried hither and thither by every shifting gale. We shall offer no direct criticism of Drummond's well-written and stimulating book, though we believe it fails entirely to establish the identity of law in the two related worlds. We only wish to examine Spencer's doctrine of life and leave the reader to apply our results to Drummond's treatise in detail.

In his *Principles of Biology*, Spencer gives several definitions of life. They are much alike in substance, though some are given in more extended form than others. These definitions are also based on the general principles of Spencer's philosophy as these are unfolded in his *First Principles*. It need only be remarked

in passing that his theory of life can have no more validity than the first principles of his philosophy in general have. This consideration, however, is not pushed against Spencer in our examination of what he holds in regard to the nature of life in general.

That our examination may be the more intelligent it may be well to give Spencer's definition in its various forms. Life, he says, is "correspondence with environment." This is the shortest form of the definition, and seems to be the one which Drummond draws chiefly upon. Again, life is "the continued adjustment of internal and external relations." This is the form of the definition chiefly criticised by Birks. The most complete form of the definition is as follows: "Life consists in a definite combination of heterogeneous changes, both simultaneous and successive, in correspondence with external co-existences and sequences." In our examination we desire to keep chiefly in view this last form of the definition. In it Spencer expresses his doctrine most fully; and we shall endeavour to discover the meaning of this phraseology, which seems to be so painfully technical that it resembles a well-built ironclad.

In the first place, we remark that Spencer's doctrine assumes that vital force is in no important respect different from mechanical or chemical force. Before the doctrine of his definition is made good he must establish the doctrine of the correlation of physical and vital forces. He seems to assume this correlation and thus deny what is really the essential nature of vital phenomena as distinct from physical. Many eminent scientific men, who are not in sympathy with the Christian religion, reject altogether the doctrine of correlation and maintain that, although there may be a certain physical basis of life and a distinct working of chemical forces in connection with vital phenomena, yet life is something more than, and something different from, anything merely physical or chemical. The chemical structure of living protoplasm and this protoplasm at the very moment life is separated from it is precisely the same; yet the one is so different from the other that it cannot be properly put in the same category. That which is living has in it something that enables it to resist the natural play of mere chemical

forces which would speedily produce decomposition and decay. Thus life is even superior to chemical force.

In the second place, Spencer confounds life with its results. He says life is "correspondence," "adjustment," "combination." We would like a little more information on this point. What does Spencer mean when he says that life is mere adjustment or correspondence with environment? What does he mean when he says that life is change, or combination of changes? Correspondence, adjustment, change may be the results of life; but they in themselves cannot be the thing called life. The only way in which Spencer's doctrine can claim any semblance of logic, is to suppose that he identifies life with mere physical change. But even this will not save his doctrine; for, in the phenomena of physical movement and change, we do not perceive the force itself by the senses. We only observe in motion or change the results of force; but the motion is one thing and the force behind it is another thing. So adjustment, correspondence, change may be the products of life, but life or vital force is one thing and adjustment is another thing. This criticism is fundamental, and goes far to show how little logic and how little science Spencer's stately words really contain. This criticism also serves to show to what straits bondage to a theory may bring even a great man. Holding, as Spencer does, that we can know only phenomena and their sequences, while their metaphysical background must ever remain unknown, then he was sure to confound the outward phenomena or results of life with the vital force itself. He would have been more consistent if he had defined life as the unknowable something which resulted in adjustment and correspondence. This, however, he does not do, and so confounds vital force with the products of life, whereas the two are entirely distinct, though related.

In the third place, Spencer's definition speaks of change and combination of changes, and yet provides nothing to be changed or to effect the changes. If life be a "combination of changes simultaneous and successive," then we ask what is that which undergoes the change, and what agency brings the changes about? Is it the conditions of material substance that change? If so, then life can be nothing more than mere physical change in the atomic structure or chemical conditions of certain material

elements. If, on the other hand, the changes are to be viewed in relation to the environment of the living thing, then life is reduced to a mere relation. It is not something which has substantive existence, but is a mere shifting relation. Here, again, Spencer's doctrine fails entirely. All change implies something which is the ground of change and something to bring the changes and their combinations about, though Spencer's expression, "combination of heterogeneous changes," is not very easily understood.

In the fourth place, Spencer's definition marks no real difference between vital and non-vital phenomena. Take any of the three forms of the definition and examine the significance of the words "adjustment" and "correspondence," and it will be evident that they can be applied equally well to what has life and to what has not life. A stone falling from a precipice corresponds with its environment at every stage of its fall. While at rest on the top of the ledge it corresponds with its environment; it is adjusted to its internal and external relations, as represented by its own position and gravity, and by the law of gravitation. In like manner, the stone adjusts itself to external co-existences and sequences, and is in correspondence with its environment every moment till it comes to rest at the foot of the precipice. A burning taper corresponds with its environment during the entire process of its combustion. If a horse, when alive, corresponds with its environment, it also corresponds with environment when it is dead; and the whole process of decay in animal substances is as truly correspondence with environment as is the existence of the animal during the period of its actual life. This element of the definition of life Spencer gives really means nothing so far as explaining what life is, or in showing wherein vital and non-vital phenomena differ. Life and death do not differ.

In the last place, Spencer's incidental admissions destroy the value of his own definition. In the Principles of Biology we find the following statements: "Animal organisms have a *certain power* of selective absorption which adapts the proportions to the needs of the system," (p. 122). "A cell differs from the rest, and *initiates* the developmental changes," (p. 153). "Groups of compound units *have a power of moulding* fit materials into units of their own form," (p. 177). "We may use the term *organic polarity*

to signify the proximate cause of the *ability* which organisms display of reproducing lost parts," (p. 180). In these and many other passages there is the assumption of a something more than the correspondence and the change. The phrases marked by italics indicate what is assumed so clearly that we need not add more.

We conclude therefore that Spencer's definition and the doctrine it sets forth will not stand examination. The somewhat pompous terms in which it is couched seem to hide the admission which Spencer is unwilling to make (but which he does incidentally make very often), that a true doctrine of life involves the existence of a living something different from and superior to, though in relation with, certain material elements and chemical forces, which living something exercises vital activities which manifest themselves in certain well observed phenomena of motion, change, and adjustment. These vital activities are radically distinct from the mechanical and chemical movements of non-vital matter. On this rock Spencer's doctrine suffers total shipwreck.

After having seen how valueless Spencer's doctrine really is on its own merits, we need only ask what becomes of Drummond's identity of law in his chapter on Death? The material for analogy scarcely even remains. To show identity of law is entirely out of the question. Drummond only makes any show of consistency by putting into the definition Spencer gives, the very thing which Spencer is most desirous to keep out of his doctrine, viz., the reality of a living individual something other than what is physical.

It may seem a bold venture, before closing this brief critique, to suggest another and a better definition. If we were to make the venture, we would be inclined to shape a definition as follows:—Life is that principle or ground of activity existing and operating in certain aggregates of material elements in organic form, by means of which certain processes are carried on and certain functions discharged in accordance with given types of structure. Here we have the existence of a principle or ground of vital activity asserted; and this principle operates upon the physical basis of life in such a manner that processes and functions are carried on according to a definite plan or given type. This definition applies directly to vital phenomena and has no significance in regard to that which is non-vital, save to exclude it from the category of living things.

F. R. BEATTIE.

*Theological Seminary, Columbia, U.S.*

## THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND CHRISTIAN UNITY.

THE above is the title of a lecture delivered by the Rev. Principal Sheraton, D.D., at the last annual convocation of Wycliffe College. The lecture is able and instructive, and pervaded throughout by an admirable Christian catholic spirit. It contains a discussion of four articles adopted by the recent Conference of Anglican bishops at Lambeth, as a sufficient basis for the re-union of Protestant Christendom. Evangelical Christians will cordially agree with the general tenor of the views respecting the first three articles, which relate to the Scriptures as the supreme rule of faith and life, to the Apostles' and Nicene creeds, and to the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. They will concur, for example, in the opinion that there should be a more definite declaration of the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith without works than is found in the creeds referred to, which in other matters are defective as an exhibition of fundamental doctrines. But there will not be so general a concurrence in what is said regarding the fourth article of the Lambeth declaration, which makes the "historic episcopate" an essential part of the basis of re-union.

What do the Anglican bishops mean by requiring the acceptance of an historic episcopate? Is it meant that in the re-united Church there must be an order of spiritual office-bearers superior to presbyters, and to whom alone will be conceded the power to ordain, the right to appoint pastors to the charge of congregations, and authority to rule pastors and people? Must Presbyterian ministers, for example, be required to renounce their claim to the possession of the rights and prerogatives of an historic episcopate and must they submit to re-ordination by a prelate? At the present time Presbyterian ministers must be re-ordained by a prelate before they are admitted to the position of ministers in the Church of England, while Popish priests are admitted without re-ordination. Must this rule be continued in the re-united Church? Or, if relaxed, is the relaxation to be conceded only to

the existing generation of ministers? These are questions which must be clearly and distinctly answered before there can be a general acceptance by evangelical Christians of an historic episcopate as an essential part of the basis of re-union. Now, nothing is more certain than that Presbyterians at all events, will never accept as an essential part of a basis of re-union an article which means that Presbyters must acknowledge their inferiority, and submission to a higher class of office-bearers in the Church called prelates or diocesan bishops? In his lecture the Principal states that it is no secret that among the Anglican bishops themselves there is a wide divergence of opinion as to the subject of the historic episcopate, some thinking that if understood in its true sense, the requirement of it would form no barrier to union; while as understood by others, it would be an insurmountable barrier; and in order to explain what he himself conceives to be its true legitimate sense, he discusses three theories of the nature of the Christian ministry which are called the *sacerdotal*, the *mechanical*, and the *organic*.

According to the *sacerdotal theory*, there is "one order of men who stand as divinely appointed mediators between their fellow-men and Christ, apart from whose ministration none can have access to Christ, or partake of the blessings of salvation." This theory involves two assumptions, first, the priestly character of the Christian ministry, and second, the perpetuation of the priesthood by tactual succession. The Principal denies the priestly character of the Christian ministry as inconsistent with the priesthood of Christ, who is the only Mediator between Lord and man, and through whom there is direct access to the Father. On this point he quotes from Bishop Lightfoot, who declares that the Kingdom "has no sacerdotal system," that "it interposes no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man," that "the only priests under the Gospel, designated as such in the New Testament, are the saints, the members of the Christian brotherhood," and that "the most exalted office in the Church, the highest gifts of the Spirit, conveyed no sacerdotal right which was not enjoyed by the humblest member of the Christian community." As to the second assumption—that respecting the succession of the priesthood, the lecturer says:—"We may well ask how can that be transmitted which does not exist?" and "It would seem to be



unnecessary to disprove its existence, but I may remind you that if the Scriptures be examined for some indication of it, Dean Alford can tell you that it is a fiction of which he finds in the New Testament no trace. If history be searched, Bishop Lightfoot cuts it off by the roots, declaring that the episcopate is not a prolongation downwards from the Apostolate, but an elevation upwards from the Presbyterate. Even Archbishop Laud concedes: 'I do not find any one of the ancient fathers that makes local, personal, visible succession a necessary sign or mark of the Church in any one place,' and he says, 'most evident it is that the succession which the fathers make is not tied to place or person, but it is tied to verity of doctrine.'" It follows from all this that any view of the historic episcopate which involves the theory of a sacerdotal ministry, can receive no countenance from evangelical Christians as an essential requisite in the basis of re-union among Protestant churches.

According to what is called the *mechanical theory* of the Christian ministry, there was imposed on the Church at the outset one fixed and unalterable form of policy by which alone its work could be done. The essential idea of this theory is not priesthood, but government. Those, indeed, who hold the sacerdotal theory hold along with it the mechanical theory; but the mechanical theory is held by many who reject the sacerdotal theory. In the Church of England, for example, there are many who have no sympathy with sacerdotalism, who believe that diocesan episcopacy or prelacy is the one true form of Church polity, resting upon divine right, and admitting of no modification. These however do not unchurch Christians outside of their own Church. Thus, in 1618, Bishop Andrews wrote: "Though our government be by divine right, it follows not either that there is no salvation or that a church cannot stand without it." And says Bishop Hall: "There is no difference in any essential matter between the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. The only difference is in the form of outward administration; wherein also we are so far agreed as that we all profess the form not to be essential to the being of a Church." Principal Sheraton rejects the mechanical theory. He does not think that any particular fixed form of government was imposed on the Church by divine authority, and holds that a particular form is

not necessary to the *being* of a Church. Presbyterians hold that although a particular form is not necessary to the *being* of a Church, it is necessary to its *well-being*, and they so far coincide with the mechanical theory as to hold that a particular form of Church government has a divine warrant, and that the Presbyterian polity is that which is divinely warranted. At their ordination, Presbyterian ministers profess to believe that their system of Church government is founded upon and agreeable to the word of God. Presbyterians do not maintain that for every particular detail in their system they can find an express warrant in the Scriptures, but they do hold that there is a divine warrant for the great fundamental principle of the equality of rank and power of the ministers of the Gospel, and this principle they cannot surrender for the sake of union with those who require of presbyters submission to the superior jurisdiction of prelates, diocesan bishops or archbishops.

The third theory of the Christian ministry is the *organic*. According to this theory, the ministry is a divinely appointed function of the Church, not an external and positive institution, but emanating from within through the quickening influence of the Holy Spirit. The organization of the Church (it is said) was gradually formed, the living body putting forth from time to time the organs necessary for the discharge of its functions. Christianity assimilates all that is best in the old forms of literature and politics. At first it assumed the framework of the Jewish synagogue, but it soon outgrew this, as it came into contact with the social and political organization of the Greek and Roman world. Thus, at an early date, the organization of the primitive churches was formed out of the pre-existing elements and methods in the Greek and Roman social life and municipal order. This is the theory of the Christian ministry, which Principal Sheraton adopts and which he thinks best interprets the Lambeth declaration of an historic episcopate. As thus understood, he thinks, an historic episcopate is well adapted to the varying needs of the nations, and that it may be accepted as an element in the basis of union of Protestant churches. Now, it will readily be admitted by students of ecclesiastical history, as a matter of fact, the Church was at first constructed according to the framework of the synagogue, which was of a Presbyterian character, and that by

degrees it became assimilated to the civil government of the Roman empire, that over the order of scriptural bishops or presbyters there arose diocesan bishops, archbishops, patriarchs and popes. But was not this in contravention of what our Lord said to the disciples when James and John aspired to pre-eminent positions in His Kingdom? "Ye know," said he, "that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them, but so it shall not be among you." The Church of England has been modelled according to the principle of assimilation. Its hierarchical system is a close copy of the civil polity of the nation in the reigns of Henry VIII. and the Stuarts. The king was the acknowledged head both of church and state, and the sovereign is still acknowledged as possessing the exclusive power to appoint bishops, to summon convocations of clergy, and give legal effect to their decisions. And, supposing the organic theory and the assimilation process to be correct, which Presbyterians deny, it may be asked why should not church government at the present time be assimilated to the constitutional form of government which now prevails in England, in the United States and in Canada? Principal Sheraton thinks that the Church of England occupies a standpoint peculiarly favorable for the work of mediation between the churches, from her historical, national and religious position. It is natural that he should so think. But may not Presbyterians be permitted to think that their system—occupying, as it does, a middle place between Congregationalism on the one hand and prelacy on the other, and above all as founded upon and agreeable to Scripture—holds the best rallying point for Christian union? They cherish the hope that their system will in the future be generally adopted. In the meantime they welcome all approximations which are made to it. The decisions of Congregational unions and conferences are gradually beginning to assure the character and to have the effects of the decisions of Presbyterian Church courts. In Canada and in the United States the appointment of bishops is no longer in the hands of the sovereign, and the authority of the chief magistrate is not required in order to the summoning or giving effect to the decisions of synods, while to Christian congregations is to a large extent conceded the privilege of electing their pastors or of

refusing to accept the pastors appointed by bishops. These things argue well for the future, as far as regards the agreement of Protestants as to a particular form of church government. But there are far more serious obstacles to church union than are found in the matter of ecclesiastical polity. Baptists, for example, are far more likely to adopt a Presbyterian prelatie form of church government than to admit to their communion persons who have not been baptised by immersion on their making profession of their faith, and evangelical Christians generally would feel less hesitation in accepting a modified form of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism or Congregationalism, than in accepting such doctrines as baptismal regeneration, the transubstantiation of the elements in the Supper into the body, soul and divinity of our Lord, or of yielding conformity to the practices of auricular confession, and the offering prayer to departed saints, and especially to Mary the mother of Jesus. It is well, however, that the question of the re-union of Protestants is being discussed. There is reason to hope that the discussion will lead to a clearer understanding of what is true and right, and tend to hasten the day when the watchmen on Zion's walls shall see eye to eye, when Ephraim shall no longer envy Judah, or Judah Ephraim, and when there shall be nothing to hurt or destroy in all God's holy mountain.

WILLIAM GREGG.

## ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE—II.

"**B**UT what about beauty? We do not *need* that. Surely it is a pure luxury"—somebody objects. No; it is not by any means. We need that quite as much as the other two qualities; but do not confuse beauty and ornament. Ornament must have beauty, but beauty can exist quite apart from ornament. A plain building and an ugly building are not at all the same thing, any more than an ornamented one is necessarily beautiful. "What is beauty, then?" I do not pretend to say all that it is. To investigate it here would be to turn this superficial sketch into an attempt at a philosophic treatise, and I have neither the capacity nor the inclination for any such effort. But though we cannot go into the depths of this question now, it must do us good to think a little about it sometimes, that we may know some of the characteristics our work must have if it is to be beautiful at all.

There are two kinds of beauty to be kept carefully distinguished; one which pleases the senses only and another which delights the mind. It is by forgetting this that many are led astray. How commonly we hear, "I don't know anything about art, but I know what I like"; or "I don't care whether it is correct or not, it pleases my eye," both probably quite true. A child or an uncivilized man will prefer a string of red and green beads to an Italian cameo; they both will like "Pop Goes the Weasel" better than anything in the "Messiah"; and the reason is that there are certain pleasurable sensations from the bright colours and sounds which, though still present, are much subordinated to a higher kind of pleasure in the gem and the oratorio, arising from harmonies only to be appreciated as one's mental faculties are gradually developed—a pleasure which must only be realized to be enjoyed above all else in the world. Persons who will admit this of music, painting and sculpture, often doubt its existence in this "first of the arts," this "petrified music," as it has been called so happily. Yet architecture possesses it in an

eminent degree. The plainest work may have the higher beauty to some extent, while some of the buildings left us in the world seem to hold exhaustless treasures of it—harmonies and melodies in stone. The faculty for enjoying it is one that grows by use rather than by instruction, though the acquiring from others the benefits of their experience must hasten the work greatly. Let us see some of the characteristics really beautiful architecture must have.

It must be truthful. There can be no beauty apart from truth in any architecture, especially in that of Christians. Ruskin is not the only one who holds that "mankind everywhere is the born enemy of lies." We hate shams naturally, especially religious shams. Everybody dislikes a hypocrite more than any kind of knave. Yet we tolerate, we perpetrate a terrible amount of falsehood in the buildings we dedicate to God. Does our work proclaim our character? Are we an untruthful, hypocritical people? Let us hope not; but let us rather see reflected a combination of penuriousness and thoughtlessness, bad faults enough, but better than the other. We do not observe how common untruthfulness is in our buildings because we are so accustomed to it all. Look where you will in our city, you will find it; wooden tracery in half the windows, galvanized iron buttress-caps, "marbled" iron pillars, stucco ornaments, plaster marked in blocks like stone, pine doors "grained" like walnut, bricks coloured and marked with mimic mortar lines. The clerestory of St. Michael's is a deception, so are half its pinnacles, and all those upon the Metropolitan tower; the central cupola of Trinity College, despite its beautiful design, is a wooden lie; falsehood everywhere! It is not true to say that a good imitation produces the same effect as the thing imitated. I doubt greatly if it does at all upon those who seek the higher pleasure, and even upon those who do not, the effect is not permanent. I have known some enraptured with the splendours of Milan Cathedral, until they were shown that the wondrous fairy-work of marble lace in the vaulting is only a painted sham; then they went away disgusted, doubting the genuineness of everything in the building. Better have no ornament than what is untruthful. If we really cannot afford to adorn our works with true art, let us leave them plain. They can be plain without ugliness.

Our church building must be true, and it must be *unselfish*; or else it ought not to be called Christian. "How can a building be unselfish?" you ask. Easily; at least those who build it can be, and that is the same thing; for works always express more than words. If the builders are selfish the buildings *will* show it whether they like it or not. Part of this characteristic has been involved in what has been said already, for the want of self-sacrifice is the cause of most of the instability and untruthfulness of our work. More outlay of time and material would take away the reproach. But there is a further selfishness very common, the kind meant by Emerson when he called many modern works "selfish and even cruel" in their aspect. It is the fault that leads men to spend all the money they have upon the beauty of the interior of their buildings, while they neglect the exterior. An ugly building is like a rude man. However good he may be in other respects, most people will not be able to overlook the selfishness that leads him to care so little for their feelings. I do not say, of course, that the outside of a building must be ornate. It must not be ugly, that is all. Garbett proves that if its outward beauty be not regarded it "displeases all who see it—all whose share of heaven's light is intercepted—whose view of the fair earth is bounded by it; because they see and feel that it benefits its owner at their expense; they have not been thought of in the design; it is *all* for self, without appearing to care whether they are incommoded or not, or to know that there are eyes without as well as within." Some savage huts are better, he thinks, in this respect, for "the rudest of these huts present on their exterior some evidence of unnecessary design. . . It shows the spectator that he, even he, has been cared for as well as the owner, and the structure belongs not altogether to a man, but in some sort also to humanity." This is a line well worth thinking out. Professing Christian work must not display the opposite of the central Christian virtue. Here again, however, thoughtlessness may have as much to do with the trouble as selfishness.

Truth and self-sacrifice are two of the beauties of good building, but they are only two of a multitude. Would that I had the power, the time and the space to enter this intensely interesting, this fascinating field, that I might do something towards drawing more people into the study of this glorious art. More people

must understand it if we ever intend to have any more really great works of architecture. Until the majority, at least, know and love this art we can never again have a St. Sophia, a St. Marco, an Amiens, a Lincoln or a Glasgow Cathedral. "Why?" you say. "Did the majority of the people in the sixth, the ninth, the thirteenth centuries know any more about art than they do now?" No; they knew less, and that is the gist of the whole matter. In those days the architects had everything their own way. Through kings and abbots they could see their designs accurately carried out—absolute monarchs they were in their own world. Now everything has changed and everybody has a say. The majority (I nearly said "the mob") rules the architect without in the least understanding his art. We can never do great things under such circumstances. Now, I know that some will point to Cologne Cathedral as a triumphant refutation of this. It is not a refutation, all the same. Its plan was made by an architect who died six hundred years ago, and that plan has now been carried out by the irresistible will of the monarchs of Berlin and the Vatican. In the good old days when kings ruled nations, they often ruled them well—far better, at least, than they could have ruled themselves; but in our own much better days the people are finding out how to rule themselves, and are gradually making the chief man a resultant rather than a primary force. His business is to carry out the public will in the best possible way rather than to rule the people. He cannot make a change without the consent of the majority; and we find that things go on very well because the majority is an educated one. Art is moving along the same line. It is now becoming popularized, and so the popular character is impressed upon it. It will grow better as the popular taste improves, for the people now control the architect. In the old days he was like a bright spot upon a black background; now he is becoming more like a bit of primary colour amidst all shades and tints. The architect of the future will be like a lens that can focus the rays of light shining from the thousand luminaries about him. Happy day when it comes! It is coming, though it may seem far away. Every straw shows that the wind is that way. We can either hinder or hasten it as we please. One way to help it would be to have the rudiments, at least, of architecture taught



in the schools. "Nonsense," I hear some say, "the children have too many subjects already." Leave out some less important then. It will be easy to find some. "What style could be taught? Tastes differ." Yes; but taste never does. "But architects differ." So do doctors; but we have medical schools, and physiology is taught in our high schools. "If you teach it in school to all the children, it will end in monotonous characterless buildings. Men should be original." You might as well say the same of music. Are composers less original because they must all learn the same scales? Sir Joshua Reynolds says that "invention, strictly speaking, is little more than a new combination of those images which have been previously gathered and deposited in the memory: nothing can come of nothing; he who has laid up no materials can produce no combinations." It was a great step in advance when Oxford appointed a Professor of Art. A little instruction goes a long way. Teach a man, for instance, the radical difference there is between decorative and representative art, and he will see far more beauty than perhaps he ever thought of before in the next specimen he sees of a leaf-moulding, foliated capital or stained-glass window. In this last-named department of the art show him a really good window, and point out its perfections—the glass itself (so few know good glass when they see it), the combining and grouping of the colours, the accuracy of the drawing, the decorative use of every leaf and figure, the unity of the design and the idea the artist wished to express. When he has grasped these principles, watch with what pleasure he will look at all the coloured glass in the city. What progress he will observe from the windows in the north aisle of St. George's Church, put in long ago, to the new ones in St. James' or Trinity College Chapel! How much greater will be his delight when he explores the wonders in glass of the older and richer lands! What is true of the glass is true of the tracery, true of the woodwork, true of everything by which a building can be made more beautiful.

It is by educating ourselves as a people that we can rise to any greatness. No great works can be done again in any other way. The best architect is helpless without the people's sympathy and support. Once working as a people upon true principles, we could wrangle no more about styles of architecture.

We would certainly develop a style of our own fit, durable and beautiful. We never will if we go on as we do now in our thoughtless way of building on one principle, and covering up our structure with the ornaments of another, or several others. We are not unlike ancient Rome in this. That Republic discovered and used a new principle, the compressible, but never acknowledged it in its buildings beyond an inevitable arch or dome, which it disguised as far as possible and covered up the necessary buttress with copies of Greek ornament. Archdeacon Dennison would not admit once that 2 and 2 made 4, because; he said, it might make 22! Fergusson says that the Romans "put things together without end, but never so as to make one harmonious whole out of two things." We try like them to disguise our new principle, the tensile, and we might as well save ourselves the trouble if we ever intend to advance. We must either acknowledge the truss or give it up.

I have tried to show that architecture, and most of all, ecclesiastical architecture, is of vast importance, that it is one of the chief means by which we can glorify God and carry on His work, that it must aim at having all the perfections of which it is capable—fitness, stability and beauty; that these cannot be attained without study, and that all of us, and not architects alone, must devote ourselves to it if we will rid ourselves of the thoughtlessness that marks so much of our work. I have tried to show these things, and if I have not succeeded it is not because they are untrue.

CHARLES H. SHORTT.

## THE EDINBURGH FREE BREAKFAST MISSION.

MANY questions of living interest, social, political, educational, theological, press themselves on one's attention here; but, as they concern tendencies and movements rather than established facts, I shall defer reference to any of them. Winds from all quarters are blowing over Scotland just now; it is difficult for a stranger to find his bearings. There are other subjects, however, matters of fact, not of opinion, which are but to be sympathetically studied to be understood. From among these I have selected, as likely to interest many readers of the MONTHLY, one of the saddest, most pathetic, and at the same time most interesting of the sights of this great and historic city. Principal Cairns, referring to it, said—"No work in our great city impresses me more. Often as I have gone to it I am impressed every time with a deeper sense of the sadness of the spectacle, and of the blessed power of the Gospel of Christ to reach the lowest depths of human sin and wretchedness." If any reader cares to accompany me we will study for a little, not a broken bridge, or old abbey, or castle ruin, but ruined characters, broken lives. I can assure any such that, seen through the eyes of another, the spectacle, if less vivid, is also less tragic than that which may be witnessed any Sabbath morning, between eight and nine o'clock, at the Edinburgh Drill Hall. But, as among the Swiss mountains, whoever would see this sight must rise earlier than the average Christian in Canada or in Scotland cares to do on Sunday morning.

Shortly after six o'clock we start out along a deserted street. The morning is such as we have had four or five times every week during the past month—cold and bleak and drizzling. Crossing "The Meadows" the raw east wind chills the marrow in one's bones, and makes ingratitude itself thankful for food and shelter. We pass the great Royal Infirmary, and soon find ourselves at the Drill Hall on Forrest Road. Already a number of young men have assembled, and are uniting in prayer to God for his guidance and blessing during the day. Much need have they

of higher help than man's, for the work before them is both difficult and discouraging.

All things are ready for the feast ; these messengers, therefore, are sent out, two and two, into " the streets and lanes of the city " to invite the guests. We follow. A few steps down a narrow street and we are in a foreign country—a country of swine and husks. This is the old " Grassmarket." Many of the old buildings, from whose windows spectators watched some of the most stirring scenes in Scottish history, remain. But they are given over to wretchedness and crime. Drunkenness has broken the windows, and poverty has no spare rags wherewith to stop the holes. Dens, misnamed " lodgings," are advertised at fourpence per night.

Out of the Grassmarket we turn down the Cowgate—Edinburgh's social sewer. Two irregular rows of rather dilapidated houses wall in this narrow lane—in some places four or five stories high. Along the busy streets, crossing overhead like elevated railways, all day commerce drives, and wealth and beauty. Here below drink, disease and death hold sway, night and day, from garret to cellar. They say it is not as bad as it was years ago ; but the evident attempts at improvement only bring the darker characters into bold relief. The air is stifling even in the early morning. Already the inhabitants are beginning to appear on the streets. Some are returning from last night's debauch ; some making their morning call at the public house ; some have been out all night sleeping on the stone pavement with no covering save the cold shadow of the bridge overhead. Here and there, diving into shebeens, up rickety stairways, down vile closes, we see our young men distributing tracts and giving invitations to the free breakfast at the Drill Hall. Sometimes they are blessed, sometimes cursed. We will not follow them into any of these closes. They go down into ghastlier settlements and darker breathing holes of lust and crime. Your soft Canadian heart would sicken. You never saw anything like it. Toronto has nothing. Your " noble St. John's Ward " is bad enough, but it needs development. Leave it alone for generations ; let poverty and crime go on with increasing momentum, and then it may show something. It takes centuries to make a Cowgate. Into this place have been

poured the filterings of the city—those who have dropped through the crust of good society—that the delicate senses of the West End may not be offended. What would proud, polished, glittering Edinburgh do without her Cowgate?

But we have reached the end of the street, and are out again in the open sniffing fresher air from the hills. To the right, rising almost from our feet, are the Salisbury Crags, and yonder is Arthur's Seat, nearly a thousand feet high. One arch remains of St Anthony's Chapel; and not far away Jennie Deans waits by St. Margaret's Well in the early morning. Directly in front, across the narrow court, stands old Holyrood, palace and chapel. That front room was Mary Stuart's. The one below was Darnley's; from that window he spoke to the Provost, commanding him to disperse his troops, on the eventful night of Rizzio's murder. Down that hill the ill-fated Bothwell dashed.

The days of pibrochs, tartans and bare knees are come again, days of chivalry and war, with tramp of mailed men and garments rolled in blood. Visions of the dark and bloody past, of what might have been had Knox but quailed, and Mary's bloody——. But hush, say nothing hard against Mary Queen of Scots. The holy Church of Rome has washed her hands, and soon she'll be the purest saint in the calendar.

But you must leave the visionary past for the dark, stern, actual present. We turn up the Canongate, which, with High Street, forming the direct route from the Castle to Holyrood, was once the leading thoroughfare in Edinburgh. Sunday morning and all, the "Chronicles" come to mind. Every close is historic. Every building has a tale to tell. A veritable skeleton has been in many of the cupboards. For centuries the Nemesis of Crime has stalked these streets. Burke and Hare did their work of blood in that house. But we must hasten on as it is nearly time for breakfast. We take a second look at John Knox's house and the room where the great Reformer agonised for Scotland's liberty. "Tron," "Tolbooth," "St. Giles," and a multitude of other names we pass, will live as long as Scottish history holds together.

We are now following the motley crowd, gathered from the places we have visited, Fishmarket, West Port, Cannonmills, Abbeyhill, Leith, staggering up the hill to the Drill Hall. The

guests are welcomed at the door, and given a tract or illustrated paper. Mr. Wilson, the indefatigable superintendent, explains in a few words the aims and methods of the mission.

In 1874 the question of how to bring the worst and lowest of the lapsed masses in Edinburgh under the influence of the Gospel was brought forward. As a means to the desired end it was decided to give a free breakfast on Sabbath morning early in December. It proved successful. Since that date the lowest of the poor, and the worst of the criminal classes, have been gathered together on Sabbath morning in this great hall, where they get a good breakfast, and hear the message of salvation through a crucified Saviour. Every Saturday afternoon a number of ladies meet here to prepare the breakfast. About 120 four-pound loaves of bread, and upwards of 100 pounds of salt meat, are made into good substantial sandwiches. Each guest receives one of these and a large mug of tea. Last year 45,019 guests were served on Sabbath mornings; 16,122 men, 11,653 women, 17,244 children. The average weekly cost of the Mission is about £13. There are no paid workers among the 150 engaged in the work.

It is eight o'clock, and we follow Mr. Wilson to the elevated platform near the rear of the hall, where a choir of about thirty voices are singing Gospel hymns. In a moment all is quiet as a church. Mr. Wilson leads in prayer. Then the workers quietly and quickly distribute the sandwiches and tea. As the feast goes on, watch the scene and study the faces. There is about an equal number of men and women (the children are all served in a separate hall in the rear) seated on the two rows of forms; the men on the one side of the centre aisle, the women on the other. How ravenous some of them appear. What faces! Wretched, scarred, malicious. If the truth were known, and the jail and gallows given their due, some of those faces would be missing this morning. Here and there a decent looking-face is seen like a jewel in an ash-heap. The look of the crowd is most tragic. Five hundred wasted lives! The women are the saddest sight. What histories! What memories! What warping from honour! The euphemism of the newspapers would call these creatures "unfortunates." There is a woman I saw last night crouching against a stone wall in the Cowgate trying to shield her babe from the brutality of its drunken father. The blackened and

scarred faces of dozens tell the same awful story. Some of them knew better days. Do you see that young woman well back in the hall, leaning on the shoulder of her companion? She belongs to a good family. Her pillow was pure as infant ever pressed. Five years ago you might have met her winsome face in West End Drawing-rooms. But she forsook the guide of her youth, and forgot the covenant of her God. To-day she is homeless, friendless, lost, near the bottom of the steep descent. Her murderer you may often see promenading with virtuous ladies on Princess Street. Do not shudder. She has many sisters in this company. Bits of wreck thrown up on the shore of life.

The breakfast is now over, and the whole company join in singing "Tell Me the Old, Old Story." This hymn is a great favorite. What more suitable? Faces say what some lips do not—"Remember I'm a Sinner." A Gospel address is always given on these occasions by some minister, evangelist or other Christian worker. This morning a stranger from Australia repeats the story of the Cross, and pleads with the lost ones to come to Jesus. They never hear the Gospel outside these walls. Hope seems to shine in some faces. But the majority are blank. "Grief has made them unbelieving." The choir sing "Christ Receiveth Sinful Men." Prayer is offered. A few minutes after nine o'clock the whole crowd is out again on the street making their way back to their old haunts of sin and suffering. The large majority will doubtless return to their old lives of darkness and shame. But it may be that some of these outcasts, as a result of this morning's meeting, may yet appear in the wedding garment at the marriage supper of the Lamb.

Simultaneously with the meeting in the large hall, the children are served in the smaller hall adjoining. Here, about five hundred waifs and strays are gathered together every Sabbath morning, and given the only good meal many of them ever get. What towsy-headed, restless ragamuffins are the boys. And the girls, how old and pinched and sad-looking. Mrs Browning's "Cry of the Children" comes to mind—

"Do you hear the children weeping, O my brothers,  
Ere their sorrow comes with years?  
They are leaning their sad hearts against their mothers,  
And that will not stop their tears."

There is something unspeakably sad in the look of these children. Except a few glints on such occasions as this "They never see the sunshine, nor the glory that is brighter than the sun." They were born in sin and nursed in the lap of poverty. Obscene songs were their lullaby. They drank in vice with their mother's milk. They are taught in no school but that of crime, in which some are already apt scholars. Were it not for missions such as this one the future of the majority could easily be read.

They have already been fed and taught some Bible verse. The Gospel story of Him who said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me" is simply told, and not always in vain. They sing several simple hymns. Then they pass out into the cold street. Some of them have no homes, and stand barefooted, shivering on the stone pavement. "It is good," say the children, "when we die before our time." The sight of old men and women dependent on charity is truly heart-rending; "but the child's grief curseth deeper in the silence than the strong man in his wrath."

We have now seen the Free Breakfast. But this is only a part of the work of the mission. There are Sabbath Schools girls' classes, bands of hope, boys' brigade, mothers' meetings, temperance meetings, evangelistic work, lodging-house visiting, men's reading-room, open-air meetings and many other agencies at work. Week after week, and year after year, a band of about 150 devoted men and women toil silently on in this rescue work. Their one aim is to bring the Gospel to these outcasts that they may be saved. You ask about the results. God only knows. Mr. Wilson could tell you of scores who have been snatched as brands from the burning, and show you letters bearing stronger testimony to the power of Christianity than all your theoretical apologetics. Lives have been rescued, souls have been saved, homes have been made happy. But the success of the work will never be known until "He writeth up the people."

When Mrs. Humphrey Ward and the friends of her New Brotherhood establish, not in a three-volumed novel, but among the outcasts of humanity, an "Elgood Street" Mission, and feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and lift up the lost by the power of their new gospel, and after they have done this without even



the applause of the novel-reading world for reward, summer and winter, for fifteen years, it will be time enough for them to inveigh against orthodox Christianity, and turn their backs on Him who, proclaiming Himself the Son of God, "came to seek and save that which was lost," and whose love is the inspiration of this and many similar movements in Edinburgh and throughout Christendom. We know this "Drill Hall," but where is "Elgood Street?"

*Edinburgh.*

J. A. MACDONALD.

## KNOX PREPARATORY COURSE.

THIS course is confessedly inferior to the University course as preparatory to entering on the study of theology. Else it would not be the case that "the General Assembly recommends students for the ministry to take a full course in some approved college, and to obtain a degree of B. A. before entering on their theological studies." The preparatory course in this college, according to the calendar, is a special course, and to be taken only under special circumstances. The comparison made in a paper in the *December Monthly*, between the studies prescribed in these two courses, plainly shows how much in the way of training a student loses, who neglects or is unable to take the university curriculum. Notwithstanding this, the number entering on the preparatory course this year is larger than for some years past; the reason of this we do not know,—it may be that they are all genuine "special" cases, but it would not be surprising to find that this growing tendency is partly the outcome of the widespread notion, which, in the Christian work of these days, puts a discount on scholarship, and a premium on zeal and enthusiasm. Presbyterians have ever boasted of an educated ministry, we should seek to preserve the high standard of education that has thus far prevailed, and bring all possible up to that standard.

One feels almost disposed to think that the Presbyteries are not sufficiently careful as to their counsel to the young men certified by them to the College Senate. Presbyteries are enjoined to encourage students to pursue a liberal, thorough course of study, and yet they are found certifying for entrance upon the preparatory course young men of good parts, in whose way there seems no serious barrier to their taking a full university course. It is possible, too, that the Senate is not always careful enough: but when a student presents himself for the preparatory course, warm, zealous, eager for missionary work, it is easy to advise, it is difficult to refuse him entrance into that department. Generally speaking, the proper time for decided action is before the student presents himself before the Senate.

It goes without saying, that some graduates of the Knox preparatory course are most honored servants of Christ in home or in foreign lands, but they are not so, because they were not able to take a university course,—the loss they sustained in not having a university education was counterbalanced by their rare force of character, and native ability. It may be that, with a fuller and more thorough course, they would have risen to even greater usefulness. Some university men have done little, some preparatory men have done much in the Master's work,—this discussion has to do, not with persons, but with systems.

Professor McCurdy would abolish the course altogether, because it has served its purpose; and, in view of the development in education, and wealth of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, such a course is no longer necessary in any of its colleges. Emphasis is properly laid on the fact, that under the present incomplete course, supplemented by special studies in University College, for which they are not prepared by previous training, the students themselves cannot be expected to be thorough in their methods of study. Probably the strongest charge urged against the preparatory course is the injury it does to the college, to the ministry, and to the Church, by making it necessary to lower the standard of theological study below the capabilities of university-trained men, so that it may be taken advantage of by students, who have had only the comparatively limited training of the preparatory department. Of course, even if the Church should take the action proposed by Dr. McCurdy, there would still be "sporadic instances of exceptional men,"—men "called of God" to do valiant service for Him, and for whom there stand insuperable barriers in the way of their taking a university course; but for such there need not be a regularly established system, as at present. The writer would heartily rejoice with Dr. McCurdy in the abolition of the preparatory course: he is quite sure that, notwithstanding the possibility of slight injury to the mission field, and of some inconvenience to the student, it would serve the best interests of the students themselves, as well as the Church at large. But he is not hopeful that this settlement of the question will be reached for many years,—until, indeed, the Church, through its Assembly, takes decided action, applicable to all the colleges alike.

If the present system is to be continued, even temporarily, what needs to be done to remedy existing evils? To lengthen the course, so as to include the month of April, might put the students of both courses on equal footing as to the length of summer service on the mission field, and it would seem that the carrying out of this proposal would be attended with less injury to the field than might at first be supposed. There seems on the part of many a disposition to extend the curriculum, in respect to time, to four years,—in respect to studies, to be more nearly on a par with the university pass course. Extension of time, if all the colleges acted in concert, would seem desirable; enlarging of the curriculum in the matter of studies might tend to make the course so full as to draw from the ranks of those taking the university work. The greater probability, however, is that broadening the course would cause some of its students, who value a university training and a university degree, to take the better course. It is the writer's judgment that it is in the improvement of the Knox course that the remedy, if any, will be found for the present state of things. Why not make the curriculum in Latin and Greek fuller? The character of the tuition cannot be improved, for the tutors have usually been specialists and successful teachers; but surely the present meagre curriculum in classics might be enlarged with benefit to the students. And why not, in addition to the classical tutors already provided for, appoint a lecturer, whose special work will be throughout the whole session to instruct and "drill" the preparatory English branches? Whatever be a student's acquirements in Latin and Greek, he ought certainly to know well his mother tongue, and be proficient in history and literature; one teacher well qualified and specially charged with the training of the students in these subjects, would be able, during the three sessions of the course, to bring the students to a high degree of proficiency. Thus, too, would the students be better able to profit by the lectures in the English branches, which they are required to attend in University College. Along with all this, let the examinations be stiffened, even if a "pluck" be the result,—if clemency be exercised, let it be towards veritably "special" cases.

W. G. WALLACE.

*Toronto.*

## Missionary.

---

### MISSIONS CHARGED WITH FAILURE.

CANON TAYLOR has recently attempted to demonstrate that "the attempt to convert the world to Christianity by the overthrow of other religions has been a total failure." This Cannonade is hardly worth the powder, but some timid souls feel their faith shaken by this confident assertion, and this is a reason for attending to it a moment. This attack on Christian missions, coming from a clergyman of the Church of England, has the aspect of an admission by a representative Christian. But Canon Taylor is not making his first sensation along this line of attack. "He came out, not long since, with a paper on Mohammedanism (the best part of which was cribbed from a book published, several years since, by the Rev. R Bosworth Smith), maintaining that Islamism is better adapted to elevate savage peoples than Christianity. It may be remarked that the Rev. Bosworth Smith has retracted some of the statements relied on by Canon Taylor, so that he was found to have plagiarized sentiments repudiated by their author." That any consternation should have been created in the ranks of Christian disciples by this late assault in the *Fortnightly Review*, is no compliment to either the learning or logic of such as are dismayed.

The basis on which the Canon founds "the great Missionary failure" will not bear investigation. Without stopping for a thorough examination of all his positions and an exposure of all his fallacies, it may easily be demonstrated that there is no occasion for alarm. There is more flash than force in this cannon's mouth and more powder and paper wadding than shot and shell in the discharge.

So far as his statements are facts, there is nothing new. Intelligent students of Christian missions will not be at all taken by storm or by surprise. The main body of the statements, based on comparative statistics, have already been conceded by

the most ardent advocates of missions and by missionaries themselves. He who has read Christlieb and Thompson, George Smith and Thomas Smith and James Croil, Anderson and Livingstone and Stevenson, Warneck and Doolittle and Dorchester, Henry and Laurie, Bainbridge and Gordon Cumming, Jessup and Hamlin, Gammell and Goodell, and particularly James Johnston's latest book "A Century of Christian Progress," will have seen these "vital statistics," facts and figures so fully presented that but little remains to be added. Indeed to Dorchester and Johnston, Canon Taylor probably owes the material basis for his argument.

But while we concede the *facts*, we dispute the *inferences*. A good scientist or statistician may prove a very poor philosopher or statesman. Even those who have gathered and classified the facts do not follow them with any such induction, as is plain from their attitude toward missions. The authors from whom Canon Taylor gleans his facts and figures are among the foremost friends and most eloquent pleaders of the whole mission host!

Now, when a man writes on the great missionary failure, first of all we would like to settle the meaning of terms. What is a *failure*? Manifestly the opposite of success. And what is success? This is the accomplishment of a plan or purpose. In the last analysis the success or failure of Christian missions must depend upon the real purpose of Christian missions.

It is said that "facts and figures cannot lie." On the other hand they may be presented in so deceptive a garb and form and arrayed in so deceptive a relation that "nothing can be made to lie so badly as figures, unless it be facts."

For instance, this learned canon contrasts the increase of population with the increase of Christian converts, and estimates the former as outstripping the latter at the rate of ten millions a year. Granted. But does that prove missions a failure? Look at the comparative agencies at work producing these respective results. In the unevangelized populations of the Eastern Hemisphere we have some thousand millions of people. Suppose we call their annual net increase one per cent., ten millions. The entire force in the field representing Christian missions is 36,000 including men and women, and of these five-sixths are converts from heathenism. Now, if there be an annual increase of 3,600

that would be ten per cent. on the number of workers. But look how far the actual results outstrip these figures! Last year, the Church Missionary Society *alone* reported 4,000 converts; and in the last year, whose full reports we have before us, the entire gain from the whole mission field, so far as figures were collected, was upwards of 150,000. In other words while population of non-christian countries grew *one per cent.* the number of converts was more than *four hundred per cent.* upon the workers employed! Does that look like failure?

Moreover, let us remember that in this estimate we are counting only what is reported in figures and can be reckoned by a mathematical computation. The greatest part of the actual fruits of missions are those that are incapable of being thus estimated or tabulated. Think of the direct results in the elevation of man as man, in the creation of communities of Christians in the very heart of paganism and heathenism. Think of the new dignity given to honest manhood and womanhood and honest toil; of the new sanctity to marriage and the new security to life, liberty, property and happiness; of the modification and even abolition of cruel rites, customs, superstitions, caste distinctions, and of the diffusion of such ennobling conceptions of God's universal fatherhood and man's universal brotherhood! Then think of indirect results, such as the Gospel's refining where there is no renewing, subduing where there is no sanctifying, of changes that stop short of conversion, but which are immeasurable in their influence. Dr. Lindley used to say that when a naked Zulu had got so far as to get on a pair of duck pants and a calico shirt and sit on a three-legged stool nine inches high, he was about nine thousand miles above the nude natives about him.

It may be true that as yet the efforts of the missionary band, however zealous, have never overtaken the net increase of population; but at the same time we nevertheless affirm, and we dare to challenge successful contradiction, that in proportion to the few men and the inadequate means employed, results so stupendous and amazing have never been shown in all the history of mankind, as appear in the single century of modern missions!

The Canon's argument, instead of reducing Christian missions to an absurdity is itself capable of a *reductio ad absurdum*. It is all grounded upon a fallacious assumption. He calculates that

at the present rate it would take from 300,000 to 1,000,000 years to convert the world. Well, that is rather a remote result to which to look forward. Manifestly we shall not live to see it! But shall missions haul down their flag before this noisy cannonade? Does this shallow argument demonstrate missions to be a failure? Behold the logical consequences as to all other philanthropic and reformatory work. What if it could be shown that, notwithstanding the herculean efforts of the temperance reformers, at the present rate it would take a million years to clear the world of drunkards, or make every man a total abstainer, would that prove the temperance work a failure or lessen the value of the men and women already rescued? On such ground all existing philanthropies would cease to-morrow. A thousand forms of unselfish ministry to human want and woe are in operation. There are asylums for cripples, incurables, the deaf, the mute, the blind, the insane; there are refuges for homeless orphans and midnight missions for abandoned women; soup-houses and coffee-rooms for the poor, night schools and lodging-houses for bootblacks and newsboys, etc. Blindness is said to be on the increase, so is prostitution: all our best efforts do not overtake the orphans or the criminals. Are we therefore to abandon all philanthropic work as a failure, and sweep away all our eleemosynary institutions?

This canon is a clergyman of the Church of England. How does he measure results? After the law of a carnal commandment, or after the power of an endless life? Results that affect the character, history, destiny of a human soul, are not to be counted but weighed, weighed in the scales of God. Who shall measure the value of one human life, the worth of one human being, of one home redeemed from poverty, misery, lust and filth, rum and ruin? We may never overtake the need of men, never banish want and woe by any efforts of our own; but we shall still run the unequal race, and our efforts are not failures, even if eternity be left out of account. Canon Taylor's preaching, it is to be hoped, rescues here and there one out of the thousands or millions about him. Does he consider his ministry a failure? If so, why not abandon his canon's robes for something more successful?

No, no! the fact is his heart is better than his head; his love



is sounder than his logic, and so it is to be hoped he goes on patiently seeking to save here and there one human soul from the awful wreck of faith and hope and love and life!

But, again, he thinks the quality of the converts scarcely justifies the expenditure of lives and treasure. Well, if the average convert in Turkey and Persia, Siam and China, Burmah and Caffraria, is not as good as in most of our Churches, we are sorry. There is no pastor who does not mourn to see the dead wood that gets into the current of a revival and then gets lodged in some bend of the stream to hinder all progress. Half our church members give no sign of vital godliness. In a land where the very atmosphere is called Christian, we have the whole decalogue trampled on by professing Christians. Can we expect a larger average of genuine and steadfast converts where the whole atmosphere is poisoned with paganism?

But here again, there is something beside numbers to be taken into account. The most important considerations defy representation in the crude coloring of the mathematician or the statistician. Did Theodore Parker rise from the perusal of Adoniram Judson's life to declare that if missions had produced but one Judson, they had repaid all their costs? With no less profound persuasion do we affirm the same of multitudes of single converts in the foreign field. Foreign missions would be a grand success, if they had produced no more results than to create out of such materials as are found in such soil, such men as Asaad Shidiak of Syria, Deacon Guergis of Persia, Kho-Thah-Byu and Sau Guala of Burmah, Africaner of the Dark Continent, Rana-valena II. of Madagascar, Kamehameha III. of the Hawaiian Islands, Tawai and Miti in New Zealand, Reveillaud in Paris, and hundreds of others that cannot now be mentioned by name like the converts of Uganda, who sang the praises of Jesus till their tongues were crisped in their martyr fires! What shall be said of the value of transforming men in Pagan, Papal, Mohammedan and Heathen communities into such heroic workers for God and man, and placing them in the midst of society as centres of holy influence?

We are constrained finally to raise the question, What is the purpose of the Gospel in this dispensation? There is a grand distinction which even students of the Word and advocates of

missions often overlook. With the work of *conversion* we have nothing to do, and for that we are not responsible. Our mission is one of *evangelization*. "Go ye into all the world and evangelize—*preach the gospel* to every creature." Our Lord Christ never said that it was our duty to convert everybody, nor did He promise such a result. We give the community a free school, though every boy who goes to school will not turn out a scholar. We are to give the community a free Gospel, though every hearer does not turn out a convert.

"This Gospel must first be *preached for a witness* in all the world." This means no superficial, hasty, formal proclamation of the good news of grace. It means thorough work—the implanting and erection of all the institutions of Christianity. Everywhere men are to be confronted with the Christian Church, and home, school and college, society and civilization. They are to see demonstrated before their eyes, and by the logic of events, what the Gospel of Christ can do for the man, the woman, the child; what it can do to elevate labor, dignify humanity, abolish cruelty, and even discourtesy, supplant caste by a true equality, and lift all society to a higher level. The contrast will thus be made to appear between the religion of the Nazarene and all other faiths. The Mohammedan, Heathen, Pagan, will be compelled to confess the immense superiority of a Gospel that is not satisfied with mere evolution, but demands revolution, and that, not out of ruins but upon them, rears a temple to God, in which unselfishness, benevolence, charity and purity, are the white-robed priests. That is preaching the Gospel as a witness, and it gives to all men a fair chance for intelligent choice. Such is the purpose of the Gospel in the present age, and such is the condition of the Church during this dispensation, *viz., world-wide evangelization*; and so far and so fast as the Church accomplishes that mission, however few or many be the professed converts, so far and so fast does the Church succeed in missions, for she is doing the work her Lord has given her to do.

While it is not promised that everybody who hears the Gospel shall be converted during this age of Gospel witness, great results have accompanied, and greater will follow, the missionary efforts of the Church of God. Already results that rival Pentecostal wonders have been realized. McKay, at Formosa, gathered

1,200 converts at the Lord's table on the twelfth anniversary of his advent to that island. Wm Johnson saw Sierra Leone transformed into a Christian state within seven years. Dr. Clough at Ongole baptised 10,000 converts in three months in 1878. The South Seas were christianized in forty years, from Tahiti to New Guinea. A thousand spires displaced cannibal ovens in the Fiji group in less than half a century. Transformations have taken place within the memory of men still living that are as inexplicable by any human philosophy as the creation of a world out of nothing. Madagascar, Polynesia, the Karens, the Zulus, the Maoris, even the Japanese in our own day furnish modern miracles as astounding as the cleansing of a leper, the empowering of the impotent, the exorcising of the demoniac, or the raising of the dead.

In contrast with Canon Taylor's assault, let us once more summon Darwin, the apostle of materialism, from his grave to give his testimony. Mr. Darwin was not regarded as a Christian, but he had the greatest respect for good in Christianity, and was great enough to acknowledge it. This is the way in which he answered some shallow critics of foreign missionaries. We give space to his testimony because it deserves to be quoted in full. After his visit to Terra del Fuego, he wrote :

"The Fuegians are in a more miserable state of barbarism than I had expected ever to have seen a human being. In this inclement country they are absolutely naked, and their temporary houses are like what children make in summer with boughs of trees. I do not think any spectacle can be more interesting than the first sight of man in his primitive wildness. It is an interest which cannot well be imagined until it is experienced. I shall never forget this when entering 'Good Success Bay'—the yell with which a party received us. They were seated on a rocky point, surrounded by the dark forest of beech; as they threw their arms wildly round their heads, and their long hair streaming, they seemed the troubled spirits of another world. . . . There is in their countenance an expression which, I believe, to those who have not seen it, must be inconceivably wild. Standing on a rock he uttered tones and made gesticulations than which the cries of domestic animals are far more intelligible."

Admiral Sir James Sullivan testifies that Mr. Darwin "often expressed to him his conviction that it was utterly useless to send missionaries to such a set of savages as the Fuegians, probably the very lowest of the human race." But subsequently

about 1867, he wrote to the Admiral, "that the recent accounts of the mission proved to him that he had been wrong in his estimate of the native character, and of the possibility of doing them good through the missionaries, and requested the Admiral to forward to the Society an enclosed cheque for £5 as a testimony of the interest he took in their good work." Yet later, in 1874, 1879 and 1880 he wrote, "I am glad to hear so good an account of the Fuegians, and it is wonderful; the progress of the Fuegians is wonderful, and, had it not occurred, would have been to me incredible. I have often said that the progress of Japan was the greatest wonder in the world, but I declare that the progress of Fuegia is almost equally wonderful. It is truly wonderful about their honesty and their language. *I certainly should have predicted that not all the missionaries in the world could have done what has been done.*

Again Mr. Darwin writes:—

"In our passage across the Pacific we only touched at Tahiti and New Zealand. Tahiti is a most charming spot. Delicious scenery, climate, manner of the people, all in harmony. It is, moreover, admirable to behold what the missionaries, both here and at New Zealand, have effected. I firmly believe they are good men, working for the sake of a good cause. I much suspect that *those who have abused or sneered at the missionaries have generally been such as were not very anxious to find the natives moral and intelligent beings.* They forget, or will not remember, that human sacrifice and the power of an idolatrous priesthood; a system of profligacy unparalleled in any other part of the world; infanticide, a consequence of that system; bloody wars, where the conquerors spared neither women nor children—that all these things have been abolished, and that dishonesty, intemperance and licentiousness have been greatly reduced by the introduction of Christianity. In a voyager to forget these things is a base ingratitude; for should he chance to be at the point of shipwreck on some unknown coast, he will most devoutly pray that the lesson of the missionary may have extended thus far."

There is too much tendency now-a-days to measure missions by mere *mercantile and monetary standards*. The question, "Do missions *pay*?" is a characteristic American inquiry. How much does *each convert cost*? If this method of computation is to prevail, perhaps it would be better carried further, and we might ask how much some of the modern products of our high civilization at home are worth to society.

The logical basis of Mr. Chadwick's recent argument was the

monetary value of saving a human life. Every human being in the land is worth, he says, £159. But is this really so? Mr. Chadwick might remember the story told of a Bishop, who is well-known for his dislike of cant, and his skill in snubbing those who practise it. A pious lady of his diocese was illustrating the doctrine of special providence by a case in her experience. An aunt of her own was setting out on a sea voyage, when she felt "a warning from on high." She obeyed the warning and did not sail. Next day the ship was wrecked, and all the passengers perished. "Was not that saving of my aunt's life a clear case, my lord, of Divine providence?" "I cannot say," replied the Bishop, "for I do not know your aunt."

We are content to leave Canon Taylor's paper with this hasty comment on its facts and inferences. Its answer is to be found in missionary history and biography during the century since William Carey went to India. There is not a missionary on the field whose mind will for a moment be disturbed by the reckless shots from this ecclesiastical gun. These attacks, whether from nominal friend or from professed foe, are like the wild dash of the birds of the night against the crystal enclosure of that superb light that shines on the colossal statue in New York harbor--the assaults beat themselves into insensibility, while the light shines on undimmed, and the grand statue, reared on granite pedestal, stands unmoved and immovable, still guiding the watching sailor to a peaceful harbor.

*Philadelphia.*

ARTHUR T. PIERSON.

## MISSION SALARIES IN THE FOREIGN FIELD.

I HAVE been asked to contribute to the pages of the MONTHLY a paper expressing my own views on the above-named subject. I do not know indeed that I have anything to suggest materially different from what I have already, and with great satisfaction, read in the wise and admirable letters of Professor MacLaren and the Rev. Dr. Fraser, as published in the November issue. I can only hope that, by adding to these excellent papers my personal endorsement, as of one who has had some experience in the foreign field, I may be able to bespeak for them all the more that serious consideration which they abundantly deserve, and which from many thoughtful men they will be sure to receive.

There can be only one opinion as to the moral and spiritual significance of such an offer as that made by Mr. MacGillivray to the Foreign Committee. If Paul might "glory in the churches of God," because of the faith of some of his spiritual children, the Presbyterian Church in Canada may be allowed to "glory" in sons such as this beloved brother; a generation of which he will not be the last, as he has not been the first, in manifesting a like spirit of thorough consecration to Christ, and readiness for all self-denial for his sake.

None the less the important question which has emerged in this connexion as to the possibility of the Church adopting henceforth a much lower scale of missionary salaries, is not to be regarded as settled by any means, even if Mr. MacGillivray, personally, should find that he can live on so small an amount as he proposes, and maintain the highest health and vigor of body and mind. For myself, I feel confident that whatever may be true under exceptional conditions, the average missionary salary cannot be materially reduced without serious detriment in the end to the efficiency and success of the missionary work. In writing on this subject, it may not be amiss to remind some, in the first place, that salary is purely a relative thing. What may be a large salary in one place may be a small salary in another.

The bare statement, *e.g.*, that a man has \$750 a year, conveys in itself no information as to whether the man is living as well as he ought or not. It can hardly mean luxury anywhere; it may often mean practical starvation of mind and body. A second principle on which I would strenuously insist is this: that whatever a Church fixed as a missionary's salary, it should be the same for all her missionaries under similar conditions. The Church does not wish to shew favoritism to any missionary, and the missionaries would wish this, if possible, still less. Granted that Mr. A, owing to the possession of an iron constitution or private sources of income,\* or some other cause, can live on \$500, it would certainly be in the last degree unjust to require that all his co-workers should, therefore, be cut down to the same level. Even if this should engender no bitterness in the mind of any laborer, it might involve in many cases a sacrifice of efficiency which the Church, if she understood the case, would never think of requiring. Or if, on the other hand, a higher salary were to be retained for Mr. A's co-laborers, then, however he and they might understand the case, and heartily agree that Messrs. B & C should have more, this difference would be morally sure, in the minds of less well-informed persons at home, to occasion unjust and injurious judgments regarding the brethren who had the larger salaries. They would be sure to say, "Very strange this! that while Mr. A can live on \$500, Mr. B must have \$750!" and then proceed to estimate Mr. B's Christian character and self-consecration at least thirty-three percent. lower than that of his brother; while all the time it might easily be that to live on \$750 in the one case involved more of real sacrifice than to live on \$500 in the other. It thus seems as clear as the light that whatever the salary in any mission field should be, it ought to be the same for all living under the same general external conditions. On carefully ascertained data, it must be decided what in a given field may be regarded as a fair average stipend, and this must be given to all. It evidently would not contravene this principle should the missionary's salary be graded according to time of service; an arrangement not unknown on the foreign field, and in favor of which much might be said. If any individual can live on less, the

---

\*I make no reference here to any one of our missionaries; I know not that one of them has any income beyond his salary.

Church must trust him with the same liberty that she accords to all ministers and laymen at home—to use the surplus of income as conscience may dictate. And thus far this seems to have been the unvarying judgment of the committees of all the great Missionary Societies. What the fair stipend may be for Honan we do not yet know, nor can we tell till after our missionaries there have had some experience of the conditions of life. Meantime, it seems most equitable that, provisionally, it should be fixed at the same which the American Presbyterians have found proper in the adjacent province of Shantung.

I suppose it will be generally admitted that if our missionaries in India and China were to adopt in general the native mode of living, it would cost the Church much less to support them than at present. Hence many are hastening to the precipitate conclusion that if this is so, then certainly our missionaries should be expected and required to adopt this style of living. But this will be very far from self-evident to any who have any intimate knowledge of the conditions of the case. Several distinct matters are involved in this question. For instance, we may apply the question to the matter of *dress*. Is it better that a man should dress as the natives of the country? We are persuaded that the true answer will be that sometimes, perhaps, he should, and sometimes he should not. The China Inland Mission, indeed, require all their laborers to dress as do the natives. There is seeming force in what they urge, that their personality is thereby the less conspicuous in a crowd, and they are less obnoxious to the prejudices of a population unfriendly to foreigners. On the other hand, however, I am told by other missionaries in China, no less devoted and no less successful, that whereas the Chinaman knows after all that this man is a foreigner and not accustomed to dress in this way—this guise of his—in the minds of a people who are sadly incapable of understanding disinterested self-denial for the good of others, is very liable to raise a suspicion of some ulterior object on the missionary's part, which he hopes the more easily to gain by disguising, as far as possible, his foreign character. As for India, with the exception of the Salvation Army, it is the uniform practice of all missionaries to retain the European dress. Although I think the dress of a respectable native gentleman in



India far more graceful and becoming, intrinsically, than our own, and excellently adapted to the climate, yet in common with every missionary I have met in India, I believe the general adoption of this dress would, in a religious point of view, be a mistake. And this not only for the reason above-named, but because it is ingrained into the mind of every Hindoo and Mohammedan in India, that dress and religion go together. The Mohammedan buttons his jacket on one side, the Hindoo on the other, and so on. The general adoption of the Hindoo dress by all missionaries, could hardly fail to be regarded by many as a constructive religious concession, and tend to deepen these fatal misconceptions as to the nature of true religion. Whereas, when, as now, the missionaries dress as Europeans, and of the native Christians, some as Mohammedans, some as Hindoos, and so on, we thereby say in the plainest and most unmistakable terms to every one, that dress, so it be decent, has nothing to do with religion.

Secondly, there is the question as to *abode*. Some travellers seem very much troubled that missionaries have so comfortable houses. I cannot speak for China, as I have never been there; but I will say that I should regard it little less than criminal to require a missionary in India to live in this respect as the mass of the natives. People here cannot understand what it means to live in a temperature, as in North India, where the monthly average of the thermometer is never as low as the average of the hottest summer month, *e.g.*, in Philadelphia, except in the cool (?) months of December and January! and ranges from that up to an *average, for the twenty-four hours*, of from 97 to 99 degrees in the shade, and from 170 to 177 degrees in the sun for several consecutive weeks in the summer. I can only wish for any who think that missionaries in India ought to live in houses like the most of the natives, that they should undertake the experiment themselves for twelve months in North India; after which, I should like to talk further with such of them as were still alive, and ask how many more converts they had gained thereby than the brethren who had lived in a comfortable bungalow, to compensate for so grave risk to health and life? Or, if then any one will say, let the missionaries live in better houses, like the better class of natives, comfortable

enough, no doubt, at some seasons, I would merely remark that such as these would cost no less, and often more than those which missionaries actually occupy.

A third element in this expense question is that of *food*. It is a very important one. I presume that this item makes one of the most serious and notable differences in the expense of living between the missionary and the mass of the people. Let me preface my remarks on this point by saying that, so far as India is concerned, I have no aversion to native dishes. I have eaten about everything that they prepare, and often with much relish. But all the more because of this experience, I am prepared to affirm that the attempt to adopt the native bill of fare, throughout, would be likely, sooner or later, for the most of Europeans in India, to prove an experiment dangerous to health, if not to life. For it must be remembered that by a continuous process of "survival of the fittest" the Aryan population of India has, in process of several thousand years, become adapted to the conditions of climate in a degree that we cannot expect to find in the average European or American. The latter will find the climate, the heat and malaria, surely and almost inevitably lowering the vital tone, and therewith the appetite and power of digestion. Hence, if wise, he must study the question of hygiene in eating (as in all else) continually; and I will venture the assertion as to the great majority of our people, that if they will attempt to live on the leathery and indigestible cakes called *chapâtis*, which are the bread of all classes, or the highly spiced and seasoned curries of various kinds (which I like exceedingly), or a diet of rice and vegetables only (a favorite dietic-hobby of some), they will do so at a peril to health which, as the servants of Christ, they have no right to incur without necessity, and which I am confident that Christians at home, if they understood the conditions, would not for a moment wish to ask of them.

I may add as an item of expense in the personal expenditure, the element of *servants*. Many ask impatiently, "Why should not our missionaries and their wives do their own work, as in many ministers' families in the country at home?" I answer, "For the simple reason that for them so to do would be to waste the money of the Church." Suppose, *e.g.*, that a man goes to India on \$500 a year—less than our Church gives—will it

pay for his wife to let mission work go, to do her own cooking, when a man can be got to do it for \$25 a year or less? Will it pay for the missionary to look after his own horse when he can get it done, as in North India, for \$2.50 or \$3 a month? Will any one say that it were wise economics for any Church by a reduced stipend to compel her missionaries to do such things themselves? Is it not plain that this were simply to decide to pay at the rate of \$500 a year for work which it could have done by the natives for one-tenth of the sum; while the work for which the Church sent out the missionary, is meantime by so much interrupted and diminished. These things may in some times and places be a stern necessity, but that the Church should by smallness of stipend place her missionaries in a position which should render anything of this *necessary*, is so preposterous that we are persuaded there is no intelligent person but will protest against it on the bare ground of economy of money.

And yet suppose that here and there a man can in all these respects "live like the natives," and not suffer in health or in other ways lessen his working power; is it right to make such exceptional individuals the law for all, and by the adoption of a narrow scale of salaries, practically *force* all either to be stretched on the same Procrustean bed, or else run the risk of a break-down and death, or return home?

I have not alluded to another element in the question of the expense of living. I wonder that in many discussions of this question, I have never seen it mentioned. It is the question of *books and reading*. Will anyone have the missionary "live like the natives" in this matter? Yet many seem to imagine that the missionary can really have no occasion for any book but his Bible; and with a Bible, a straw hat, and the traditional "palm-tree" under the shade (!) of which to preach, think they have a complete missionary outfit! It is commonly admitted by intelligent people that it is a great shame that many churches at home so meagerly support their ministers, that they can rarely afford to get a new book; and that in this they do themselves grievous injury, by thus hindering their minister from instructing them and serving them in the Lord as he might. The reasoning applies with even greater force in many missionary fields. Oriental books are expensive; yet if the missionary will become a first-

class scholar in the language and philosophies of the people, as he is bound to try to be, he will deny himself helpful books only to the detriment of this object. Nor must it be forgotten that the false philosophy and science, and the destructive criticism of Europe and America has already found its way among the educated classes of India and Japan, and many other heathen countries; and, if I mistake not, the missionaries who are now entering China, will soon have to face these questions in the streets of Chinese cities also. The study of works which shall equip a man for such controversy is already more necessary for many missionaries in India than in most Canadian parishes. Shall the missionary be enabled to get these or not? It were worse than folly to preach philosophy or science; but it is worse folly, however common it is becoming, to condemn our antagonists, and vainly imagine that we can serve the Lord better by ignorance than by an intelligent acquaintance with the errors of those who contend against us. And, then again, the Holy Scriptures are to be translated, or revised, and a literature, expository and other, must be prepared for the rising Church. Will a man, unable to afford requisite books, be able to decide, in translation, for instance, which of two readings should be preferred as the true Word of God, by a faculty of spiritual intuition? Such questions answer themselves. We may be sure that whatever service, more or less, the Salvation Army may accomplish by "living like the natives,"—so long as they may be able to live at all,—of such most vital and fundamental work in the building of Christ's church, they will do nothing at all! And yet their example is commended to us by some as a model of economy in mission work!

Another element in the expense question might be discussed at length, but this paper has already far exceeded its intended limits. It is the question of a *celibate service* on the foreign field. There is no doubt that it would be possible to support a body of missionaries much more cheaply on this plan; but would it be wise? That in exceptional cases it may be undoubted duty for a man—to use Christ's words—to "make himself a eunuch for the kingdom's sake,"—no one will deny; but that the cause of Christ would be better served among the heathen by a body of celibate missionaries—"costing so much less"—this is to be denied with all possible earnestness. In

this notion, of late so zealously urged by some, we have no new theory. This is not claimed. Strange indeed to say,—the advocates of this theory point us as an argument to Romish missionary work. In answer, I also point to the history of Romish missions! For the Roman Church has been engaged in an experiment of this kind for centuries. And while we may gladly admit that there have been among her celibate laborers, many men and women of saintly purity of character, yet the general result of this experiment has been such as to cover that Church with an infamy which can only be effaced by the fires of the Day of Judgment. Let the condition of the priesthood and people in such lands, *e.g.*, as Mexico and other Papal States of America, bear testimony in this matter!

I may close this article by extending this remark to cover this whole question as to the wisdom of any policy which shall require that missionaries “live like the natives.” The experiment has been tried on a world-wide, age-long scale by Rome ever since the day of the so-called conversion of Europe, and the effect as a general rule has been, as in India, not the Christianizing of heathenism, but the heathenizing of Christianity.\* So, while there may undoubtedly be individual exceptions to the general rule, we should protest to the last against the adoption of any scale of missionary stipend, or any other “new departure” in missionary policy, which should practically require the missionary to lead a celibate life, or that he should “live like the natives.” How far, in any particular case, any may safely conform to native usages must be left wholly to the individual conscience. If any man in anything, dress, food, abode, at any time, in any place, will do it, let him do it, and without blame. Little harm may result from such individual action; it may even sometimes be a duty. But let the Churches beware of making such a requirement a governing principle of missionary policy! We, in this nineteenth century, have quite too much Church History behind us with its sad and awful warnings, not to be very careful in this matter! I will let others speak for China; I am persuaded that as regards India, at least, the notion that the missionaries would thus better win the confidence of the natives, is but a dream! I may be pardoned for personal reference, when I say that I have

\* Might not this remark be applied to Europe also?

tried both ways, heartily willing for either, if thereby more might be gained for Christ. I have traveled, preaching, with oxen and tents, sleeping in a bed like other Europeans,—not in luxury—but in comfort; and, again, I have tramped on foot, without equipage, eaten with my fingers, to the wonder of staring villagers, slept on the ground under a tree, or lain down in the straw with naked faqeers, in a sheep-shed! But I could never discover that the natives were any more accessible in the one case than in the other. I am reminded here of a remark once made to me upon this subject by a saintly missionary of simplest habits, who had seen forty years of fruitful service:—"It is not of so much importance for winning souls what a man wears, as what the man *is!*" I always found the mass of the people of North India, as a general rule, thoroughly accessible to the approach of kindness and conciliation; to many I became sincerely attached, and am obliged to them for many acts of kindness. I believe that many of them were also attached in friendship to me. And in this my experience is nothing peculiar. I believe that the missionaries of every Protestant body in India have, as a class, the hearty confidence of the great mass of the people, to a degree that would be nothing increased by any such change of policy as some have suggested. And I may remark in closing, with a full apprehension of the gravity of the charge,—that some recent statements to the contrary, whether made by members of the Salvation Army, or by high ecclesiastic, are hurtful *slanders*, the criminality of which can only be palliated by an ignorance so incomprehensible as to seem itself quite inexcusable.

*Toronto.*

S. H. KELLOGG.

## Editorial.

### PRESBYTERIAL CONFERENCES.

IN holding a conference on devotional and practical subjects the Toronto Presbytery at its regular meeting in December began, or rather revived, a practice that, if regularly and generally followed would undoubtedly prove of value to the spiritual life and work of the Church as a whole.

We may contend as earnestly as we please that all the Church's business is spiritual, but so long as our meetings are confined largely to routine business with almost no recognition of devotional life and practical work, extra Presbyterial conferences, with the sole aim of developing the spiritual life of the Church, will multiply. Thus, the chasm between the Church's business and the Church's life will tend to become wider and wider, and Presbyteries and Synods will cease to exercise any direct quickening influence upon those who attend them.

Such conferences either in conjunction with the meetings of Presbyteries and Synods or as a regularly recognized part of their sederunts would tend to avoid the break that is fast taking place. They are much needed by pastors and elders. There is a constant drain upon their spiritual resources by coming daily in contact with those who are living on a lower plane of Christian experience than themselves, and, lacking *the stimulus of fellowship, the natural tendency is to become cold and formal*. It may be said that in closet prayer with the Father we can have our strength renewed. While this is true human nature demands, and the Word of God recognizes the benefits of, "Fellowship one with another." The consideration of the topic so earnestly and fully presented at the afternoon session of the Conference above referred to, viz:—"The Fullness of the Blessing of Christ (*a*) Freely Offered (*b*) Imperfectly Realized"—is just what pastors and elders need to revive their drooping energies.

By thus conferring together we would also constantly be learning from each other newer and better methods of doing church work. All trades and professions are acting upon this principle and we hear, for instance, of Farmers' Institutes being held all over the country where the best methods of farming are fully and earnestly discussed. But the Church has not to any extent adopted a similar course, thus proving

that, "The sons of this world are for their own generation, wiser than the sons of light." In such discussions let what has actually been done or what is sought to be accomplished be presented, and not mere theories of what might be done if circumstances were so and so, and the objection that such conferences are mere "talky, talky" places, will cease to be made. The great hindrance put in the way of such conferences is the lack of time. But surely we have all the time there is, and if time spent as the disciples spent it during those ten days they were in the Upper Room at Jerusalem, or as the Church spent it hearing what the Lord had done through the Apostle Paul, is not properly employed, it is difficult to see how it can be rightly spent. The Church is apt to all run to head, but the highest results can only be reached when head and heart grow together.

#### QUALITY IN WORK AND WORKERS.

MOST men ask themselves some time or other the question, How *much* work have I done within this or that period? And they are apt to commend or condemn themselves as the amount of work they have done is greater or less. But there is another and much more important question that ought to be asked and honestly answered by every worker. This question is, What *kind* of work have I done? Quality in work and in workers is a much more weighty consideration than quantity. And yet, from the amount of hastily-done, slipshod work that is continually being turned out, and the tendency to estimate the influence of an organization by the mere number of its agents, one might fear that many workers make quantity the chief consideration.

In this high-pressure age there is to be found everywhere the temptation to sacrifice quality to quantity. And nowhere, perhaps, is this temptation stronger than in student and professional life. To satisfy the demands of frequently recurring examinations, the student is compelled to go over a certain amount of work. In order to accomplish this he must hurry over many a field of investigation where he would gladly linger and make a minute and thorough inquiry. When he passes into a profession the multifarious demands made upon his time and attention often interfere with the concentration that is essential to the doing of the best kind of work.

The result of the pressure that is brought to bear upon men to produce a great quantity of work in a short time is, that much of the work is poor in quality. There is a great deal of inferior writing and inferior



speaking. Mediocre physicians and lawyers and teachers are plentiful. Excellence is a rare attainment.

It is often difficult for one to resist the pressure placed upon him to undertake more work than he can do well. And yet, this pressure must be resisted if work is to be done that needs no apology. If a man is to do anything well he must refuse to listen to a thousand demands upon his time. He must often refuse to do a great many things that are in themselves good and praiseworthy. First-class work of any kind is the result of long-continued, concentrated effort.

The way in which a man does his work exercises a reflex influence upon himself as a worker just as the use made of the body results in physical degeneracy or improvement. The student who does not do his work well in college is almost certain to develop into a man whose work all his life is of inferior quality. If a student goes through the curriculum of his college with an honest, painstaking striving after knowledge, he will almost certainly do good work in his chosen profession. Whatever he does, much or little, will be well done.

There is no calling in which there is a more crying demand for good work and good workers, than in the Gospel ministry. And no enterprise of the Church needs good workers more than that of foreign missions. A man who is to enter upon this work, ought to be a tried and tested man. There can be no better test of a man's fitness for this work than that furnished by the way in which his college work has been done. If he has been a good and faithful student he will, in all likelihood, do good and honest work for the Church, at home or abroad. A disposition to shirk hard, protracted study or to get through his college course without doing the prescribed work, cannot be made up for by any amount of so-called enthusiasm. There is no place where the difference between a good worker and a bad one is seen more clearly than in the class-room or study. There is room for any amount of courage and determination and faith within the four walls of a man's study in fighting the temptations to indolence and slovenliness and conceit that beset the earnest student. And the student who fritters away his time whether in downright idleness or in doing anything that interferes with earnest, exact study, is not doing good work as a student and is unfitting himself for doing good work anywhere. Let those who want to work for Christ be sure that the work they are doing is just as perfect in its kind as they can make it and that they are just as efficient workers as they can make themselves.

## ABUSE OF THEOLOGICAL OPTIONS.

EVER since the introduction of theological options into the University curriculum, it has been questioned by many whether the opportunity given of substituting certain subjects usually connected with a course in Divinity for certain regular pass-subjects of the third and fourth years in Arts, was a real benefit to anyone. While we do not doubt that it is important that some knowledge of Apologetics, Church History, and Biblical Greek, be possessed by all, it is yet felt that, in proceeding to a degree in Arts, subjects of such general interest as Moral Science, Civil Polity, Physics, European History and Classical Greek, should not be set aside for those of a more specific interest mentioned above. This change, inaugurated some years ago, is now seen to be but one direction in which there is being manifested a tendency to make professional training a part of the university course.

But whether these options be beneficial or not to the hard-pressed student about to enter on his theological course, for whose advantage they were first intended, all must regret an abuse of this privilege to which it has become necessary to call attention. Attracted apparently by the fact that the amount of time and energy required to read extracts from the Gospels, or one of Paul's epistles, or even both these, is less than that expended in the preparation of either a play of Euripides and an oration of Demosthenes, or a dialogue of Plato and two books of Xenophon's Hellenica, a few students who have no intention of studying for the ministry are substituting Biblical for Classical, Greek, and some, it is said, are even studying not at the theological college of their own denomination, but at that at which they think they will pass the required examination with greatest ease.

Clearly the only advantage of such a state of things, so opposed to the object of those who instituted the change, is that it may lead to the withdrawal of this doubtful advantage of affiliation. It is plain that the Senate of the University can make no distinction between those who intend to study theology and those who have no such intention. The restraining of the evil lies wholly in the hands of the theological colleges. Let the senates of these institutions absolutely refuse to admit as regular attendants at lectures and examinations any but those whom they have good reason to believe intend to continue their studies with a view to entering the ministry, and the evil now complained of will be obviated.

## Open Letters.

---

### THE STUDY OF NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS.

I HAVE just returned from Glasgow where, during the past fortnight, I had the opportunity of hearing two series of lectures on the Religions of the Nations. One of these was the Gifford lectures on "Natural Religion," in Glasgow University, delivered this year by Professor Max Muller, of Oxford; the other was Professor A. B. Bruce's lectures to his students in the Free Church College. I wish to refer briefly to these lectures, and to express my strong conviction that the time has come when more attention should be paid to the study of non-Christian religious systems, in the hope that those interested in theological education in Canada may consider the advisability of making provision for this study in our theological colleges.

Max Muller is one of the greatest living authorities on the subject treated of in the Gifford lectures. His views are fully stated in his published works, and these lectures are practically the summing up of his life-study. Students will be glad to know that a popular edition of his complete works will soon be published.

These Gifford lectures impress one with the fact that, whether Max Muller is right or wrong in his theory, students of theology cannot afford to be ignorant of non-Christian religions. It is gratifying, therefore, to know that this fact is recognized in the Free Church College, and that Dr. Bruce—than whom no man in the theological halls in Scotland is better fitted for the task—devotes some ten lectures to this subject. I would not venture a statement of Dr. Bruce's position in a few sentences. His standpoint may be learned from Chap. III. of his "Chief End of Revelation"—which chapter deserves a reading in this connection. In his college lectures his aim is apologetic, not merely scientific. He confines attention to the great historic religions of India, China, Persia, Egypt, Greece, and those distinctively called Semitic, including Mohammedanism. Having Christianity always in view, he examines these systems as to their idea of God, the prominence given to the ethical element, morality taught or practised, doctrines of a future life, the connection subsisting between any one of these religions and that of the Bible, any affinity and its explanation. Among other apologetic questions

raised is the bearing of the history of these religions on the Bible account of the origin and primitive condition of mankind. With this are involved the questions of the unity of the race and the hypothesis of original revelation.

I am not concerned, however, to explain or defend Dr. Bruce's position and method. My purpose is much more important—to urge that provision be made for such study in Knox College. So little attention has been given to the comparative study of religions that it is practically neglected altogether. As a result, many regard all religions outside their own as “inventions of the devil;” and were it not for the information, always fragmentary, sometimes erroneous, received from missionaries, many ministers could not safely venture beyond the statement that “the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty.” To remedy a state of things that is surely not creditable, I propose this systematic study in college.

Much might be said in favor of the study of non-Christian religions. I indicate but two lines of argument:—1. An intelligent study of the Christian religion demands a knowledge of the non-Christian. No one religion is absolutely independent of all other religions. Christianity historically stands related to other religious systems. To say that the Hebrew religion contained all God's truth, and that all other religions are false and altogether false, is obscurantism. And to say that outside the chosen nation God left himself without a witness, and that in those religions, whose devotees in every age vastly outnumber the followers of Christianity, there was no ray however feeble, no twilight however dim, is paralysing pessimism. Now, in claiming for these great historic religions some attention from the student of Christianity, I am not carried away—nor are those alumni of Knox College who share my opinions—with the fascinating theory of the evolution of religious thought. We believe, with Sir Monier Williams, that between our Holy Bible and the Sacred Books of the East there is a great and impassable gulf fixed hopelessly and forever; that between our Christ and Vyasa, or Zoroaster, or Confucius, or Mohammed, or Buddha, there is an abyss bottomless and bridgeless, never to be spanned by any science of religious thought. But this does not say that the study of these religious systems has no apologetic value. Indeed, such study seems immensely more valuable than much of the apologetical study done in Scotland at the present time—combating heresies long ago exploded and making carefully prepared attacks on systems dead and buried and embalmed centuries ago.

2. The other argument in support of such study arises out of the present interest and activity in missionary enterprises. We are bending all our energies and devising many schemes for the overthrow of heathen relig-

ions and the establishment of Christianity in the world. Is it not time we got beyond a few vague generalizations, and measured the strength of our opponents? Scores of ministers in Canada cannot even classify the non-Christian religions, not to speak of expressing an intelligent opinion about them. Hence the missionary addresses one sometimes hears. Hence the God-dishonoring arguments sometimes used. But misrepresentation of a nation's religion, whether wilful or ignorant, is immoral, even though it be to produce a background sufficiently dark for modern Christianity. Then when one considers the case of those going to the foreign field, the need for such study is surely abundantly manifest. They must face these religious systems. They should know their strength and weakness. Crude notions will not do. Indiscriminating onslaughts will not avail. They must know. How necessary, then, such study in college. I know that these systems have degenerated; that the religions of to-day are as far removed from that of their Sacred Books as is some of our religion from our Sacred Book. They began with bright flashes of light and are now in darkness. But the Christian missionary must know what that light was, whence it came, and what it meant.

But an open letter does not admit of more than a reference to these questions. What I desire is that the matter may be discussed in the MONTHLY, and by those who have fully considered it. Should it be deemed advisable to establish such a lectureship, action should be taken at once. Of course the value of such study would depend largely on the competency of the lecturer. Men like Max Muller and Prof. Bruce are not numerous in any country. And an inadequate, one-sided, unsympathetic presentation would be prejudicial to truth. The view must not be narrower than that presented on Mars Hill. The lecturer must not only have mastered his subject, but must have sufficient sympathetic insight to understand that speech of the Apostle to the Gentiles. The appointment, however, is for after consideration. What I press is the principle, and trust it may be considered in subsequent issues of the MONTHLY.

*Edinburgh, Dec. 20th.*

J. A. MACDONALD.

## Reviews.

THE CREDENTIAL OF SCIENCE THE WARRANT OF FAITH—BY PROF.  
J. P. COOKE. Carter Bros., N.Y., 1888.

It is refreshing to get a work on Christian apologetics from Harvard, especially since Atheism is diligently taught in the philosophic department there. Over against "Cosmic Theism," stands the volume of Prof. Cooke. It has come to us by way of the "Ely Lectureship" in Union Theological Seminary, New York, which is doing so much to buttress Christian truth.

Prof. Cooke addresses a larger audience than that accustomed to assemble in Adam's Chapel, for this book will be read by scientists. Its aim and method is severely scientific, nor can theologians afford to pass it by who wish to follow the trend of scientific thought and its bearing on Christianity.

The author, while holding a brief for the supernatural, confines himself strictly to the lines of natural theology. In the opening chapter he presents the *status questionis* in a somewhat novel aspect; from the standpoint of natural theology our reasoned theism rests on an inductive process. This relegates deductive arguments to the status of attempts to give syllogistic expression to the theistic conviction in the mind.

We believe, certainly, that the time has come when apologists should cease attempting to establish their arguments for the existence of God by assuming them in the premises, and then finding them in the conclusion of a syllogism. This attitude, so very antagonistic to the methods of scientific men, is in no small degree responsible for the present conflict, or supposed conflict, between theology and science. Considering not the doctrines of Christianity as a system of revealed religion, but the facts of Christianity as external verities, the author thinks that the idea of God is largely developed by experience, and so is inductive. Holding, as we do, the views of Calvin, Turretin and Hodge on inspiration, we object at the outset to the statement "that the so-called induction resembles inspiration, and the loftiest inspiration seems to be only the same faculty of the mind more highly developed."

Passing this, let us hear Prof. Cooke. In the growth of the idea there is, first, will emerging in consciousness. Then the conception of power arises from conflicts with the will. Thus the idea of energy in our own experience irresistibly impresses us with the idea of a God of power. So, from our experience of the fitness of things, we reach the idea of His skill. The beauty of the external world is paralleled by His perfection, order by law, and sacrifice by love in a supreme intelligence. This is purely inferential, and so not satisfactory in every respect. We would rather say that man comes from the hands of his Maker with a highly-illuminated moral consciousness, and endowed with germinal

theistic ideas. Then through contact with Divine revelation, under the influence of Christian nurture, and the discipline of Providence and grace, he arrives inductively at a full-blown theism. Still, if we can articulate the matured conception in terms of an inductive process, verified by experiment, and which appeal on their own ground to men accustomed to this mode of thinking, so much the better.

Chapter II. is entitled "Preparing the Way," and presents a brief historic review of the failures and successes of inductive processes, showing that the inductions of theology are as broad and perdurable as those of physical science. Then we have a chapter devoted to the progress of investigation by Tycho Brahe, Kepler and Galileo, up to the crowning Newtonian inductions that to-day are regarded as primary postulates in all scientific research. From this point of view, spiritual realities are typified by the natural, and have as valid sanction.

Chapter IV. is devoted to deduction as a necessary process of verification and combination of sequences. Some most beautiful examples of this are given from mathematics, physics and chemistry. The way is thus prepared for most interesting exemplifications of the powers and limitations of scientific laws. We hear a great deal to-day in scientific circles of the origin of physical law, and the impossibility of any change in the laws of nature by Divine intervention. Hence it is important to remember (p. 150) that when such an all-pervasive law as the law of gravitation is extended to include the mutual action and reaction of the sun and planets on the solar system, computations arise with which no human power can grapple, and whose solution is simply impossible to human calculation.

Prof. Cooke shows that "we have no exhaustive knowledge of Nature's powers;" and, "it is perfectly possible to conceive of a new element being introduced into one of the chains of causation, which would materially alter the final effect." That is to say, a new force may at any time be introduced into the plexus of natural forces already acting, react with them, and produce a different resultant. Thus the physical possibility of miracles is stoutly affirmed. This cuts the nerve of anti-theistic contention to-day. The opponents of Christianity have changed front since Hume's day. He was cautious, and confined himself to the denial of the *credibility* of miracles. But his disciples have grown bolder and now deny their *possibility*. Here is the battle-ground for the supernatural, and we owe Prof. Cooke a debt of gratitude for his strong arm and effective weapons. "We cannot disprove Divine interference in the course of nature, and the scientific improbabilities against such occurrences may be fairly set off against the moral presumption in their favor."

Then, further, universe builders on a materialistic basis are reminded (p. 176) "that the whole tendency of modern science goes to prove that the particles of matter have in themselves no inherent potency." Science now emphasizes a *dynamical* theory of the universe, over against the *mechanical* theory of days gone by. The sum of material things is sustained and directed by power issuing ever and in all directions from the centre. This is an obvious necessity, since the particles of matter have in themselves no inherent potency. What then is this

power? Our opponents say ἀγνοῖω. We have a perfect right to say, an extramundane personal God transcendent, yet imminent in nature, is the central seat of energy. This is aptly illustrated from the "Jacquard Loom" (p. 194).

Chapter VIII. points out the insuperable difficulties of the undulatory theory of optics, the molecular theory of chemistry, and the Darwinian hypothesis. The latter meets with special consideration, its difficulties and inconsistencies are pointed out and the impression given that if a man can believe this theory with all its mysteries, he has greater reason to believe in Christianity. The author rightly says "that time may be trusted to place all human systems in their true relations. Time has wrought wonders. Fifty years ago Astronomy was bold in opposing Christianity; to-day, she is her handmaid. Thirty years ago, Geology became the great opponent; now, they are in harmony. Fifteen years ago, at the meeting of the British Scientific Association in Belfast, Prof. Huxley announced that the production of life might be realized any day in the laboratory, and the great objection to materialism removed. To-day he has receded from such arrogant assumptions.

In Chapter IX. we are shown that "the study of science prepares us to recognize other possibilities of being than those of known material relations." Spiritual realities are not the figment that many opponents of Christianity affirm. Nor are the spiritual and material mutually exclusive.

Chapter X. welds the separate links of the argument together, and parallels the credentials that science presents with the self-evidencing power of Christianity. And thus, Prof. Cooke concludes, "If man can in any case rely on his experience as a test of truth; if harmony with nature is any evidence of participation in the scheme of nature; if this world is not a phantom and a desert; if all knowledge is not equally delusive—then the essentials of Christianity must be true."

This book will well repay perusal. The author is a strong and vigorous thinker, not afraid to open his eyes in the presence of nature, nor close them in the presence of God.

Tara.

W. G. HANNA.



## Here and Away.

---

WORD has been received from Yokohama, from Messrs. Gale and Harkness. They were in excellent health and spirits, and expected to sail from Japan for Corea on December 7.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to the Goforth Mission Fund, should be paid as soon as possible. The Treasurer of the Fund is Rev. Wm. Burns, 15 Toronto Street, Toronto.

THE publicity given to the recent congregational turmoils in Toronto, is but pandering to the lower tastes of the non-religionist, is a libel on the tastes of a Christian public, and is unfriendly to religion.

THE friends of T. M. Logie will be sorry to learn that because of failing health, he has been compelled to give up his studies and lectureship in Manitoba College. He has gone to Colorado for the present.

H. R. FRASER, '88, has returned from British Columbia, somewhat the worse of wear from his stay in that country. He is in the city under the doctor's care, but it is expected he will soon be himself again.

THE liberty of the secular press has to-day developed into a license to which nothing is any longer sacred. When any trouble makes its appearance in a congregation, influential dailies announce the fact with a double header.

REV. James Smith, M.A., an alumnus of Knox, missionary at Ahmednagar, India, under the American Presbyterian Church, has been compelled, through ill health, to give up his work and has gone to Australia.

ANOTHER of our men at the front has fallen. News of the death of Rev. John Gibson, B.D. of the Coolie Mission, West Coast, Demerara, has just been received. Four of our missionaries have died within a short period of time, and none of them veteran in the work.

A MAN is feverish, not because of the external temperature, but because of the state of his blood. Did the two or three congregations in Toronto, in which there has been so much unseemly squabbling, and which is productive of so much harm to the work they profess to be engaged in, take the temperature of their spiritual life, they might be able to discover the cause of this unhappy state of affairs.

THE proposition that the Alumni Association should undertake the support of a second missionary is a month older now, and seems likely to out-grow its infantile weakness. A recent graduate writes: "I am willing to assist to the amount of twenty-five dollars a year, and rather than see the undertaking 'strangled,' I will try and double that amount." Hear, hear.

REV. MR MACKAY, of Montreal, met the students at their Saturday morning Conference on December 8, and gave them a splendid talk on "The Reading of the Scriptural lessons in Public Worship." His contention is, that the Scriptures should be read in such a manner, that, without making comments, the reading will be an exposition of the passage read.

THE Public Meeting of the Student's Missionary Society, on Friday evening, December 7, was well attended. A paper on "South America" was read by A. E. Mitchell, and Wm. Neilly in a paper on "Mission Work in the Far West," gave an account of his summer's experiences. The address of the evening by Rev. A. B. Mackay, of Montreal, on "Non-Missionary Failures" was appreciated.

THE students were all pleased to see Mr. Henry W. Darling in the chair at the Public Missionary meeting. There was a bright, crisp air about the manner in which he discharged the duties of the chair, savory of a business man, and pleasing to everyone. Our Church in Toronto affords a good many laymen, who are equal to an undertaking of a like kind, and our societies should be encouraged to secure them for their public meetings.

THE readers of our College Magazine will be pleased to know that Rev. Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D., of the Free Church College, Glasgow, is to contribute the leading article in an early number of the *Monthly*. He is one of the leading men in theological thought in Scotland, and author of "The Parabolic Teaching of Christ," "The Miraculous Element in the Gospel," "The Training of the Twelve," etc.

Rev. Dr. Proudfoot has lost none of his vigor in the class-room. His lectures on Homiletics which closed last term were popular, and deservedly so. One of the early changes in the curriculum of the college, when made, should be in Dr. Proudfoot's department. His lectures should extend over the full college session, and should reach more than the senior classes in theology.

IN Knox Church congregation, Galt, where so many good people are to be found, there has existed for years, a soil, in which almost any unbalanced extreme will take root and flourish, so long as it aims at a higher Christian life. It is feared, however, that from the attitude of some people there, they have found a short road to the high attainment they claim. Ordinary Christians, who are endeavoring to be cleansed from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, are disposed to believe, that there is quite a section of the highway to holiness which they have either missed or passed over in the dark.