

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming.
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
 - Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
 - Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
 - Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
 - Pages detached/
Pages détachées
 - Showthrough/
Transparence
 - Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
 - Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
 - Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
 - Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
 - Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
						✓					

THE CANADIAN Methodist Review.

[NEW SERIES.]

VOL. VII.]

MAY-JUNE, 1895.

[No. 3.

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF CHRIST.

WHEN Milton essayed to write his "Paradise Lost," he invoked the aid of the heavenly muse to his adventurous song, because it was about to pursue things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme. My supplication is for aid because I essay a theme so often pursued before. He feared lest he should be lost in his solitary way, and I lest I should be lost among the multitude of my companions. Many times since I chose my theme for this lecture has the poem of Edwin Arnold been repeated in my memory:

“ ‘How shall I write,’ I said, ‘who am not meet
One word of that sweet speaking to repeat?’
‘It shall be given unto thee. Do this thing,’
Answered the voice, ‘wash thy lips clean and sing.’”

The Consciousness of Christ is my subject. And I have chosen this theme, not because I shall attempt to explain to you what His consciousness was, but that I may indicate the way in which that consciousness is to be discovered. I do not presume to unfold something new and striking about the person of Christ, but to state some facts that gather about His person, and some reflections that arise from these facts.

That Jesus Christ is the great object of interest to the world, and specially to the Church, we all know. But this

He has always been, and this He always will be. When Goethe, and Renan, and Mill declare that His worship will renew itself to endless ages, what sentiments concerning the future interest which He may awaken may we not expect to hear from those millions who now worship Him as God! A proper knowledge of Him is the greatest desideratum of the Christian Church.

He is one whom we would fain understand. We would read His place in the history of events. We would know whence He cometh and whither He goeth. But in order to obtain this knowledge we must make our excursions both backward and forward, we must investigate the past, we must trace up the future. We must know something of what transpired in the world anterior to His birth, and something of what followed His death.

Since He is called the Supreme Person of history, and His life and doctrine have become the greatest problem of the world, He is interesting to history, to philosophy, and to religion. And whoever will make Jesus Christ an object of study, and subject Him to the same analysis as any other problem, cannot come upon Him suddenly, but must approach Him through the avenues of those thoughts which were planted by the men whose conceptions prepared the way for His appearing. For not more surely was John the Baptist the voice of one who prepared His way in the wilderness of unbelief to men of faith, than the academicians were men who prepared His way in the wilderness of thought to men of reason. And since He is made an object of scientific study, as well as an object of religious faith, one has no alternative but to say, "Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? Unto Cæsar shalt thou go." And we must study Him in connection with the thinking as well as in connection with the believing of the human race.

When I speak of the consciousness of Jesus Christ, I must have some standard of comparison. I must know what consciousness in general means, and what it means as applied to other men, for without this knowledge I cannot estimate its quality in Christ.

I may say that the effort of thinking men has always been to obtain a consciousness of truth, to solve the enigma of life, to clear away the mist that involves the truth in obscurity, and to find reasonable ground for conduct and for religion; and that by the consciousness of Jesus Christ I mean His comprehension of the truth which ever has engaged, and ever will engage, the fullest exercise of the powers of the human mind. "What is the truth?" said Pilate, repeating a question the sophists had not answered. "I am the truth," said Jesus, declaring himself to be an incarnate consciousness of what the world was ignorant of, but of what it industriously sought to know.

Those who would interpret Jesus Christ by the commentaries of psychology and metaphysics, should remember that He is not the child of philosophy; and they should remember the nothingness of the beginnings and the barrenness of the endings of their system of interpretation.

The question which a British statesman discussed the other day, and which may be taken to be the cardinal question among thoughtful men, is the very question with which philosophy began to build its structure twenty-three hundred years ago. "What are the foundations of belief?" inquires the Hon. Arthur Balfour in the last decade of the nineteenth century. "What are the foundations of belief?" inquired Socrates four hundred years before the Christian era. The philosophy of to-day had its origin in the necessity of a reasonable ground for faith. And one cannot turn back and survey the annals of those ancient times without feeling such pity as one feels who thinks upon the Mound-Builders of our race. Nor can one doubt the divinity of man when he sees the prodigious and heroic labors which were made to restore a vanishing faith and revive a dying hope. It was because the Gentile world had lost its confidence in the credibility of its myths, its traditions, and its cults, and thereby was losing its religion and its moral consciousness, that an imperative demand was created for such truth as would arrest the moral decline; and ancient philosophy is nothing less than an attempt to save the world.

The first thing to be achieved, as it is the last thing to be achieved, was a certainty of truth; or, as I would say, a consciousness of truth. And as we believe Jesus Christ to be certain to himself that He knew all truth and was all truth, we contrast Him with the beginnings of the consciousness of truth.

But what were those beginnings? They were the postulates of all thinking; they were the universally accepted realities which were known intuitively; they were facts which no man could prove, and which no man could doubt; and they constituted the primary consciousness of man. And thus the foundations of all reasoning are laid in faith. This is the fulcrum, even faith, on which reason placed her lever and tried to lift the world to God; this is the base on which reason erected a ladder that she might climb, round by round, up into the light of divine knowledge.

Beginning, therefore, with what was self-evident, reason discovered one fact after another in the realm of thought, and every fact once discovered was added to the calendar of consciousness, and knowledge grew from more to more, and all the facts of truth certainly known I call the consciousness of Christ; it was because Paul could boldly compare the truth of Christ with the truth of the wise men that he was not ashamed of his ministry. It is not assuming anything to say that Jesus Christ is the end of thought, or is the wisdom of God; it is a fact of history that He is so, for all philosophy flows into Him as all rivers flow into the sea. The question discussed by Origen fifteen hundred years ago was discussed by Dr. Lee before the Parliament of Religions, at Chicago. viz., "Christ the Reason of the Universe." Religion is the supreme question of thought to-day, and the Supreme Person of religion is Christ. We may say that the moral consciousness of the civilized world, and its conceptions of Divinity, are the creations of Christ—His personality has produced them.

It is not without interest in this connection to notice the stages of progress which are distinctly seen in the discovery of truth through the researches of reason. Before the Divine

Teacher had come, what were the problems that engrossed the minds of thinking men? and what was the fruit of the ripened culture of the human mind? The answer to these questions must be given in the briefest manner possible. Having ascertained what presuppositions are necessary for the development of the first usable conceptions of nature, such questions as the following came in slow succession under the analysis of the human intellect: Being and becoming; Ordered movements in the universe, and a rational cause of them; The atomic theory concerning quantitative and qualitative differences exhibited by nature; An order of nature in conformity to law; Whether there is any law of life universally valid as distinguished from the laws of institutions; What is the supreme law of nature? Is it for every man to follow the impulses of his nature, or to follow his knowledge of the good; The relative value of perception and thought in discovering the real; What is the real? Is it the knowledge of phenomena or the knowledge of Being? Is it material or immaterial? And how behind the changing multiplicity of phenomena a unitary and abiding Being is to be thought.

These are the chief questions on which the human mind developed its powers to a degree never developed before nor since. And the conclusion at which it arrived, and the truth which it discovered as its final contribution to the consciousness of the world is, that the cause of all generation and change is an eternal, unchangeable, incorporeal Being; is a self-conscious Mind; is a Spirit.

In addition to the above subjects and subsequent to them there arose questions of an ethical and religious character. By a school of great and far-reaching influence it was taught that the only important thing is virtue; and by exalting character individuality was exalted. With the discovery of the intense importance of personality, to man is assigned the most important place in the creation of God. Formerly man was believed to be one of the phenomena of nature, but now he was held to be the cause of nature, and anthropology became the religio-scientific reason of the world.

Though these discoveries became the formative principles of

Roman jurisprudence, and a permanent heritage to the world, yet no example of this ideal virtue anywhere appeared; and the immense contrasts of social life, and the insufficiency of philosophy created a religious urgency which was without an equal.

It is in the existence of such facts as these that we observe the preparation for the coming of Jesus Christ into the world. Not only was the classic tongue of Greece fitted to express His doctrine, and the empire of Imperial Rome fitted to transmit His gospel, but the philosophical thought of the patrician and the religious faith of the plebeian had created the necessity for His appearance, and in the fulness of time God sent forth His Son.

But the Son of God was too transcendent a being to be comprehended by the wisdom of the world, and He was too obscure in His birth and His associations to obtain its attention. Though we can see in looking back over the years what an awakening He became to the minds of men, yet that awakening was not immediate. "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not." But we have only to compare His knowledge of God with the knowledge of His contemporaries to behold His immeasurable superiority over them.

I have proceeded all along upon the assumption that Jesus Christ was the fulness of that knowledge of which the ancient world had discovered a little, but only a little; and since He was wisdom and truth, nothing was more natural than that He should become an object of study to the wise men. If His advance to the foremost place in the problems of thought was not immediate, it was nevertheless most certain and rapid. It was inevitable that He should enter the schools and sit among the sophists in Athens, and in Alexandria, as He once sat among the doctors in the Temple, hearing them and asking them questions. A great teacher had come into the world; it did not matter where, He was a city set upon a hill and could not be hid. The leaven had been put into the measure of meal—it did not matter how large the measure, all it contained should feel the working of the vital germ.

Jesus Christ was in the beginning what He is to-day. His person and His teaching have undergone no change. But the person of Christ and the truth of Christ had to take their chances in the world as it was. And the world as it was was no highway specially prepared for His heralded progress as the accepted Saviour, and so after His death His reputation and His doctrine came into the hands of all sorts of men, who treated it in all sorts of ways. He was devoutly worshipped; He was humbly trusted; He was reverently studied; He was critically analyzed; He was cynically despised; He was bitterly hated; He was pitilessly persecuted. Two hundred years after His death there were Christians in every part of the world. But they were Christians of every nation and language; and to their interpretations of Jesus Christ they had brought all the varieties of their different nationalities, their cults, their prejudices, their traditions, and their customs.

We should greatly err from the facts of the case if we imagined the universal Church of that period as possessing the homogeneity of our own Church to-day. Methodism has remained for one hundred and fifty years a contented and unfaltering disciple of the teaching of the fifty-two sermons and the notes on the New Testament. But in the same length of time early Christianity had largely lost sight of the Scriptures, and had incorporated with it uncertain tradition and surrounding religions. Nor could anything less than a miracle have prevented this from being so—it was impossible for men to be other than they had been made by their ancestors and their environment. And that they should miss the truth to a degree was about inevitable. Even in the lifetime of Paul he saw it was his duty to lift up his warning voice and say, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ."

But what I wish specially to notice is not what the Christian people throughout the world thought of Christ, but what the Church in its corporate capacity thought of Him. What did the men who had a right to speak say of Him? or rather by what means did they interpret Him? The answer to this

question is most significant, for the answer will tell us by what process theology became possessed of its definitions. I have said that Christ's person and doctrine came into the hands of all sorts of men. It is notably true to say that He came into the hands of the schoolmen; that the apologists of Christianity were schoolmen, and that Jesus Christ and the doctrines of Christianity were in their hands submitted to the same kind of philosophical analysis as the doctrine of "insight" had been submitted to by Socrates, and the doctrine of the "idea" by Plato. Christianity has always been believed by the Church to be a Divine revelation. But this Divine revelation is full of great thoughts—thoughts that immeasurably transcend anything that the mind of men had ever conceived before. These great thoughts philosophy took up in the name of Christianity, and endeavored to express in the terms of comprehensible reason. The ideas are wholly Christian, but the language and the methods are thoroughly Grecian. In this development of doctrine the Grecian language and the Grecian method but pursued the way they had been going for ages, taking up and assimilating every thought that came within the range of their observation. For this reason theology was slow in its construction; it did not spring full-formed at once from the minds of the fathers. Many unsuccessful attempts were made to arrive at a satisfactory definition; every sentence had to be purged of objections; every phrase had to be refined in a seven-times heated furnace; and every word had to be ground down like a diamond on a lapidary's stone before it would be accepted as a perfect expression of the idea; so that every definition of Christian doctrine which is accepted by the Church was believed by those who formed it to shine like a gem of the purest water in the crown of eternal truth.

I am sure that if any one is disposed to think lightly of accepted theology, he will be brought into a serious and deferential mood towards it when he reflects upon the labor, the piety, and the learning that united in giving it a systematic expression. What profound scholarship and prodigious labor are expressed in this one clause alone of the Athanasian creed,

"We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is to say, of the substance of the Father; God of God and Light of Light; very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things on earth; who for us men and for our salvation, came down and was made flesh, made man, suffered and rose again the third day, went up into the heavens, and is to come again to judge the quick and the dead." But whatever value belongs to theology, its creeds must be accepted for what they are, and not for what they are not. They are attempts to express in the forms and after the method of scientific philosophy spiritual truths that have come to us in Divine revelations from heaven. This they are; and if they have succeeded, then there remains nothing more to be learned in the definitions of the truth of God. Not only is the revelation perfect, but the reason has perfect comprehension of that revelation so as to state it in terms acceptable to the reason. "But these gracious and sublime ideas," says Principal Fairbairn, "were the aim rather than the achievement of the theology; they were more what it aspired to than what it reached. But the theology was as little the ultimate science of the religion or of the history as Plato or Aristotle is the ultimate science of nature, and man and society."

Christian doctrine had become pretty well crystallized against the seventh century, and so it remained for half a millennium of years. The Church was one throughout the world, and what it taught all believed.

Scholasticism, however, in forming an acquaintance with the original sources of Christianity, began to discover a contrast between these sources and the faith of the Church, and by its labors it prepared the way for the renaissance, and the renaissance made the Reformation a necessity.

Until the times of the Reformation the two chief factors in determining doctrine were tradition and philosophy. But the only authority which the Church of the Reformation would accept is the canon of Holy Writ, as it is contained in the fifth article of our Church, "The Holy Scriptures contain all

things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not contained therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

I have already observed that Christianity was introduced into tribes and nations of varied customs and religions, and that it had to make its way as a universal religion to every language and people. But in order to do this and to create a Church in the likeness of Christ, it had to uproot prejudices and superstitions, and to prepare for itself a vehicle for its own true interpretation. It had to purge human thought of perverted and distorted conceptions, and human conduct of sinful and ungodly practices; for the Church, like the individual, cannot understand nor express the whole mind of Christ until it is washed in His blood and baptized into His Spirit.

To this day the work of preparation for a living Christ in a Church that fully shows forth His mind is incomplete; and it is hardly too much to say that the whole truth of Christ will not be fully perceived until the whole earth is full of the knowledge of God—until He shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power.

We are happy to believe that there is a better understanding of Christ to-day than formerly, and that the Church is doing His deeds more truly than it did. But this means that mistaken or imperfect views were held concerning Him. And these mistaken views existed because of what I have said, viz., that Christianity was corrupted by the introduction of foreign elements into its interpretation. Greek philosophy read into the character of God so much philosophical subtlety that the ethical attributes were quite obscured. The national polity of Rome incorporated itself in the organization of the Church, and consolidated a hierarchy and a popedom of unimagined authority and power. The heathen idea of sacrifices, and the Jewish custom of priests were leading factors in creating the pastorate into a priesthood, and the mass into a sacrifice. Out of these arose the doctrines of salvation corresponding to them. The teaching that man is by nature not only sinful, but also criminal, and that redemption is a purchase made

from the devil, or a price paid to God for man's sin considered as a debt, is in part the product of Roman jurisprudence, and of forensic speculation. Out of the doctrine of consubstantiation as believed in by Luther arose the question of the incarnation—the discussion of which has continued to our time, and affords the highest contribution to modern theology. Calvinism is the doctrine of men of a constitutionally scholastic and speculative mind, while Arminianism breathes a humanistic and literary spirit. Modern evangelism is the law of the English Commonwealth, or of a limited monarchy applied to God. Fear of liberalism developed the doctrine of the High Churchman; love of liberalism the doctrine of the Broad Churchman; while on the very day on which I write the socialistic spirit of our time is giving its complexion to the utterances of ten thousand pulpits.

If, then, theology would interpret Jesus Christ, it must retrace its steps, and expurgate from its teaching the interpolations which it has inserted from foreign and alien sources; for Jesus Christ taught us nothing about a sacerdotal Church, an ecclesiastical hierarchy, a legal redemption, and an unconditional reprobation.

This brings me at once to the question of the true interpretation of Christ. Where shall we find it? We shall find it in himself, and in the history that is specially His own. In speaking of himself, I recall a sentence from the *Light of the World*, "Suffer if one of modern mood steals back—weary and wayworn from the desert road of barren thought, from the vault, the failure of all fond philosophies—back into thee, thy people, and thy story, and thy Son, Mary of Nazareth." If we would know the truth that men have ever sought to know, we must learn it of Christ himself. "For no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him."

I cannot agree with those who teach that Christianity had to prepare a way for its own expression. It had for its comprehension, but not for its expression. The working out of the theologies of the Church were never required in order to

express Christian doctrine. I do not pronounce upon their utility in their own time. I think they are not truly of the genius of Christianity; they are not necessary save for those who will not have anything better. I cannot tell what is owing to them from my own generation—for what am I indebted to Origer, and Augustine, and Athanacius? They may have saved me from being born a heathen; but I owe it to Jesus Christ and the apostles that I was born a Christian. Had the Church held to the sacred Scriptures, believed in its promises, honored its precepts, obeyed its commandments, it had known the truth, and had discerned what was of God and what of men. The labor of Christian scholarship to-day is to eliminate from theology what it has derived from philosophy and law and custom, and to define it after the consciousness of Christ. Heretofore Christ was studied through theology; now theology is studied through Christ.

The present position of inquiry was brought about by a most active and interesting process of investigation. Its manner was compelled if Christianity was to hold its ground, and because the enemies of Christianity were many, and the ground of attack and defence was new, alarms were raised for orthodoxy which agitated the public mind like a sea raised by a tempest. Even now we can remember how the tail of the storm passed by in our youth, and the echoes of the waves subsiding in weariness after so great a struggle still linger in our ears. The names of Locke, of Hume, of Voltaire, of Lessing, of Kant bring before our imagination a succession of philosophers which, in gathering the harvest of human thought, seemed to pull up the wheat with the tares, and to commit sacrilege in the shrines of Divine revelation. I can not even tarry to note the changing ground which was occupied by these men in their successive interpretations of truth. But there is a striking change between the standing ground of those days and of these days, and the shifting process has been going on in an adjustment to the necessities of thought. The artillery of human reason supported by the infantry of intuitive consciousness, and flanked by the flying artillery of a revealing faith, has been crowding truth into its strongholds.

The empiricism of Locke, the criticism of Kant, the transcendentalism of Hegel, the mythicism of Strauss, the idealism of Baur have been abandoned, and defenders of truth have fallen back from one position to another, and to-day the breastworks of a literary and historical criticism are thrown up, and the subject of that criticism is the person about whom all history revolves.

The attempt is now made to find the true setting of Jesus Christ, and in order to this discovery it is necessary to find the bearings of what was anterior to Him, and of what is subsequent to Him as related to himself. How is He indicated and interpreted by all that went before Him, and how by all that have followed Him? How by all that surrounded Him? The answer to these inquiries will be found almost exclusively in the sacred writings of the Hebrews, and of the Christians. A proper understanding of these writings, of the times in which and the conditions under which they were written, is now the great study of Christian scholarship, for a literary and historical criticism of the Scripture is imperative to an accurate conception of Christ.

The gospels contain an account of our Lord's life and teaching as seen by eye-witnesses, and as heard from His own lips. In them we hear Him speaking in His own voice, and acting with His own hands. They may justly be esteemed as the most valuable portion of our sacred Scriptures.

But the importance of the Old Testament as an interpreter of Christ is unspeakably valuable, and the New Testament is supplemental of the Old Testament. The gospels are necessary to a perfect understanding of the prophets, and without the prophets the gospels could not be understood. It was by means of the prophets that Christ interpreted himself to His disciples. It seems that this was His only means of doing so. Such terms as, "it is written," "it is fulfilled," were often on His lips. "Moses," He said, "wrote of him. And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

But I shall not tarry upon ground that is so familiar to us all. I rather call your attention to the fact that there did not

exist among men any other key to unlock the mystery of His birth, His life, and His death. In comparison to the light that shone in the Old Testament, every other source of information left Him hidden in dark obscurity. To apply to Him the methods of interpretation at the time of His birth such as were used long after His death would have been as egregious folly as the subsequent methods were. The philosophy of agnosticism is as capable of doing justice to the Christ of history as the philosophy of the Lyceum was of doing justice to the Christ of prophecy. Of the prophets it may be said, in bold and absolute contrast to all existent sources, they are they which testify of me. Twelve hundred years before the men of Athens had reached their conclusions concerning "Being," and "insight," and "idea," the slaves emancipated from the bondage in Egypt were taught sublimer ideas of these very things than the sages ever knew. It is an amazing thing to say, and yet nothing is more certain, that the accumulated wisdom of the academicians, the peripatetics, the epicureans, and the stoics contains nothing that can compare with the first verse of the Book of Genesis. All the philosophies of antiquity never discovered that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And all the wisdom and the piety of the ancients did not know that the Lord, the Lord God, is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in goodness and in truth.

And if the opening sentence of our sacred Scriptures strikes all wisdom dumb with amazement what marvellous revelations must we expect to find in the development and expansion of those Scriptures! How must the unfolding pages of its growing truth prepare the way for the revealing of the last great mystery, and with what consciousness of reality did the heir of these sacred Scriptures take up the young child in his arms and exclaim: Now lettest thou thy servant depart, O Lord, according to Thy Word in peace. For mine eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast prepared before the face of all people. A light for revelation to the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.

As to the degree of knowledge which the apostles possessed

concerning Christ, I have but a word to say. I believe that while in some minor matters they may have misunderstood Him, in everything pertaining to his person and his doctrine they were infallible teachers. One may say that there is a Pauline Christology, a Petrine Christology, and a Joahnine Christology. To me this means nothing more than that each of them wrote from his own standpoint for a certain purpose; but it does not mean that Paul did not agree with Peter, and Peter with John. The position of these men as founders of Christianity, their boldness of statement, and their claim of Divine instruction, greatly strengthens one's confidence in them as teachers sent of God. And to this I may add: that when Delitzsch and Hodge and Pope have given place to others, as others gave place to them, and when a thousand generations have come and gone, the Christian will cherish the Divine classic as we cherish it now, and will find his surest confidence and highest knowledge in writings of the holy men of God, who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. And the theology which alone can abide forever is that which is moulded out of nothing save the Word of God. Such was Mr. Wesley's attempt: "My design," he said, "is in some sense to forget all that ever I have read in my life; to speak as if I had never read one author ancient or modern (except the Scriptures)."

There is but one more observation that I desire to make, and with it I shall conclude my subject. I am deeply impressed that of all the truths which entered into the consciousness of Christ, there is one that occupies an imperial pre-eminence: It may be said to be the distinguishing contribution which He gave to the world. He came to show us the Father. God had been known as the Almighty, the Eternal, the Omniscient. His glory and His handiwork were revealed in the material world. His sovereignty and His righteousness were revealed in his chosen people; but it remained to Jesus Christ alone to disclose the fact that God is a Father of the whole human family. You see that this is the essential revelation in Jesus Christ, inasmuch as it is the one fact which is made known to His disciples; it is the one revelation which, shining on the human heart, creates our sonship. God sent forth his Son

made of a woman, made under the law, that He might redeem them that are under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons, and if sons, then heirs of God. This revelation is not the creation of a new fact in God, but the discovering of an eternal fact to man. The sonship of man is not a creation of an act in time, but we were begotten in Jesus Christ from times eternal, and the mystery hid from ages and from generations is now made known, which is Christ in you the hope of glory. The truth that God is God of all nations was first established by Christ, and His apostle had to enlarge the conception of God entertained by the only monotheistic nation in the world by asking the question: Is He the God of the Jews only? Is He not also the God of the Gentiles? Yes, He is the Father of the spirits of all flesh. He is kind to the unthankful and the evil; and it is our Father which is in heaven that sendeth His rain upon the just and the unjust, and causeth His sun to shine upon the evil and the good. And because our Saviour was conscious of this fact, He prayed that they may be one in us as Thou Father art in me and I in them. And that the world may know that Thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as Thou hast loved me. Already the broadening conception of this truth has softened the hardness of a too rigid theology, and has broadened the charity of a compassion that was narrowed by fixed decrees. Already the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is felt to be the God of the heathen nations, and the consciousness of Christ has penetrated into every society, profession and philosophy throughout Christendom, until all classes are proclaiming the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

This, then, is the crowning truth of revelation—this is the message for our ministry. It is greater than all truths; it is beyond human discovery; it is revealed to faith; its reality is as certain to the peasant as to the prince, and its truth is as well-known to the ignorant as to the educated. Whoever possesses it is saved. And to pass from the light of its revealing into any school of human teaching, is to pass from the noon-day glory into the twilight or the shades of darkness.

Whitby, Ont.

T. MANNING.

THE MINISTERS' CODE OF HONOR.

In "Webster's Dictionary" is found this definition of a "Code of Honor": "Rules for the regulation of social intercourse among people of fashion, founded upon regard for reputation." The phrase to-day is used to signify any set of rules in any profession or society regulating the intercourse of the members thereof, with a view to avoiding friction, establishing harmony and realizing in practice the highest possible ideal of honorable dealing one with another. The best example we are acquainted with of a code of honor is the Code of Medical Ethics, by which every physician is expected to regulate his conduct toward his patients and fellow-members of the medical fraternity.

Now, the compilation of a code of ministerial ethics would, we know, meet with many objections. Some would consider it a reflection upon the brotherhood. Some might see in it a violation of those sentiments which have always gathered around the sacred office and high calling of the Christian ministry. Others might object that the effect of these rules and regulations could only be to substitute a constrained and artificial, for a spontaneous and natural decorum.

On the other hand, it might be said that there are in the calling of the ministry, as in all other callings or professions, men the emphatic points in whose characters are not a fine sense of the becoming or a strong instinct of honor. However strong and able they may be in other ways, they are deficient in these qualities, without which harmonious fellowship and intercourse is impossible. Such of us as are thus, not having the spirit, are greatly in need of the letter.

As to its being a reflection upon the ministry, it may as well be recognized at once that this democratic age has disrobed us of all superhuman excellence. Our office no longer clothes us with superior worth or entitles us to peculiar reverence. Were we angels, a code of honor might reflect discredit on us. But we are not angels; no one thinks so now. Being men of like passions with lawyers and physicians, we might with profit adopt some of their ways.

But whether we need the code or not, we need a very liberal supply of the honor. Few men are thrown into closer relations with each other than Methodist ministers of the same Conference. In cities and towns our fields of labor overlap. We cross each other's paths. Occasionally we meet in the same homes, with a view to making new members for our church out of the same strangers who have come into the portion of the city over which our unlimited and indefinite parish extends. Of course we are not rivals, when judged by a standard worthy of our calling. Yet we are rivals, judged by standards much in use in official boards, and considerably in use in Stationing Committees. A full church on one street means a smaller congregation in the neighboring church. No one knows better than the minister himself how much of what passes for success, and in a certain sense is success, depends on who occupies the pulpit of the church near by. In this sense we are rivals.

And our itinerant system greatly intensifies this state of things. Our names are thrown into the same Official Board. One comes out to find its way into a flattering notice in the daily press, of the "unanimous-invitation" sort. The others go to the waste-basket. And even while we know we are rival candidates for these invitations, we meet each other on the street and in association meetings. We also follow each other, going into the same parsonage, visiting in the same homes, preaching from the same pulpit, presiding over the same Boards and committees, and taking up the same list of members. Truly Methodist ministers of the same Conference are compelled to assume intimate relations with each other, such as necessitate, if we be loyal to each other, the spirit of the highest honor.

And further, our pastoral relations with our people, and business relations with our Official Boards, demand the same spirit of honor.

It becomes every minister to recognize the almost sacred character of the relations into which he is admitted with his own people. The confidence reposed in him as pastor is given to no other. Even when he is a total stranger he is welcomed to the homes of his people, and often he is welcomed into a very intimate knowledge of the history of the home and its

present troubles, or joys or successes. He cannot close his eyes to what he sees. Sometimes he discerns petty or grievous faults of character disclosed by the very confidence reposed in him. Into such confidence as he is admitted as pastor he should admit no others. No physician talks indiscriminately of his patients. A like reserve is becoming to a pastor. Such a reserve will dignify his relation to his people, and help him to appreciate the confidence to which he is admitted.

The minister and the Official Board. In these matters the question of the salary to be apportioned often proves a troublesome one. The following appear to us to be becoming unwritten rules regulating the same: (a) The Official Board is morally responsible for the payment of the salary apportioned. No honorable, self-respecting Board will allow any portion of it to go unpaid. (b) It is taken for granted that where an Official Board invites a minister and makes no stipulation regarding salary, the salary will remain as it was, or, at least, will not be less. (c) That if the salary for any reason must be reduced, the proper time to make such reduction is at the change of ministers. If the case be urgent, notice of intended reduction should be given at the May meeting, for no minister should, if possible, be allowed to return to his circuit to receive less salary without being notified of the same before Conference. (d) Unless these rules are violated by the Official Board, the minister has nothing to say in the matter of his salary. He has, however, a right, we think, to insist that plain, common-sense, business maxims, like the above, be adhered to by his Official Board. The writer is acquainted with a minister who received a unanimous invitation to return to his circuit for the third year, and at the first Official Board meeting had his salary reduced sixty dollars. No one would find fault with such a minister did he give such a Board a piece of his mind. No minister should condescend to plead with his officials for an increase in his salary, or, indeed, to use any influence with his Board in a matter of this kind.

It is becoming recognized generally that the minister should support the funds of his church. His wife and members of his family should contribute their fair share to all the expenses of

the church. It should not be taken for granted that the parsonage pew is free, unless the Trustee Board so specify. An official member in one of our churches said: "If our minister gives a tenth, how is it none of it comes our way? He does not pay for the parsonage pew, and no members of his family contribute through the envelope." In all financial matters, let the minister prove himself honorable and liberal to the extent of his means. He should pay his way, and not dead-head it even to the extent of 10 per cent. He should not take it for granted that any services for himself or family from any of the members of any other profession are free. Nor should he expect any brother minister to fill his pulpit for him when he is on vacation, or for any reason absent from his work, without paying him for the same. In the exchange of pulpits, for missionary or church anniversary, or any other special occasion, the cost of supply should be included in his expenses and paid for by that interest of the church which he serves. This does not apply in cases of personal or family affliction. Then any service rendered by any brother minister should be gratuitous and hearty.

In the matter of invitations the following rules are self-evident: No minister should be a wire-puller, *i.e.*, he ought not to use any secret influence, management or intrigue to obtain the invitation of any Quarterly Board. He should write no letters, send no telegrams, speak to no friends for the purpose of influencing the Board to invite him. Nor should he ask his friends to do it for him. It is highly improper for any minister to canvass any official member of a Quarterly Board for his vote or influence. If he, personally, does not see the impropriety of such conduct, he should remember it is unfair to the brethren who do and who hold themselves above such methods.

When the question of inviting one's successor is before the Board, the minister who is presiding should use his influence with caution, and generally very sparingly. Personal friendship for a brother minister will not justify the putting forth of much effort to secure for him the invitation. Nor should a minister use his influence in these matters to further his own ends. The situation is generally understood by our Official

Boards, and if they choose to arrange with other Boards in the interests of their retiring pastor—and that they should often do so is not to be wondered at—well and good. But if not, let the minister not seek to influence them so to do.

If a minister receive an invitation, and is unable to decide whether he should accept or decline, let him state how long he wishes to consider it. At the end of that time let him give a prompt and definite answer. It is not proper to hold to one invitation in the hope of a better, until you weary the patience of the brethren who are waiting for your answer.

If a minister having accepted one invitation receives another, however much more desirable it may be, he should decline it. If the Stationing Committee offers him a better place than the one to which he has been invited, let him stand by his invitation, so far as he exerts any influence in the matter. We cannot, as honorable men, accept the advantages without being willing to accept the disadvantages of the invitation system.

The minister, in his relation to the Stationing Committee, should accept the following rules: (a) If a member of the Committee, he should not consider himself the guardian or advocate of his own interests. Neither directly nor indirectly should he further his own cause. (b) He should accept the decisions of the Committee loyally, and, if it be possible, graciously. For a disappointed brother to stir up strife in any Board, or do anything which would make the work of any brother more difficult, is under any conditions reprehensible. (c) Nor should he canvass the members of the Stationing Committee. They should be left free to perform their difficult work unthwarted by the fear or favor of any brother whose station they are deciding.

The minister's relation to his brethren would, in a code of honor, we think, call for rules such as the following: (a) No minister should steal sheep from his brother's flock. If they, deeming the pasturage better, should wish to come over to his field, he will, of course, welcome them. He should not include the members from other churches who occasionally visit his in his regular visits, or use any influence to sever them from their own church. Where, however, they attend his church regularly,

and are but nominal members elsewhere, he is at liberty to welcome them into the number of his flock. No minister should be unwilling to give certificates of removal to members who, for any reason, desire to join another church. While anxious to retain our members as long as possible, we should remember we are a connexion.

His relation to his predecessor and successor on a field of labor would call for rules like the following: He should be careful to avoid saying anything in the homes of the people or before his Official Boards which would reflect discredit on the one whom he succeeds. It is certainly dishonorable to put items of news in the *Guardian*, or in the daily press, that in any way discount the work of a former pastor. We can surely tell of the success of our work without saying that it dates exactly from the hour of our wonderful advent upon the scene.

In relation to our successor, we should do all we could to make it as easy as possible for him to take up our unfinished tasks and carry on the work. The parsonage should be left fit for immediate occupation. A visiting-list and a very carefully revised membership roll should be put in his hands. Let us make our successor responsible for no more members than actually are to be found; and inasmuch as it is likely that some are members because of personal pastoral relations, now to be dissolved, let the number reported on the last year of our term be under rather than over the mark. You will notice, if you consult the Conference Minutes, that the decreases in members generally take place in the first year of the pastor's term. Either too many members were reported by his predecessor or he pruned his lists with too sharp a knife, either of which conditions is not as it should be.

"In honor preferring one another," should be our motto in relation to the positions of honor in the Church. Of these positions it is unbecoming to speak in any slighting manner. The honors in the gift of the brethren are worthy of sincere appreciation. Yet however high our estimation of these honors may be, they are not to be sought after. An office-seeker among ministers of the Gospel should always be made to feel that he is very far out of his element. Some of us remember

how, at college, anyone who canvassed for a position of honor in our societies was not only sure of defeat, but much in danger of forfeiting the respect of his fellow-students, and even of being put under the pump. And every brother who canvasses or wire-pulls for any position of honor in our Church deserves to suffer like ignominy. Our votes should not be given to any brother who asks for them. And however great his ability or fitness for the position, he deserves it not if he lends himself to such things. To canvass for a place on the Stationing Committee, or for the chairmanship of a district, or for election to the General Conference, or for any similar position of honor in our Church, ought to be beneath any minister. The methods of the ward politician should have no place among us. "In honor preferring one another."

One other matter demands our attention. Every minister has asked himself the question more than once, "To what extent am I justified in using the press to bring my church and my work before the public?" Evidently to some extent. Into homes where no pastor goes the evening paper regularly finds its way. "Can I not make use of it? Can I not use it to attract to the church some who never attend any church?" The following rules, we think, would be suitable for our guidance: The minister is at liberty to publish items of news regarding the work of his church when he believes such items are of interest to the public, or would in any way increase the power of his church to attract to its services the non-churchgoers in the community. The preacher is at liberty to offer to the press any sermon, or any portion of any sermon, which he believes would be of interest to the public or would help to create a stronger sentiment on any of the moral questions of the hour. On the other hand, no minister should publish any item in mention or praise of his own ability, eloquence or popularity. He should not plague the editor of the *Guardian* with notices of invitations to return for another year. Nor should he insert any items which are but an advertising of his own ability or success. It was an unpardonable sin on the part of our editor when he prefaced a personal notice, very flattering to Mr. So-and-So, with the very innocent sentence, "Rev. Mr. So-and-So

sends us the following." The question in some of our minds is whether it would not be a very wise thing should our worthy editor be guilty of such sins more frequently.

Brethren, let us cultivate the æsthetics of our morality. Not only are we to think upon the things that are true and just, but also upon those that are lovely and of good report. With faith, and courage, and zeal, let there also be found the finest sense of the becoming and the instinct of the highest honor.

Toronto.

R. P. BOWLES.

CONNEXIONALISM IN EDUCATION.

THE closing years of this century will decide whether the principle of connexionalism will survive in Canadian Methodist education, somewhat after the English model, or be completely dissipated after the American example. In our educational history Canadian Methodism began upon the English principle in this respect, that the Church, by the action of its highest court, authorized the inception and controlled the direction of our colleges. In the United States the tendency has been to such a degree of disintegration that it cannot be said correctly that they have any connexional educational system. This is largely owing to private benefactions and local enterprises under no central control. The result may be pleasing to denominational pride; but it is startling to Old World ideas of educational equipment that the Methodism of the United States has 72 universities and 185 other colleges! The Old World is right in disapproving of such vast diffusion of agency when the point considered is the best results in higher education, but it is wrong in failing to appreciate the great moral and educational advantage these schools, with their 50,000 students, bring to the people in the wide diffusion of general intelligence. But where will this educational development stop? No one can say, for no one is authorized either to stop it or to guide it. If a man gives \$10,000, or \$100,000, or half a million dollars to found a college in the Rocky Mountains, and call it the Smith Methodist University, who can hinder him or interfere with

the conditions of his generous gift? An attempt has been made during the last few years to connexionalize the work by a convention of college presidents, representing some of the foremost educational men in American Methodism. But what does it amount to? Simply this, that a few of the leading universities band together to assimilate to some degree their curricula, and to try and elevate the standard all through the ranks of Methodist universities. But the Church has lost control in the matter. Connexionalism in American Methodist education is doomed or dead, and no General Conference can restore it. An unfriendly critic, not appreciating the benefits of the system, says that it has "gone to seed." Bryce, a true and scholarly friend of the United States, and generally regarded as correct in his estimate of its society and Government, states, in his work on the "American Commonwealth," that in the Republic there are over four hundred so-called universities, but not more than nine worthy of the name.

How is it in Canada? We have come to the point in our history when we must choose between the two methods of procedure—between having a host of weak colleges and a few strong ones. To encourage the hope that we will probably choose the more conservative principle of connexionalism, there are the following facts:

1. We distinguish—or at least most of us do, and all of us should, according to Discipline—between colleges which are connexional and those which are not. If a layman takes a fancy to build a monument to himself in the shape of a Methodist university, not controlled by the supreme authority of the Church, or even if an Annual Conference decides on its own responsibility to found a college, or if to call an institution Methodist, the favor is given to the Methodist Church to appoint a certain number of its trustees; surely such institutions are in no sense connexional, for the simple reason that they are neither owned nor controlled by the connexion—the very reason that declares non-connexional dozens of excellent missionary schemes throughout the Dominion, which, although doing good work, are not controlled by the Church. It is

surely needless to say that this view implies no unfriendliness, no invidious reference to non-connexional colleges. The question is not as to their efficiency, but as to their legal status. The excellent work they do only a bigot would ignore.

2. Our history has, on the whole, decidedly favored the connexional principle. We have at present, apart from missionary institutes, seven connexional institutions: Mount Allison (New Brunswick), Wesleyan (Montreal), Albert (Belleville), Victoria (Toronto), Alma (St. Thomas), Wesley (Winnipeg), and Columbian (British Columbia). Some of these were free-born, and some obtained their citizenship only at a great price; but all of them have been instituted by order of the united or uniting churches constituting the present Methodist Church. Such action has not always been unanimous, but it has always been regular and constitutional, and every loyal Methodist accepts the result. A principle may be good, and yet its application may be unsatisfactory to some. It is so with this principle. For example, in 1873, the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Canada authorized the establishment of the Wesleyan College, Montreal. The proposal was ably and honorably opposed at the Conference, but was sustained by a large majority. A diminishing but keenly active opposition was continued for some years; but time has fully justified the wisdom of the action taken, and the connexional status of the college is, of course, universally recognized. Again, at the recent General Conference, the Columbian College was adopted as connexional. It came, with very limited resources. Its adoption was strongly opposed by a few, including some representatives of Stanstead College, and on very serious grounds. In contrast with the absence of resources of the Columbian College is the position of Stanstead, which, through the liberality of its friends, has no debt, but has a fair endowment, besides a splendid equipment of buildings, etc. It is doing both High School and University work. In the latter, by affiliation with McGill, it carries students through two years of the university course. Through the efforts of Principal Flanders and his excellent staff its attendance is large and increasing. Now, twice this institution has sought a

connexional standing, but each time the request was refused by the General Conference. It is now, by provincial enactment, the property of the Montreal Conference, by whose liberality alone it has been brought to its present success—a Conference which has contributed most freely to the Wesleyan College, Montreal, and more liberally to the Educational Fund the last ten years than any other Conference. Under these circumstances it was natural that there should be some dissatisfaction with the action of the General Conference. But the action was legal and final; and now it behooves every Methodist in the Dominion to realize that in some measure he is responsible for the Columbian College, which, so far as its legal status is concerned, both as an academy and a theological college, can hold itself erect with as much independence as Victoria or Albert, Wesleyan or Mount Allison. It is commissioned to do academy work, and, as a matter of fact, is required to train theological students in philosophy, logic, political economy, Greek, history, etc., and every delegate at the General Conference who voted for its recognition as a connexional institution helped to make the Church responsible for qualifying it to do the work assigned to it. The danger, however, is that there is more readiness to give the child existence than to give it nourishment. But universal Methodism in Canada should resolve it must not starve. It is in an atmosphere evidently not very favorable, for the Legislature of British Columbia, it appears, was so indifferent to the views of Methodists, that the very name the Board preferred was rejected in the charter, and an odious name adopted, which strangers would suppose was chosen by ourselves as if deliberately to disclaim what the word "British" implies.

These particulars are stated to show how the principle of connexionalism is working. Many will say it is not working very satisfactorily. But the fact is patent that the principle is recognized. It is not ignored. Connexional recognition is of some account; and herein is some encouragement for the hope that the principle will continue.

3. A good guarantee of its continuance is the following resolution, moved by the Rev. Dr. Burwash at the last General

Conference: "No new educational institution shall be initiated by any Church Court or Board without the consent of the General Conference, or, during the period between sessions of that Conference, without the consent of the General Conference Special Committee." This, surely, is a boundary line at which authority says to every irregular enterprise, "Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther."

4. Another favorable omen is the resolution submitted by Rev. Dr. Potts, with one to the same effect by Rev. James Elliott, B.A., proposing that all heads of universities and theological colleges should be appointed by the General Conference. The proposal was not adopted. Why? Not because of want of general sympathy with it, but because of sectionalism and unwillingness to part with powers now held by College Boards. Victoria would probably acquiesce, and the Wesleyan (Montreal) has its charter so drawn as to be completely obedient to the General Conference. The two other institutions concerned resisted and defeated the proposal. The sooner that resolution of Dr. Potts is adopted the better will it be for the connexional stability of our universities and of our theological colleges and faculties, more especially of the latter. The Presbyterian General Assembly appoints not only the principals, but all the professors of its theological faculties. If a wave of latitudinarianism should sweep over our Church, it is quite conceivable that a College Board, largely made up of laymen, would be so enamored with some brilliant heretic as, in spite of the whole Church and the General Conference, to appoint him either as principal or professor, actually to train candidates for our ministry. It is said, You had better not transfer to the arena of the General Conference such a question as the election of a professor. I reply, If there is peace, it is morally certain the nominee of the Board would be appointed. If there is war, better fight it out where the whole Church can pronounce upon the issue, rather than have a matter so important settled by a small Board. The Presbyterian Church of Canada certainly shows no evil as resulting from the system. Surely, if the election of an officer to take charge, say of the Superannuation Fund, is so important as to require the

action of our Supreme Court, how much more is the determination of the question, What men shall mould the ministry of the future, or shall give character to the higher education of our universities?

5. The method of aiding our universities and theological colleges from a common fund is also helpful to the principle of connexionalism, and so is the present loan system, proposed by the General Secretary of Education. It represents in its most practical form the strong helping the weak. The strong Central Conferences, which used to loan their student seach \$100 a year or more, have now to fall into line with the rest, and be satisfied this year with the "standard loan" of \$33, sending the surplus to weaker Conferences. Some fear the strain of this system cannot be sustained; but the principle is exactly the same as in the missionary administration. A strong Conference does not dream of retaining its large income for its few missionaries, but there is one fund uniformly administered for the whole Dominion. So it is proposed to deal with the Educational Fund as regards loans to students.

In conclusion, I respectfully make the following suggestions on this subject to all friends of Canadian Methodist education:

1. We should keep Dr. Potts' motion in view, and in a conciliatory way aim at giving it effect. His resolution sought as little displacement as possible of existing arrangements, and proposed the appointment of a commission to deal in a friendly manner with the institutions concerned. It is hoped that before the next General Conference the universities and theological colleges concerned will be disposed to acquiesce in the measure.

2. The distinctions should be observed in all references to our educational equipmant between connexional and other institutions, so that the attitude and responsibility of the Church should be accurately defined in the minds of ministers and laymen.

3. Dr. Burwash's resolution must be maintained hereafter as fundamental and final. This stands as one of the best acts in our constitutional history.

It may be objected that the whole policy above outlined is

partial, and amounts to, this: You are inside the favored enclosure, and you shut the door against anyone else coming in. I reply: No, the door is open wide under Dr. Burwash's resolution, but only to worthy candidates. It is a moral certainty that, with a territory so vast, covering half the Continent, Methodism—representing the largest Protestant denomination in Canada, and growing faster than any denomination, Roman Catholic or Protestant—will need in a hundred years to increase the number of its connexional colleges, but the principle to be maintained is that in each case, as it arises, the Church shall order its inception, control its work, and aid it financially.

We have now seven connexional colleges, in addition to two proprietary and two Conference institutions; but the total equipment of these seven is nothing to boast of. Victoria, both a university and a theological college, has altogether an endowment of only \$280,000—about the same as the Presbyterian College of Montreal, which does the work of theology alone. The Wesleyan, of Montreal, has a meagre endowment of \$70,000; Mount Allison has \$117,000. There is not one of these whose resources are sufficient to keep it out of debt.

In such an unfavorable showing as this there is a strong argument for the principle of connexionalism. The energy of the whole Church should be engaged to make these a credit to us in every way. It may not be prudent to canvass for the Columbian in Montreal, nor for the Wesleyan in Manitoba, nor for Mount Allison in Ontario, nor for Victoria in Newfoundland; but in point of fact the whole Church is responsible for each, and Columbian, the youngest, has as much right as Victoria, the oldest, to a share in the financial efforts authorized by the General Conference; and these plans of aid should come on impartially in order of succession, and no one college should have the benefit of an order from the General Conference for its relief, beyond the quadrennium, unless such order be reaffirmed. The question should be in each General Conference, What connexional institution should now be specially aided and strengthened?

These views are not formulated to make invidious distinc-

tions between connexional and non-connexional institutions, but they represent a principle which is deemed essential to the highest efficiency of our educational work in Canada. As stated before, we have come to the point where two paths diverge. Let us hold loosely the principle of connexionalism—let us abandon it altogether, and the middle of the twentieth century will show in Canada a host of Methodist colleges; a few of them comparatively strong, but the majority weak, and all but slightly controlled by any central authority. On the other hand, let the General Conference say, We refuse to connexionalize any institution whose existence is not justified, first by its necessity, and secondly by its resources; and further, let us concentrate our efforts systematically, and in succession, to do the utmost for the institutions we have. Then, the next century will show in Canada a Methodist educational system far superior to that of the United States, where there is too much laxity; or to that in England, where there is too much rigidity. It will make little difference to the present generation of workers which tendency we encourage, but it will sensibly affect our whole educational future.

Wesleyan College, Montreal.

WILLIAM I. SHAW.

ISAIAH VI.—AN ESSAY IN INTERPRETATION.

ISAIAH, in the first verse of the sixth chapter of his prophecy, tells us that he had, in the year of King Uzziah's death, 758 B.C., a vision; and then follow the contents of the vision, which, in the main, constitutes a call to missionary service to the people of Judah on behalf of Jehovah. This portion, with some interesting historical announcements, extends to the end of the chapter. Has this vision a relation to the prophet's generation? and what is the relation? Has it, further, a relation to other times, particularly to that of Jesus, and generally, to all other times?

We are of the opinion that the piece stands by itself, and is without chronological connection with the preceding or following matter of the book of Isaiah. It is a general commission,

whose tenor one would expect to see fulfilled by all of Isaiah's subsequent activity, by the attitude of the people toward it, and by the historical events which developed in the period in which Isaiah exercised his prophetic office, or shortly afterwards.

Was there, then, a fulfilment of these terms in the days of our prophet? There is no doubt about this point, if we rely on biblical data. Isaiah was all his life long a persevering opponent of the forgetfulness of Jehovah, which existed among the people. He was the consistent advocate of faithfulness to political obligations to Assyria, when these had been once assumed, though he had warned Ahaz against entering into covenant with the Assyrian power. Isaiah was not obeyed by the people. "Their heart became fat, their ears became heavy, and their eyes were shut" to the consequences of their carelessness. So it was until danger came upon them, and then there was a call for the wise counsel of the man of God; at least from the King, Hezekiah, whose request for Isaiah's advice we may assume to represent a changed mind in the people.

As to the fulfilment of the prediction in respect to the results of the popular heedlessness, we have only to remember the dreadful desolation of Judah which was wrought by Sennacherib, about the time when he was so wondrously turned away from the walls of Jerusalem. The Assyrian record of this expedition is very explicit as to the havoc wrought by Sennacherib before he was sent back to his own land. The words, in substance, are as follows: "Forty-six of his (Hezekiah's) strong unwalled cities, and the small villages of their vicinity without number, with razing of the defences and with storming, I destroyed; 200,150 inhabitants, great and small, men and women, with horses, oxen, asses, cattle, and small cattle, I led away as spoil of war. I raised ramparts against him, and made those who came out of his city gates pay toll. The cities taken I separated from his land, and gave them to Mitinti, King of Ashdad; Padi, King of Ekron, and Zilli-Bel, King of Gaza; and I reduced in size his land, and laid upon him a burden of additional taxes and war indemnity." The rest of the story from the monument is intensely interesting, but it is unnecessary to quote it in this connection. We

have quoted enough to show from an extra-biblical source the truth of that part of Isaiah's commission which refers to the future vicissitudes of Judah in consequence of her neglect of the prophetic admonitions.

Has this commission any further relation than to the time of Isaiah; particularly, has it reference to the time of our Lord and His apostles?

We need not stop to examine many passages in the Apocalypse, where the privileged narrator casts his vision into the old Hebraic forms of apocalyptic description, and borrows the very words of Isaiah's vision to express his own experiences; for example, the oft-used term, "Him that sitteth upon the throne," appearing, perhaps, a dozen times in the Book of Revelation.

But if we turn to the end of the Book of Acts (Acts xxviii. 26, 27), we find a quotation almost verbatim of Isa. vi. 9, 10. The Apostle Paul, who uses the words, regards them as spoken "unto our fathers," and by their enduring aptness fittingly applicable to the Gospel-resisting Jews of Rome. Paul's statement does not give to the words used by him any specific Messianic application.

In John xii. 40, however, is quite a different manner of quotation. Paul quotes faithfully, even to verbal correctness, the passage in Isaiah as found in the Septuagint; yet he professes not to be dealing with a direct fulfilment of prophecy. John, on the contrary, quotes the sense, and comes none too close to a reproduction of the expression of the prophecy, and yet he makes the immensely significant comment after his quotation, "These things said Isaiah, because he saw his glory; and he spoke of him." What do these words mean? They express the belief of John who wrote them, and, in the connection, they make him assert that Isaiah saw the glory of the Messiah, and spake of the Messiah. The correctness of this expressed conviction of an inspired apostle, whose inspiration may for the moment be lost sight of, is not disproven by the proof that Isaiah's commission related to his own time, and was then fulfilled in all its terms. The proving of the earlier fulfilment does not exclude the possibility of another and later.

It is not, as we read John's expression, meant that Isaiah knew clearly the Messianic import of the commission given to him; but the statement is very distinct that he had a Messianic consciousness, and spoke under its influence and with reference to it.

It is a great cross that John, when adding so significant a comment to the citation, has not given us a more exact reproduction of the original words of the prophet. For, when we have such weighty by-statements introduced by the expression, "these things said Isaiah," and this, in turn, preceded by words whose substance only Isaiah said, it makes it hard, though not impossible, to uphold the full significance of the by-statements alluded to, namely, "because he saw his glory, and he spake of him." We have, however, notwithstanding this difficulty, an inspired opinion from one taught by our Lord himself, that Isaiah saw the Messianic glory and spoke of the Messiah.

A way out of the conclusion in favor of Messianic prediction in Isa. vi. is to deny the trustworthiness of John's testimony at this particular point. But that we cannot think of doing, for the discrediting would require as its ground that which would be at the same time its purpose. Proceeding from a feeling that there could be no Messianic prediction in Isa. vi., we would go on to disqualify a testimony which declared that there was such; and as a result of the disqualification, we then would feel ourselves on firmer ground in our denial of Messianic prophecy. This would surely be a short cut in criticism, and an easy way to established convictions, but not a method to be praised.

In Luke viii. 10 there follow the announcement by our Lord of the apostles' privilege "to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God," the further words, "but to the rest in parables; that seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand." We are well aware that a somewhat similar explanation of the use of parables was proffered by the Rabbins, and this consideration, added to the comparison of the passage with Matt. xiii. 13, where similar words are made to introduce a citation from Isaiah vi. 9, 10, makes it altogether probable that we have here an explanation on the part of our Lord, couched

in language which, of necessity, approaches to that of the prophet, but may easily be quite independent of the latter.

Then, if we pass to Mark iv. 11, 12, we have a quotation of Isa. vi. 9, 10, but in a much abbreviated and paraphrastic form. On this passage alone nothing in the shape of argument can be built up. It is not recorded as a fulfilment of specific prediction, though it is quite evident from the text, that our Lord regarded His teaching as fulfilling the conditions of the Old Testament words, be they prophetic or otherwise.

The citation in Matt. xiii. 14, 15, above referred to, is next to that in Acts in respect to fulness. It also rivals, and even excels, the latter in point of accuracy of quotation. The introduction preparing the way for the words of Isaiah as quoted, is as follows: "And unto them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah which saith." These words are put into the mouth of our Lord, and form an inspired report of what he said. Is it more likely that he did say these words, with the application just as Matthew has given it; or that he said nothing of prediction and of its fulfilment by himself? Matthew may be said to write one side—especially of our Lord's life—that which looked toward the Old Testament, its obligations and its prophecies; but such an aim should not be held to involve either incompetence or misrepresentation. It is more likely to involve a decided preference for such facts and features as are favorable to the purpose in view, and this only with a statement of them such as would avoid any prejudicial influence on other aspects of the character and life in question.

Assuming all this in advance, we have our Lord's declaration that His teaching and its results were prophesied by Isaiah. Are there any ways to avoid this conclusion? There are none, as far as we can see, other than the disqualifying of Matthew as a reporter of the saying of our Lord; the interpretation of our Lord's utterance in some way foreign to the Jewish intelligence, to which He addresses himself; or, finally, to assume accommodation on our Lord's part to a perverted view of prophecy prevalent in His generation. We think, as to the first of these means of evasion that, failing sufficient proof to the contrary, we should believe Matthew's report to be trustworthy.

The second choice would be made, if we were to assume anything else than a prophetic prediction and a real fulfilment. The third choice has often been made, but on very small grounds in cases of this sort, where a moral principle would be involved in the accommodation. The simplest view, and the Jewish view as well, is that of an actual prediction and an actual fulfilment.

We now see, if our positions be correct, the relation of this commission of the Old Covenant prophet to the Messianic times.

There remains to say that Paul's application of the passage to the Jews who refused to receive his message, shows us the manner of its application through all time. Wherever the Gospel is refused, the relevancy of the passage may be felt, and may be made a means of profitable admonition.

In closing, let us indicate that the largest portion of Isa. vi. cannot be, with certainty, given a Messianic application. The only portion explicitly announced as Messianic is that in verses 9, 10. John xii. 41 may be said to refer to the whole vision of the prophet, but we have no sure evidence of this. Certain it is that we have, in this sixth chapter, a vision of Isaiah the prophet, in which he is appalled by a Divine apparition, prepared for Divine service by a sanctifying process, called to service, given a commission, and finally given an assurance of the results of his work, and of certain disastrous events which must have some casual and occasional relation to this work. Beyond this, we have in the New Testament, of two verses (9, 10), an expressed application to our Lord and His great prophetic ministry. Such is the sum of that which we regard as the clear direction of this passage—a passage, by the way, which we do not observe among those treated in Dr. Briggs' work on Messianic Prophecy.

Heidelberg, Germany.

WALTER M. PATTON.

SIN AND CRIME.

WRONG-DOING may be divided into offences against God and against our fellow-creatures. The former are sins; the latter are crimes. The two words are sometimes used generically and interchangeably; but speaking specifically sin is an offence against God, crime is an offence against man. There may be sin where there is no crime, but there cannot be crime without sin. The heart may be stained with a thousand sins without involving any injury to society. Hatred and lust are sins, but while they still remain hidden in the heart, no crime is committed. A man may erect an altar to a false God, or blaspheme the name of Jehovah on the wild expansive prairie, where no human being is within a hundred miles of him. The idolatry or blasphemy is sin, but not crime. The same act, however, may be both sin and crime. If I bear false witness against my neighbor, I transgress God's law and wrong my fellow-man. God's administration is based upon the principle of right, of justice. From His very nature it is impossible for Him to sanction or tolerate injustice or wrong. The moral universe is constructed upon the principle of a grand and all comprehending unity. The supreme and ultimate design of the divine Creator is the highest possible perfection of all the beings included in this moral universe. The loftiest destiny is reached by full conformity to what reason intuitively recognizes as true and right and perfect and good. These primitive principles of rational intuition implanted in the human mind by the Creator correspond with the same essential principles in the infinite, absolute reason in the mind of God, and with the divine rule of human life as taught in the Bible. Sin consists in a failure to conform to the rule of life prescribed by the highest dictates of absolute reason in God, intuitive reason in man, and revealed truth in the Holy Scriptures. This is only its negative aspect. In its positive aspect, it is a wilful departure from the rule of life, and consequently falling short of attaining the true destiny of man. It is the disturbing element in human nature which diverts from the right and directs toward the wrong. It is a perversion and prostitution of man's noblest and God-given

powers. It is discord in man's nature, and antagonism to the nature of God. Its outward manifestations are many, but they all spring from one underlying principle. This principle is the same everywhere and always. "The sea is one, the waves are innumerable." Selfishness is the real principle of sin. It is seeking one's centre and happiness in himself. Viewed from the standpoint of revealed moral law, sin is transgression and disobedience. It is breaking the link of life which unites man to God. Sin has no power to arrest its own progress, or to divert its forces into another channel. Continuance is the inherent law of its being. It is of its nature to perpetuate itself. Self-purification and self-correction are impossible. Confusion and discord have no power of self-rectification. Redemption from chaos in the natural or spiritual world must come from an external and superior power.

PARDON AND PUNISHMENT.

There are only two ways in which God can dispose of sin. It must be pardoned or punished. He cannot pardon sin as earthly monarchs pardon crime; that is, upon the ground of sovereign prerogative. If He pardon at all, it must be in harmony with the principles of everlasting righteousness.

In dealing with the problem of forgiveness, three things are imperatively required:

1. Sin must be adequately condemned.
2. God's righteousness must be amply vindicated.
3. Provision must be made for the full reconciliation of the transgressor to God and man.

The atonement of Jesus Christ is God's provision for the accomplishment of this threefold purpose. It includes vastly more than is usually attributed to it in theological creeds.

"The cross, the manger and the throne
Are big with glories yet unknown."

(1) One purpose commonly overlooked is the extent to which it satisfies the human conscience and divine justice by its unequivocal, effective and supreme condemnation of sin. To

every careful student of Holy Scripture, it must be evident that sin deserves to be branded and reprobated with such force as to expel it utterly and forever as a vile and abominable thing from the sphere of goodness. This abhorrence and condemnation of sin must follow it through all the countless cycles of eternity. That sin deserves condemnation is a first principle. God's ordained method of condemnation is by punishment. Sin, therefore, deserves to be punished because it deserves to be condemned. Punishment is not a first principle, but a means of condemnation. Now, is there any way by which sin can be effectually condemned except by the punishment of the sinner? Yes, there is one way. The atonement, in the strictest and fullest sense, condemns it, reprobates it, with an emphasis and moral force far exceeding that which will attend the punishment of all sinners. Repentance merely condemns sin in our own name. The atonement condemns it in the name of God, and with all the force of the highest manifestations of the divine character.

When a man believes, his faith accepts this import of the divine atonement, and gives its fullest sanction to God's condemnation of his sin. There is, then, no more necessity for that man to suffer eternally in order that sin may be reprobated, crushed and made abominable. The sins of the fully punished sinner are not more completely condemned than the sins of the believer in Jesus, "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3).

JUSTICE AND JUSTIFICATION.

(2) Any provision for the remission of sin must fully vindicate the righteous character of God. He must be just while He justifies. For the accomplishment of this purpose He has set forth Jesus Christ as a propitiation. The Gospel reveals the righteousness of God in the remission of sins. To do this, a twofold substitution is indispensable. There must be the substitution of the one for the many, and the substitution of His humiliation, sufferings and death for the punishment due to sin.

(3) In the remission of sins, provision must be made to

bring the transgressors into harmony with the righteous character of God. It must include reconciliation to God and harmony with the laws of the universe. The incarnation of Christ is the symbol and prophesy of the new society which God designed to form on earth. The life of Christ is the model after which the Christian character is to be constructed. The grace emanating from the atonement makes the birth and perpetuity of the new life possible. It secures the spirit to effect in man a new creation, a restoration to the divine likeness, and holy and unbroken fellowship with God.

The only other way to dispose of sin is the infliction of penalty. Unless man avail himself of the special provisions of redemption, his sin must be condemned by personal punishment. Sin is an infinite evil, and merits infinite retribution. Upon a finite creature an infinite punishment cannot be inflicted within a limited duration. What he cannot endure intensively, he must bear extensively. The infinite penalty cannot be compressed into a small compass, it must, therefore, be indefinitely extended. Without this, how could sin be adequately condemned in the man who has not availed himself of the salvation offered in the Gospel? As its duration is without limit, and there are different degrees of demerit, so there must be different degrees of intensity in the retributive suffering. God's dealing with sin implies that it must be pardoned or punished.

THE LAW OF RESTITUTION.

Let us now look at how God deals with crime, or offences against our fellow-men. Does He undertake to forgive crime? No; he does not. If I defraud you of a thousand dollars, can I go to God and obtain forgiveness, without having any regard to you? How could He forgive me the wrong I have committed against my fellow-creature? The sin against Himself involved in that wrong He can forgive, but He sends me with my crime to the man I have injured. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar," etc. The divine purpose is to bring about universal reconciliation—to reconcile man to God, and to reconcile man to his fellow-creature. If God could forgive the crime as well as the sin, this would not effect reconciliation between

myself and the man I have wronged. There are only three ways to dispose of crime:

1. Restitution with forgiveness.
2. Forgiveness without restitution.
3. Punishment.

1. Then, restitution with forgiveness. We may injure our fellow-men in their reputation or their property. Restitution is required by reason, justice, common-sense and the Word of God. In the earlier ages of the world's history, and among nations possessing merely the light of reason, conscience, and some elements of traditional religion, it was imperatively demanded. The ancient Egyptians, Greeks and Romans all had laws compelling restitution. The Roman law required the publicans, when fraud or extortion was proved, to restore fourfold. Zaccheus recognized his obligation to this law. "Amongst the Mohammedans, restitution is enforced with the greatest rigor. It is usual when a Turk is near his death for his relations to approach his bed with all the papers that refer to his property, and presenting them to him one by one, to inquire whether his conscience accuses him of any injustice in the acquisition of his wealth. Without this examination and consequent reparation of any injury he has committed, he cannot gain admission into Paradise." The law of Moses required restitution, and in some cases compensation in addition twofold, fourfold, and even fivefold. Restitution to the fullest extent of man's ability does not necessarily restore confidence and harmony. That all wrong feeling may be obliterated, there must be true repentance in the transgressor and frank and full forgiveness on the part of the injured.

2. Forgiveness without restitution. In some instances it is utterly impossible to make restitution. Reputation may be so blighted as to be beyond the possibility of restitution, or man may become so hopelessly bankrupt, as to be unable to return the property he has unjustly acquired. In all these and similar cases, he should resort to every available means to obtain forgiveness from those he has wronged. As crime and sin are widely different offences, so their forgiveness is not necessarily based on the same principles. In the remission of sins, God

has been always right, and man has been invariably wrong. In the pardon of crime, both parties concerned may have been to blame, though in different degrees.

CRIME NEVER PARDONED.

3. Punishment. If there is neither restitution nor pardon, what disposition can be made of crime? It must be punished. Even after God has pardoned the sin of wrong-doing, the punishment of the crime is extended through a long and troubled life. May we not find here the cause of a large amount of our disappointments and sufferings and disasters which follow multitudes through the whole of their earthly career, even after God has forgiven their sins. Is it not time that this much neglected Gospel should be preached with a clearness and emphasis that cannot be misunderstood? In old Testament times I find an atonement provided for all kinds of sins, but no atonement for crimes. In the New Testament, I never find God offering pardon to one man for the crime he has committed against another. He invariably sends the man who has wronged his neighbor to the injured party to make restitution or obtain forgiveness. "If thou bring thy gifts to the altar," etc.

The punishment of crime is very different from the punishment of sin. Sin is an offence against an Infinite God; crime is an offence against a human being. Sins are generally punished in the future world. Crimes are usually, though not always, punished in this life. The same offence cannot be both pardoned and punished. David committed a sin against God, and a crime against Uriah. God pardoned the sin but punished the crime. "And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord, and Nathan said unto David, the Lord also hath put away thy sin. Thou shalt not die; howbeit because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die. . . . Now, therefore, the sword shall never depart from thine house. . . . Thus saith the Lord, behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house." Evidently, then, while the sin was forgiven, the crime

met with appropriate and merited punishment. The penalty corresponded closely with the transgression. Not personally, but through the bloody demon of war, David put Uriah to death, and the sword departed not from his house all the days of his life. His was a domestic wrong. Domestic trouble embittered all his earthly years. The history of individuals, families, communities, and nations, is full of terrible retributions inflicted upon crime.

The principles inculcated in divine revelation in regard to God's dealings with sin and crime accord with the deepest dictates of human reason. Their full and constant recognition in human society would tend largely to arrest the progress of wrong-doing, and make men much more considerate in all their relations and in all their dealings with their fellow-creatures. The universal practice of these divine principles would disburden the earth of its sorrow, and everywhere reconcile man to his God and to his fellow-man.

Toronto, Ont.

WM. GALBRAITH.

Sermonic.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF EDUCATED MEN.

2 Tim. ii. 2: "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."

IN the opening and closing words of this epistle we have a life picture of rare beauty. An old man, who for threescore years has been a student and a teacher of the highest truth, is giving his parting admonitions to his young disciple. The old man is shut up in a dark and noisome prison, not because he has wronged his fellowmen, but because he has offered them the truth. In that prison he has but one companion, a beloved physician, who for many years has been his helper. He has recently been placed on trial for his life before the Imperial Court of Rome, and though some of Cæsar's household in days past had seemed to be his friends, now no man stood by him; all forsook him. He now clearly understands that there

remains but one thing more for him to do, *i.e.*, the martyr's offering of his life, followed by the martyr's crown. "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand." It is exceedingly interesting to be able to look into the old master's inner heart at such a time as this and read its hidden faith. "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day." He is thinking of his own great Master—not Gamaliel, but Christ. But specially touching is the turning of the old man's heart to his favorite pupil. "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus." His thoughts run back to the days, when as a lad of sixteen, he found him in Lystra, even then a lover of the old manuscripts, in which was contained the wisdom which God had revealed to the ancients, and carefully educated by a mother and a grandmother worthy of honor even among the honorable women of the Bible. That was a wonderful school, of which Paul and Barnabas were the teachers, and Mark, and Luke, and Silas, and Timothy, and later on Titus and Apollos, and many others were the students. That was a strange college, which moved about in a camel's-hair tent from city to city in Asia Minor, and Macedon and Greece, the home of philosophy and literature, of science and art. Let us follow them through a day's work. In the morning they apply themselves to the simple handicraft by which they earn the humble fare of pulse and water, on which, for the love of truth, they are quite content to live. But while one plies the shears, and the others the needles which fashion the tents, Paul at the same time delivers his lecture. His theme, perhaps, is Isaiah and the Christ, or Abraham and the righteousness of faith, or David and the forgiveness of sin. But whatever it is he will surely bring forth the most sublime conceptions, both in religion and ethics, to which the world has ever listened. Presently the morning lecture and the morning work are finished, and after a frugal meal of pulse and water they go forth to the second item of their college work. They are missionaries as well as students. In every town in which they pitch their university tent, they at once establish among the poorest and most needy of the

inhabitants, a college settlement for the dissemination of truth and of higher ideas. All turn preachers to the little groups in the market-place, or to the loungers under the great sycamores, who are taking the noon spell of rest from the day's work. Finally, at eventide, they gather home to their college-tent once more, and the evening hour is spent in Christian fellowship, and in prayer and praise to God. A wonderfully simple, beautiful, pleasant college life was that. They needed neither football nor gymnasium, for the morning work kept the mind clear and the body healthy. They dreaded no desperate crams or trying examinations, for such was the eager spirit and love of the truth, that what they once heard they never again forgot. Their reviews were the quiet meditative hours in which each worked out for himself, and in his own way, that which had fallen from the lips of the teacher. They needed no expensive buildings, for the blue vault of heaven was their noble dome, and the great mountains were its pillars; and if it was a rainy morning, their black hair tent gave them shelter. They needed no endowments or scholarships, for students paid no fees, and professors received no salaries, and each day's work purchased the day's meal. Their study was humanity, and their book the book of human life. If at any time they needed a new mantle or a few parchments for writing, they must work a little harder at the making of tents. But now these days are over. They are a pleasant memory of the past. The students are scattered over the world. One is in Ephesus, one in Crete, another in Corinth, possibly one in Alexandria, and one alone, a man whom the whole world loves, Luke, the beloved physician, follows the old master, doing what he can to take care of him. Their home is now in the Mamertine prison, and soon the martyr's blood will seal the truth which the voice and pen may no longer teach. It was under such circumstances as these that the words of our text were written by Paul, devolving upon Timothy the responsibilities of an educated man. To-day I ask this class of '95 and all others here present, to join with me in what to some of us may be our last study together of its important lessons.

Paul in these words implies the infinite value of all truth.

What is truth? Truth is that in the human mind which corresponds to the reality of things. These things are all the work, and hence the thoughts of God. He has laid their deep foundations by His own infinite wisdom. As Plato long ago taught, all first existed as idea, and then as fact or thing done. The things that are made declare, according to Paul, the invisible things of God. When then our minds, in contemplation of the world about us, grasp something of reality, when the truth shines in upon us from the real world all around us, we are reproducing that which first was in the mind of God—not in its divine fulness and perfection, but after our finite measure. It may be that what we thus know is the structure of the daisy, the mechanism of a worm, the nature of a chemical compound, or the composition of a drop of water, or of the air which we breathe. It may be the still more wonderful movement of our own minds, and the inner nature of their various products of thought in science, art, literature and language; or it may be the laws which govern the great movements of the social organism in its industrial, social, religious and political relations. But if in any of these directions we have arrived at truth, if we have learned to distinguish truth from falsehood, if our minds have been exercised to know the truth, then we have attained to a possession and a power of inestimable value.

1. Because that which we have thus reached is immutable. It is reality. It is fact. It can never cease to be true. It came forth from the fountain of immutable perfection, and however the sensible things in which it is embodied may change and pass, the truth is changeless; and hence

2. It is eternal. It may seem presumptuous for us who are of a day, to speak of eternity. Our most extended historical investigations reach out but a little way. Dr. McCurdy may carry us back to the foundations of the Semitic peoples, to Babel and Accad, and Sippar, and Erech, and Ashur two thousand years before Abraham, and we may find there the same moral, social and political forces at work as in our own day. An Arnold may show us that the history of Rome is modern and not ancient history. Max Muller may find the fundamental elements of religion in the Vedas written millenniums ago.

Prof. Wright may have shown you that the structure of the plant of the palæozoic was governed by the same laws as that which grew in the swamps of Florida last season. Dr. Chapman may have pointed out that the chemical forces of the Archæan age were exactly those of our own time, or Prof. Baker, that the light of the most distant star is identical in nature with that which shines from your table lamp. And yet it is not because of these vast ranges through time and space that we say that truth is immutable and eternal, but because we believe that it comes forth from the infinite perfection of Being in whom we live and move and have our being. It comes forth from the immutable eternity of His Being. It enters as law and order into the very essence of all created being. And thence it is reflected into our being, the glory of the Eternal, full of grace and truth. The tiny moat that floats in the gilded air is full of this truth. It is founded and built in truth because it is the work of God. The summer shower may wash it down to the earth and dissolve it, and carry it to the river, and the river to the ocean, and there it may be planted in the rocky formations of a continent yet to be; or the lightning may smite it and rend asunder its molecules, and mingle them with the clouds of heaven to be carried to other lands. But that in it which came forth from God, the power of His will, and the law of His intelligence giving it force, measure and direction, abides unchanged and unchangeable and eternal. Now, if this possession of truth were no more than this intellectual, spiritual contact of man with the immutable and the eternal, it would of itself be of infinite value. All our thinking—and think we must—is either true or false. The true abides and satisfies forever, the false must some day perish. It is, hence, of inestimable value to know the truth and to be able to discern the truth.

3. But the value of the truth lies still beyond in its moral side. Of all beings in the universe man is a worker, in some measure an independent worker, a responsible worker, a worker with God. The truth is not given to man only for the pleasure of knowing. It is to guide his life. It is to make him in that life a free man. A machine, animate or inanimate, cannot be

free because it cannot consciously direct its work by consciously known truth. That is at once the responsibility and the glory of human life. He knows the truth, and by the truth he is able to be free. By it he builds his work of life. And hence this truth not only glorifies, ennobles, strengthens the thoughts of men and makes their thoughts things to live on forever, but it does the same for all their work. We are not merely to think the truth, to know the truth, but to build the truth into our lives. What a wonderful thing is a human life! Your life, my life! We each have but the one to live. Is it to be a noble, beautiful life? Is it to be a marred life, a failure? This is the question of all questions for you, young men and women, as you stand on the threshold of life to-day. Paul, in one passage, tells us of two kinds of life: one of wood, hay, stubble—a life to be burned up, a failure of life, even if the man himself is saved so as by fire. There is nothing in his life to endure, nothing which in God's final working out of all things to the ultimate glory can be used except for destruction—no fitness to survive. There is another life, of gold, silver and precious stones. These will stand the fire and the testing of time. Now cast your eye over the world's history, and ask yourself, where is the work which endures? Is it the work of Nimrod, of Rameses, of Nebuchadnezzar, of Alexander, of Cæsar, of Napoleon? That which they built has in every instance long since perished. Only that which God built, and which they knew not, remains. But of the life-work of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, of Paul, Peter and John, of Galileo, of Savonarola and Luther, of a Newton, a Wesley and a Wilberforce, of a John Howard and of a General Booth, there is great store of gold, silver and precious stones that will abide forever and shine in the final glory of the world's regenerated kingdom. Now, what is this abiding work? It is the work done in truth. I do not say in perfect truth, for who has yet attained to that? We all have some wood, hay and stubble, something which must be condemned and burnt up. Blessed is the man who has, at least, a little in his life of the gold of truth, the imperishable treasures of truth. Look at Paul himself. See how his work remains, how his ideas have moved on

down the ages, rising up again from the dead, until to-day everywhere they lift and bless the world. Such is the inestimable value of truth as it takes the moral direction of the individual and of the sum total of human life. And to-day more than ever before, the world's life and work needs the sure guidance of the truth. The first stages of all great movements are slow. The student of history can trace the first beginnings of Rome's great fabric of empire far back into a misty past. There he finds them slowly evolving, building up a national character and a national organization in a conservative spirit. The slowness of the movement made it sure. They were not in haste for new things, and only obvious truth and right could make their way. Every step of progress was thus firm. But after six centuries or more of this slow movement, they began to rush things. And then ambition trampled on truth, and luxurious indulgence disregarded the laws of righteousness and temperance, and you all know the utter crash and collapse that followed. Now for a thousand years or more our British world has been slowly but steadily moving forward. Step by step the constitution of the Empire has been slowly evolved, and thus far, we think that each new step has been founded in political truth. It has taken time to reach it, but the time has been well spent. Greater haste might have built in more hay, wood and stubble. And so the great commercial and industrial fabric of the Empire has been built very slowly. From a very poor country, Britain has climbed gradually to be the richest country on earth. The bubbles have burst. The rash speculations have utterly failed and vanished, and the sure farthing profits have built the great pyramid of wealth. And so in social life, notwithstanding all our sin and misery, there is no country in the world where the sum total of human happiness is greater. But it is not the happiness of rout and revel of carnival and masquerade, but the quiet joy of pure and useful lives. Now, all this slowly growing strength of our nation is built on truth. True principles, right ideas guide this great, steady, onward movement of life. It has been like the central current of our great broad deep lakes. But in our time we seem to be nearing the rapids. The world is in haste. We are

all impatient to see and hear some new thing. All sorts of theories are advanced. All sorts of experiments are tried. In the quicker movement of life we feel the evils of society more than ever before, and this adds to our impatience and to the hurry, not only of the individual, but also of the whole mass. Never before did we so much need the skilful pilot to guide us in the true course. Never before did we so need the prayer, "Teach me thy way, O Lord; Lead me in thy truth, and teach me." We need truth and right in politics, truth and right in commerce, truth in religion, truth in all our social and charitable enterprises. Turn your life where you may, the world is calling for men of truth, for clear-headed, keen-sighted lovers of truth and right to stand on the bridge and command the great ship that it may move on in safety. The lesson of this for young people to-day is, "Master the truth." Understand the exact truth of something. A thorough, accurate knowledge of something that belongs to human life will lift you to a place of power and influence in the world. And the wider and more perfect your grasp of truth, the higher and the more influential will be the pedestal upon which it will place you. Each young man's best treasure is the truth which he so understands that he can build it into useful life-work.

Young ladies and gentlemen of the class of '95, I speak to you to-day as to people who know something of this truth. During the four years of your college life you have been professed seekers after truth. You have been in daily converse with men who have given their lives to the investigation of truth in divers fields. They have placed before you the best thoughts, and the most perfect sentiments, and the highest ideals of life of all the ages. From them you have learned the lessons of science and of history, of ethics and religion, of literature and art, and above all else, you have learned how to seek for and to recognize the truth. And now upon you, as educated men and women, let me press home the words of the venerable teacher Paul: "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."

There is a beautiful touch here. Timothy, the eye of all your

fellow-disciples is upon you. They expect great things from you. In this large class of thirty-seven members, each is a witness of the work of all the rest. Of some of you, certainly, your brothers and sisters are expecting great things. A few weeks ago I stood by the grave of my last surviving college classmate, and as we laid him away to rest, I was the only witness that he had been faithful to the trust of his *Alma Mater*, that he had not disappointed the hopes of our boyhood. You are witnesses for each other, or against each other, through the whole course of coming life. Be faithful, and your brothers will gladly bear their testimony when you fall.

But what is your peculiar duty as educated men and women? This : To pass the heritage of light and truth on to the coming generations.

Over in England there are families that date back to the days of the Norman Conqueror. They are justly proud of their ancient and honorable lineage. They have gathered the precious heirlooms of the centuries. Here is a sword wielded at Cressy. There is a necklace of gems, the gift of a king. Here is a service of plate wrought by the cunning workmen of the Middle Ages. There is a castellated home built in the days of the Tudors. Here are ancestral oaks planted in the days of Elizabeth. The dying old lord is leaving it all, handing it over to his son and heir to preserve unimpaired and to enrich with new monumental treasures. And you are the heirs of all the ages. Your lineage is a lineage of minds that have loved and grasped the truth. In your veins there may not flow the blood of a Howard, but in your mind there live and move the thoughts of a Plato, of a Paul, of a Solomon, of an Isaiah, of a Solon, of a Moses, yea, of the Divine Christ. This is your lineage, the lineage of men of thought who have first learned and have then taught the truth in all the ages. You are in the spiritual succession, and to your keeping the heirlooms of truth, the precious spiritual treasures of humanity, the accumulated truth of all the past is now committed. Keep it as the apple of your eye. Guard it with your life's blood, if need be. Others have languished in prison and felt the keen axe on the block, or the scorching flame at the stake, that you might have

this truth. It is the precious heritage of prophets and apostles, of sages and heroes, of saints and martyrs. Keep it without spot or tarnish till the end. We commit it to you as it is embodied in the science, and philosophy, and literature of all the ages. We commit it to you as it has been built into the firm foundations of our institutions. But more than that, we commit it to you as it lives in the conscience and religious faith of humanity, and as it is written in an ancient book given by inspiration of God. And we charge you, in the name of all the past, for the sake of all the future, guard it as a priceless treasure. Let nothing of it ever be lost. But more than that. It may be the unspeakable privilege of some of you to add something to the sum total of human knowledge of the truth. The united voice of all humanity may still join with the great Newton and say, "We have been as little children gathering a few shells on the seashore, while the great ocean of truth lies all undiscovered before us. Can you at some point roll back the primeval mist and bring to light some new treasures of hitherto unknown truth? If such should be your privilege, it is surely your duty. But as you know, this is given to but a few. But a wider and equally important duty falls to all. Let your light shine. Lift your torch on high. Don't put your candle under a bed or under a bushel. This is the responsibility of every man to whom the light of God's truth comes. The truth which came to the old Hebrew prophet was a burden. He found no rest till he had uttered it; it was as a fire in his bones; it tormented him until it came to the surface. And I warn you that knowledge will make you restless and uneasy mortals. It will incite your ambitions, it will stir your consciences. You must tell it out for the very joy of telling it, and in so doing you are not only fulfilling a law of your being, a restless instinct of your spiritual nature, but you are obeying a law of God as well. This law in the past has created literature, has founded institutions, has built universities, has established churches, and has shed upon our world to-day its nineteenth century light and glory.

Go forth, then, my young friends, with what of the divine light of truth we have been able to give you. Go forth as

faithful men. Go forth under the inspiration of a grand responsibility with a rare mission. Go forth with the eye of your witnessing brothers upon you, and for your brief day bear the burden of truth for the healing of the nations, until the Master of all truth shall himself say to each one at last, "It is enough, come up higher."

Victoria University.

N. BURWASH.

OUTLINE STUDY OF THE LIFE OF THE CHRIST.

V.—THE THIRTY YEARS OF PRIVATE LIFE—FROM BIRTH TO BAPTISM.

1. The Advent of the Saviour. Luke ii. 1-20 (Matt. i. 18-25).
2. The Infancy of Jesus. Luke ii. 21-39; Matt. ii. 1-23.
3. Christ's Life in Nazareth. Luke ii. 40-52 (Matt. xiii. 54-58; Mark vi. 1-5; John i. 46; vii. 5).

(1) *The Advent of the Saviour.* Luke ii. 1-20 (Matt. i. 18-25).

(a) The taxing of Augustus; Enrolment of Joseph and Mary. vs. 1-5.

(b) Birth of Jesus the Christ—Bethlehem. vs. 6, 7.

(c) The Angelic Announcement—"Gloria in excelsis!" vs. 8-14.

(d) Visit of the Shepherds—Holy men. vs. 15-20.

The following synthetic statement of this section may be given:

"In consequence of an imperial decree issued by Cæsar Augustus, when Quirinius was Governor of Syria, that the Roman world should be taxed, Joseph, according to Jewish custom, went from Nazareth with his betrothed for enrolment to their ancestral city, Bethlehem, the city of David, to whose house and family they belonged. Joseph and Mary were late in arriving at Bethlehem, hence they could find no room at the inn, and took lodgings in the stable. When there Mary gave birth to her first-born Son, and having swathed Him, laid Him in a manger.

"During the same night that He was born, an Angel of the Lord appeared to some shepherds who were watching their flocks near by Bethlehem, and joyfully announced to them the good news of the birth of a Saviour, giving them a sign by which they should know the child. Immediately the Angel was joined by a great heavenly choir, praising God, singing, 'Glory to God, and peace among men.'

"When the angels went away the shepherds talked the matter over, and decided to go and see what had been made known to them. Leaving

their flocks they hastened to Bethlehem, and find the child and his parents, just as it had been told them. They related what had been spoken to them about this child, and everybody that heard it wondered. Mary remembered these things, and pondered over them. The shepherds returned, praising God."

Study the time, nature, extent, and purpose of the "decree," noting Luke's object for referring to it. Think of all the possible reasons for Joseph and Mary leaving Nazareth and seeking a home in Bethlehem, one hundred miles distant. Examine the Scripture references to Bethlehem, "House of Bread" (Genesis xxxv. 19-21; xlviii. 7; Ruth i. 1; ii. 4; 1 Samuel xvi. 1-13, etc.); the prophetic connection with the birth of the Messiah (Micah v. 2), and its admitted recognition by the Jews (Matt. ii. 6; John vii. 42). Notice how the power of the Roman Empire was employed to determine the birthplace of our Lord, and thus secure the fulfilment of prophecy. Compare with this fact Gal. iv. 4, "When the fulness of time was come," implying an appointed time beforehand and a series of preparatory steps prearranged. Why did Mary as well as Joseph at this census-taking go up to Bethlehem for registration? Luke says Mary was "betrothed" to Joseph at this time; compare with Matthew i. 24, 25, and see in what respect, if any, this differed from "married." Imagine the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem, and possible reason for their late arrival at the "guest chamber" of the khan.

Consider carefully the circumstances of our Lord's nativity; how the "Son of God" found His first resting-place in the manger of a stable; that His was a truly human birth; and that He began His earthly life as a frail, helpless, human child, looking for care and training to human parents, destined as all others to wait for the growth of years to fit Him for His work. Ponder well the lowly birth of the world's Saviour and its religious teaching, whether it detracts from His character or is incongruous with His mission. The manner and condescension of His birth has dignified infancy and childhood, and exalted humility and meekness. Notice that our narratives of the birth and infancy are the simple statement of the bare fact. That the appropriate and delicate silence touching the circum-

stances of "the nativity" gives such a befitting purity and guilelessness to the story as to put it beyond the possibility of being a natural product of Judaism or a normal development of Jewish thought. It also makes us to feel that the very contrasts suggested by this lowly birth of "the King of the Jews" is in harmony with the kind of person the New Testament declares Him to be. Luke's brief announcement of the circumstances of the birth was to show the humble and friendless state of "the Son of man" at his advent into humanity. Does "first-born" imply other children later? Compare Hebrews i. 6; Matthew xii. 46-50; xiii. 55, 56; John vii. 1-5.

Mark that God regards the advent of a deliverer as of importance to the humblest class of people, seeing that He reveals the fact to the devout, industrious shepherds, who were, no doubt, in their midnight meditations, contemplating the Coming One. Also, that heaven was moved by this event, that attracted so little attention from the great ones of earth, either in Church or State. The flocks were probably for sacrificial purposes, and the shepherds not of the ordinary class, but those in constant intercourse with the priests and Levites. If, therefore, they "made known abroad thoroughly" what they had heard and seen, those at the temple would early hear of the occurrences, and the minds of all would be prepared with wondering expectancy. The Jews not only believed that the Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem, but that he was to be revealed from Migdal Eder, "the tower of the flock" (Gen. xxxv. 21)—a watch-tower for the temple flocks that lay close to Bethlehem, on the road to Jerusalem. Compare vs. 7 and 12, and see how that fact could be a sign. Compare the Authorized and Revised Versions of ver. 14, noting the difference of interpretation; study the form of the song as a three-fold parallelism. Notice the angelic description of "the Saviour" as "the anointed (Christed) Lord," and recall what has been already said concerning Him and His work. Meditate upon the scenes and circumstances connected with this first Christmas night—and God's great gift to man. Pick out everything mentioned concerning the angels, the Lord, the babe, the

shepherds; and make a comprehensive description of each in your own words. Observe that the keynote of the angelic announcement is "Saviour," the Messiah. Search the Old Testament to ascertain the description of Him as the "Anointed" Lord, especially reading Isaiah xi. and lx. and comparing with John i. 33, to see how our Lord was "anointed" with the Holy Spirit as Prophet, Priest and King. Mark that these shepherds must have had the needful spiritual qualifications, or the revelation would not have been made to them; and, also, that they received all required instruction to lead them to the Saviour, and enable them to become the first human preachers of the glad Evangel. Let us, with the shepherds, bend over the babe, and anticipate the life that is before Him in the light of Isaiah ix. 6, 7, and liii. Think that the salvation of the world hung on such a slender thread as the feeble throb of an infant life. Consider the supernatural birth of the Son of Mary from the standpoint of Isaiah vii. 14; and think of other children mentioned in Scripture, involving the miraculous, comparing their birth with His.

2. *The Infancy of Jesus.* Luke ii. 21-39; Matt. ii. 1-23.

- (a) The circumcision—the Babe named. Luke ii. 21.
- (b) The presentation in the Temple—the Babe consecrated. vs. 22-24.
- (c) The testimony of Simeon and Anna—the *Nunc Dimittis*. vs. 25-38.
- (d) The visit of the Magi—Herod's suspicions aroused. Matt. ii. 1-12.
- (e) The flight into Egypt—murder of the innocents. vs. 13-18.
- (f) The return to Nazareth—prophecy fulfilled. vs. 19-23; Luke ii. 39.

The contents of this section may be synthetically stated thus:

"Upon the eighth day after His birth the child was circumcised and named Jesus, as had been foretold by the angel. When forty days old He was presented by His parents to the Lord in the temple at Jerusalem, according to the law, with the appropriate offerings. Among those in Jerusalem 'waiting for the consolation of Israel,' was the righteous, reverent, expectant Simeon, who was endued, instructed and directed by the Holy Spirit. He, coming to the temple at this time, sees in this child Jehovah's Anointed, whom he was divinely promised to behold

before death. He received Him into his arms, and thanks God for the sight of the universal Saviour, by singing the *Nunc Dimittis*. He blesses the wondering parents, and tells Mary of the nature and influence of the child's life and work, and also warns as to its effects upon herself and others. He also says He is a sign to be spoken against, and a means by which men will show what they are—some for, some against, Him. The prophetess Anna, an aged widow, who had spent her widowhood in the temple service, 'looking for the redemption of Jerusalem,' came up at that hour and responded to Simeon's testimony by praising God and going about and testifying of the Lord to all them that looked for redemption. Having fulfilled all the requirements of the law, the parents returned with the child to their Bethlehem home.

"These events in connection with the birth of Jesus took place when Herod was king of Judæa. Soon after the return from the presentation in the temple, Magi came from the East, guided by 'His star,' to worship the new-born King of the Jews. This visit excited the suspicions of Herod, who made diligent inquiries concerning the prophetic birthplace of the promised Messiah. Finding that it was to be in Bethlehem of Judæa, he sent these 'wise men' to find out concerning the child and report to him. They found the child by the guiding star and worshipped Him, and made offerings, but being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, departed to their own country another way.

"Immediately after their departure, Joseph, warned by God in a dream, takes Jesus and Mary and goes down into Egypt for the safety of the child's life. Herod, as soon as he finds he is deceived by the 'wise men,' gives orders that all the male children in Bethlehem and vicinity of two years old and under be slain. This slaughter of the innocents revives in the evangelist's mind mother Rachel weeping for her captive sons at Ramah, as described by Jeremiah. Joseph, with Jesus and Mary, remains in Egypt till he hears through an angelic messenger of Herod's death. He designs to return to Judæa, but warned by God enters Galilee and settles in Nazareth, where they reside during the childhood and youth of our Lord. In these various movements prophecy concerning the Nazarene is fulfilled."

Notice that He who was to deliver Israel was subject to all the appointed laws and religious customs of Israel. He was treated as one of the seed of Abraham, and regarded as a child of the law. These and other events connected with the infancy and youth of Jesus show that his mother did not realize that her first-born child was truly the Son of God. Consider how necessary it was, in order to the fulfilment of His mission, that His real humanity should be undoubtedly recognized and the consciousness of His divinity gradually developed. He was necessarily nurtured, treated and brought

up as a human child. If not, then Heb. ii. 14-18 could not be true; and if His divinity were not veiled even to Himself until His entering upon His great mission, then Heb. iv. 15 were meaningless. In connection with the circumcision, compare Gen. xvii. 10-14; at it the obligations and privileges of the Abrahamic covenant were assumed and the child received the angel-given name (Matt. i. 21; Luke i. 31), *Jeshua* (Jesus). "Jehovah is help or salvation," which indicates that through Him Jehovah would give the promised help to His oppressed people. Recall the naming of John (Luke i. 59-63), in connection with the administration of this rite, as evidence of the Jewish custom; also the other angelic title of Jesus (Luke ii. 11), "A Saviour which is the Anointed Lord," as interpreting the purpose of the incarnation, "for it is He that shall save His people from their sins."

In studying the presentation in the temple, note carefully the twofold legal object, the "purification" of the mother (Leviticus xii), and the "redemption" of the child (Exodus xiii. 2, 12, 13; Numbers xviii. 15, 16). Observe that the offerings for "purification" were that of the poor (Lev. v. 7), and that the child, according to the law, was given to the priest as a consecration to God, and received back on payment of the temple charge, or "redemption price" (Numbers. iii. 12, 13, 44-51). In the light of the meaning of the rite of "presentation" to the Jewish people, look through this standing memorial service and discern the spiritual significance of the dedication of this first-born. If this is a fulfilment of Mal. iii. 1, what a humiliation; but notice in this, as in every other, a glorification. See here, as in the others, a manifestation of the Holy Spirit, Simeon and Anna being the instruments of testimony. Make a careful study of the character and words of Simeon. Distinguish his conception of the Messiah from that of the ordinary Jewish expectation; also draw your inference as to the kind of Saviour Jesus was expected to be. Dwell on the meaning of the "Consolation of Israel," "Redemption in Jerusalem," and "Thy salvation." Are they related to Heb. xi. 13? Analyze Simeon's even-song, the *Nunc Dimittis*, and compare with the songs of Mary and Zacharias,

noticing how they all express longings for the deliverance of the people of God from enemies that oppress them, in order that Israel might serve God without fear—a deliverance to be wrought by a son of David. May we not infer that those represented by these songs followed the Pharisees as religious teachers, but sympathised with the Zealots in their national hope, hence were “waiting” for the Coming One? Also compare these with the angelic announcements to Mary and the shepherds, noting that Simeon is the first to declare that this child is for “the salvation of all peoples; a light for revelation to the Gentiles.” How account for the difference in Simeon’s announcement to the others? Study Luke ii. 34, 35, and see how Mary and those of her time were unprepared for the conception of a “suffering Saviour.” Meditate on Simeon’s desire, and realize that we all should “see the salvation of God” before death. Master fully his prophetic portraiture of the intention and effect of the advent of the Redeemer, contemplating how he becomes the woe or the weal of those to whom his proffered grace is offered. Note that Anna, the widow prophetess, belonged to an unreturned tribe, and that she became the first female evangelist. How did the “Hope of Israel,” as he appeared to her, differ from the appearance to Simeon? Does “spake of Him to all” suggest a possible source of Luke’s information?

Mark that, after the presentation of the “Holy Child” to God, came His presentation to the world—first to Israel through Simeon and Anna; second to the Gentiles, through the Magi. Trace the threefold adoration of the Divine infant; first of the shepherds, second of Simeon and Anna, third of the Magi. These might also be called three Epiphanies. Three circles had been formed around the infant as a Messianic nuclei, viz.: a priestly group, the Baptist’s parents and friends; a rural group, the Bethlehemite shepherds; a Zion group, the holy watchers at Jerusalem. How are they characterized? See Matt. i. 19; Luke i. 6; ii. 25, 36, 38. From this infer the circle of human influence, in which “the Word made flesh” grew up, and was fitted for the work appointed Him by His Father. Remark

that Matthew, the gospel for the Hebrews, and not Luke, the cosmopolitan gospel, records the visit of the Magi, the representative Gentiles. The holy family had returned to their Bethlehem home when "the wise men of the East" came "to worship Him." Study carefully who were the Magi, and whence they came; also, how they knew of "the King of the Jews," and what prompted them to go and do homage to Him. Why did they come and pay the single act of homage, and retire forever from sight? (Isa. lx. 6). What is the significance of "His star"? (Num. xxiv. 17). Was it a natural or supernatural phenomenon? Did it appear as a guide or as an announcement? Was it visible to the Magi only? Does Matthew ii. 7, 16, throw any light on the probable age of Jesus at the time of the visit of the "wise men"? From "the murder of the innocents" conceive the character and purpose of Herod in the light of vs. 4, 7, 8, 16. Observe that from the standpoint of Jewish expectancy, the story of the Magi would be an impossible invention, and that Num. xxiv. 17 and Isa. lx. 6 could form no historical background for the narrative; therefore, it cannot be a Jewish legend, and must be a true account.

Note the prominent part assigned to and assumed by Joseph as the earthly guardian of the child. In every instance minute instruction comes to him in a dream, indicative of watchful and tender solicitude. Contrast the mode and measure of divine guidance given the shepherds, the Magi, and the priests and scribes. Compare the influence of the Epiphany on the shepherds, Simeon and Anna, and the Magi, with that on Herod and the priests and scribes. Men are always self-judged by the attitude they take toward Jesus. The Gospel never leaves us as it finds us. God truly guides all who really seek Jesus, so that they are sure to find Him. Note Matthew's frequent reference to the history and prophecies of the Old Testament, and the meaning of "that it might be fulfilled," distinguishing the difference between a prophet's prediction and a prophetic utterance. Ascertain the sense in which he made the three quotations in this section (see Micah v. 2; Hos. xi. 1; Exodus iv. 22, 23; Jer. xxxi, 15; xl. 1), their historical setting and application to Jesus. Mark the enforced change in the plan

of Jesus' parents as to the destiny and proper home of the child, brought about through his enemies, considering reasons why they would select Bethlehem for the place of his bringing up, and why Nazareth should be chosen. Give special attention to Nazareth and its environment as the home of the youth and early manhood of Jesus. How is it connected with Nazarene? What is the meaning of this term and its prophetic connections? (See Isa. xi. 1). Harmonize Luke ii. 39 with Matt. ii. 13, 22, 23. Observe that the reticence concerning His advent is only broken to show how He was received in His own country by His own people, Matthew represents Him as the King descended from David, who fulfils the words of prophecy, but is rejected by the Jews, recognized by Gentiles of the East, and received by those of the South. Make spiritual applications of the stories of the advent and infancy of the Saviour.

Montreal, Que.

A. M. PHILLIPS, B.D.

The Itinerants' Round Table.

BIBLE STUDY.

MIDDLE GROUND IN MORALS.

ROMANS XIV.

- I. Introductory.
 1. Advantages of an historical study of this subject.
 2. Shifting character of this middle ground.
 3. Varying methods of treatment.
 4. Practical problem in the church at Rome that led Paul to discuss this matter.
- II. Analysis of the material.
 - Vv. 1-3. Statement of the case and a hint at its solution.
 - Vv. 4-12. Judgment belongs to the master, not to the fellow-servant—Paul's message to the weak.
 - Vv. 13-23. Liberty of individual action must be limited by the general good—Paul's message to the strong.
- III. Paul's method of treatment.

The discussion of great principles and not the statement of specific rules.
- IV. Principles laid down.
 1. Moral character belongs to the agent doing, not to the thing done. Rom. xiv. 14, 20; 1 Cor. viii. 4; x. 19.
 2. The Christian is called to freedom, and may count himself happy in the right enjoyment of it. Rom. xiv. 2, 22; 1 Cor. iii. 22; Col. ii. 16; Gal. v. 13.
 3. The Church is not to attempt to lay down one absolute standard and exact conformity thereto. Rom. xiv. 3; Matt. xi. 16-19.
 4. The responsibility of decision must be left with the individual. Rom. xiv. 5, 23.
 5. The principle of action must be love. The weak party must not condemn the strong; the strong must not ignore the weak.
- V. Helps.

1 Cor. x. 14-33; Article on Casuistry, in Encyc. Brit.
Hand-Book of Moral Philosophy. Calderwood. Principles of Ethics.
Borden P. Bowne.

CHRISTIAN LOVE.

I. CORINTHIANS XIII.

- I. Introductory.
 1. Historical setting of the letter.
 2. Relation of chapter xii. to xiii.
 3. Brief resume of chapter xii.
- II. Analysis
 - Vv. 1-3. Without love genius and wealth are worthless.
 - Vv. 4-8a. Qualities of love.
 - (a) Positive.
 1. Suffereth long.
 2. Is kind.
 - (b) Negative.

3. Envieth not.
 4. Vaunteth not itself.
 5. Is not puffed up.
 6. Doth not behave itself unseemly.
 7. Seeketh not its own.
 8. Is not provoked.
 9. Taketh not account of evil.
 10. Rejoiceth not in unrighteousness.
 11. Rejoiceth with the truth.
 12. Beareth all things.
 13. Believeth all things.
 14. Hopeth all things.
 15. Endureth all things.
 16. Love never faileth.
- Vv. 8b-9. The transient character of other gifts.
- V. 10. The coming of the perfect does away with the imperfect.
- V. 11. Illustration from experience.
- V. 12. A contrast of present and future.
- Vv. 13, 14a. Get love, for it is greater than faith or hope.
- III. Practical Suggestions.
1. Paul's greater gifts.
 2. Paul's most excellent way.
 3. The coming Church.
- IV. Helps.
- A study of the word "Love," as it occurs in the New Testament.
 The Greatest Thing in the World. Prof. Drummond.
Garret Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. CHAS. HORSWELL.

INSPIRATION AND AUTHORITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

THE general theory of Bible inspiration is covered by the statement that "no prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." And that which holds true of prophecy in the strict and limited sense, is equally true of other parts of the Scriptures. The Psalmist affirms that "every word of God is pure," and that His "word is true from the beginning." The Saviour prays, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth"; and He put His confirming seal upon the whole volume of Old Testament revelation, for there is scarcely one book from Genesis to Malachi from which He did not quote as an authority from which there could be no appeal. While Paul declares that the Gospel he preached was not received from man, but "by the revelation of Jesus Christ." The conclusion is not merely that the Bible *contains* God's word, but that it *is* God's Word; nor is there a chapter from beginning to end over against which we might not write the inscription: "The word of the Lord endureth forever; and this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you."

At the same time, we should be careful not to overstate the truth. To affirm, as some do, that only certain parts of the Bible are inspired, is to drag the sheet-anchor of our faith. To hold, as others seem to do, that every word and every letter is inspired in the same sense and to the same degree, is only to challenge attack upon a position that cannot be successfully defended. That the whole Bible is inspired I do not hesitate to affirm; that it is all inspired in precisely the same sense, or that in some cases other words, or a different arrangement of words, would not have

conveyed the truth just as well, I am not prepared to prove. There is a difference between "Scripture inspired," and "Scripture given by inspiration." Thus, when we say of certain parts of Scripture—such as predictions of far distant events—they are inspired, we mean that in those Scriptures truths are revealed which we could not know but by direct revelation, because they lie beyond the range of observation and experience. When we say of certain other parts, such as records of contemporary events, they are inspired, all we can fairly mean is that the writers were moved by the Holy Ghost to put upon record things which they saw and heard, and that this Divine impulse was such as to prevent mistakes in the record.

Of course it is not to be inferred from this that every part of the Bible is of equal importance, or should receive equal prominence in preaching. It is well enough to know that David and Jonathan loved one another; but far more important to know that "God so loved the world." It is well enough to know that Moses died on Nebo, and that God buried him over against Beth-peor; but vastly more important to know that "Jesus Christ by the grace of God tasted death for every man." It is well to know that, under the old dispensation, "the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh"; but infinitely more important to know that "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God," can "purge" our "conscience from dead works to serve the living God." But in which ever sense we use the term "inspired," it still remains true that "every Scripture inspired of God is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness"; and out of this storehouse the man of God may be completely furnished, and from every part of this exhaustless treasury he may bring forth things new and old. The Spirit who inspired the men who wrote the Book, and the Spirit promised as an abiding comforter, are one and the same; and still He can inspire alike the message and the messenger, and make His own word like a fire and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces.

But if the Bible rightfully claims a Divine inspiration, it must needs carry with it a Divine authority. These two stand or fall together; for the Bible is not primarily a record of history, nor a theory of creation, nor even a code of morals; it is first of all, and above all, a revelation of God. But having so begun, the Bible cannot stop there, for this word God is not a mere symbol in abstract reasoning, but is "the all-controlling factor in regions visible and invisible"; and so out of this revelation of God there necessarily comes a revelation concerning man, which is not like a human theory, reasoned upward from amid the strife and clamor of human interests and passions, but like a "still small voice" comes "downward from the calm and solemn heights of the Divine Personality." Of each one chosen as the medium of divine revelation it may be said, "He taught as one having authority and not as the scribes"; and every man who is truly called of God to the Gospel ministry may speak with similar authority, for it is not he who speaks, but the Spirit of the Father who speaks in him. But it should go without saying that speaking with the confidence of Divine authority is very different from speaking with the confidence of self-sufficiency. The first is the offspring of humility, the second is the offspring of pride; and just in proportion as we fail to realize the authority of the Divine Word will we be likely to claim a spurious authority of our own, and try to make up for the lack of that spiritual power which comes from God alone by a vociferous utterance of our own opinions. But the Gospel we are called to preach needs no fictitious aids of worldly wisdom or eloquent speech. It is a Gospel divinely inspired that carries with it its own evidence and its own authority. Let us not try to improve upon it;

let us not apologize for it ; let us not utter it with faltering accents as though we had a secret misgiving of its truth ; but with calm assurance, born of a divine call and of personal experience that this Gospel is "the power of God unto salvation, let us *preach it* everywhere, and boldly declare to every man we meet, "I have a message from God unto thee."

Toronto.

A. SUTHERLAND.

A STRANGE LAW OF PRACTICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

WITH certain qualifications this law may be thus enounced : The universe is to us what we are to the universe ; material things are to us what we are to them ; people are to us what we are to people ; and thus society is a mirror which reflects our own mental and moral image. In fact, God himself is to us just what we are to Him. We project our own inner selves upon every object we behold, and we never can distinguish clearly between the shadow thus projected and the object contemplated.

This law governs all our acts of perception. Philosophy teaches that this material world is probably not what it seems to us to be. We can imagine the Creator giving us another sense, which would reveal to us practically another world. If He had given us eyes with the power of the microscope or telescope, we would behold a whole universe, which at present lies beyond the limits of our unaided vision. He might have given us ears by which we could enjoy the music of the distant spheres, and by which we could hear the throbbing of life in every pulse of animate nature. At present, we have but five senses by which we discover as many qualities in matter ; but if we had other five, we would discover that matter had as many more qualities as those which we now perceive, so that the world around us may be something else than what we perceive it to be. What it is to us depends upon what we are to it. The eye and the mind contribute something towards every act of perception. One man looking at Niagara is overwhelmed with a sense of the awful and sublime ; but, at his side, whittling a stick, is another, whose unpoetic, practical nature sees nothing of the Divine attributes that are mirrored there. He is busy making a rough estimate of the machinery that torrent could move—the work it could accomplish. The one hears in that booming thunder an echo of the voice that spake this world into being ; the other only hears the sound of revolving wheel, clashing loom, and whirring spindle. To each it is a different Niagara—all the difference, in fact, between God on the one hand and a cotton factory on the other.

We have stood upon an eminence commanding a view of a wonderful country. The scene combined all the elements of the picturesque and the grand. A long stretch of plain, touched everywhere into fertility by the serpentine river that flowed through its midst ; and away in the distance in the form of a series of graded terraces, surmounted by lofty peaks, capped with the streaming clouds, or tinged with ethereal purple, was a mountain range, forming a grand background to the whole picture. To some of us it was the mountain of Transfiguration, it was an apocalyptic vision. One of our party, however, was estimating how many fortunes lay latent in those fertile plains and distant pineries. To one it was Paradise, to another a barnyard. Each saw in the scene a projection of his own inner self, so that in this sense it is true what Emerson says : "The subject and the object, the seer and the spectacle, the inward thought and the outward thing, are one."

This principle holds good also in regard to the moral world. Beware of the person who sees good in nobody, and has not a good word to say of

anyone. It is said, "it takes a thief to catch a thief." The converse of this is just as true; it takes an honest man to appreciate honesty. One symptom of insanity is, that the patient believes all the world to have gone mad but himself; he is the only sane man left. Poor man! it is not the insanity of others he beholds; it is nothing but the projection of that shadow that rests upon his own disordered brain. Deranged himself, everyone else appears deranged; and so it is with moral insanity. To a liar all men are liars; a lewd soul will suspect the chastity of an angel. It is said that a painter, who was himself grossly vicious, could not paint a face or figure which did not bear the marks of his own voluptuous mind. A jaundiced eye must see the yellow tinge everywhere.

On the other hand, let a man be virtuous, true and good, and these qualities will become in him so many eyes to perceive virtue, truth and honesty in whomsoever found. He will see a great deal of possible goodness in the very worst of men. In every vice he will see an underlying virtue, in every lie he will see a possible truth, and in every form of uncleanness he will see a great deal of latent purity. There is no man so bad as to be entirely destitute of the promise and possibility of goodness. In every human devil there is a sleeping seraph, and in every sinner there is a possible saint. Every evil act argues the presence of a power to perform its opposite, and every pure-minded man has eyes to discriminate between the actual and ideal man. Thus, to the true all things are true; to the virtuous all things are virtuous, and to the pure all things are pure.

Toronto.

JAMES HENDERSON.

Synopses of Important Articles.

In *The London Quarterly Review* (April number) the third article is a very careful and judicious exposition of the "Present State of the Pentateuch Controversy." We present in very abridged form the conclusions arrived at upon the points involved:

1. The opinion that the period of the Pentateuch was one of general ignorance and barbarism, in which the art of writing was unknown, and that therefore the Israelites could not have been equal to the task of such a literary production as the Pentateuch must now be abandoned. The discoveries at Tel-El-Amarna and elsewhere prove that the people of Canaan were familiar with writing for centuries before the Mosaic age. "The events of the day were as fully chronicled as they would be in our own century, and the historian who desired to compile a history of the cities of Canaan would have had at his disposal more than enough of contemporaneous material. From a period earlier than that of Abraham there were documents before him containing history of the most authentic and trustworthy kind." The same is substantially true of Babylonia and Egypt. It is, therefore, highly probable that the Israelites were quite able to compile such a record of their history and laws as the Pentateuch. At any rate, the presumption that they were unable to do so is seen to be altogether unreasonable.

2. "It is certain, moreover, that the Pentateuch contains matter of a very early date, such as no sane man can imagine to have *originated* in the fifth or the ninth century B.C." Some of the laws of the Pentateuch would be altogether out of place at this late date. As Canon Rawlinson says: "They would be *bogus* laws, intended to impose on the unwary.

No object can be assigned to them except that of inducing persons to believe that the code of which they formed a part was instituted in Mosaic times, when such laws would have been quite natural and, indeed, necessary.

3. When, without any external evidence, the critic pretends to be able to take a passage of Scripture and distribute it by verses and clauses among "a swarm of imaginary historians and subsequent emendators, editors and redactors, assigning the beginning of a verse to one writer, the end to another, and some phrases in the middle to a third, the whole being obviously worked over by an editor in the interests of somebody living centuries later,—*risum tenentis, amici?* To such a course there is no parallel in literary history; there is no occasion for it except to avoid difficulties of the critic's own causing, and the attempt to illustrate it in the pages of Homer or Livy, of Bede or William of Malmesbury, would simply cause it to be laughed out of court."

4. A discussion of considerable length upon "The Substantial Historical Trustworthiness of the Books as they Stand" closes as follows: "In our judgment the critics have failed to make good the historic verisimilitude of their views when describing the introduction at different stages of the new codes which their theories suppose. If fraud figured in the process they are met by the gravest difficulties; if, on the other hand, new legislation introduced serious innovations without any pretence of antiquity, difficulties of another kind arise."

5. The prophecies of Hosea and Amos are generally accepted as genuine, and there is also a general agreement as to their date. But these prophecies imply a much larger amount of religious instruction and legislation than the critics have usually been willing to allow.

6. Discrepancies in history and legislation have often been greatly exaggerated. Much trouble would be avoided, if, at the beginning of investigation, the course suggested by Mr. Lias was accepted as a working rule, "When difficulties occur in the Scripture narrative they are not, in every case, to be explained by the theory that the compiler combined in one narration stories which are obviously contradictory, but that in many cases fuller information, such as was before the historian when he wrote, or rather when he abridged his authorities, would enable us to clear up what occurs in any way perplexing." The use of this rule would not explain every apparent contradiction, but it would prevent the critic from inventing to suit his own convenience, "a subsequent narrator, or a redactor, or an imaginary emendator of some description, who, by the hypothesis, while he had sense enough to perceive the difficulty, had not the wit or the will or the ability to remove it."

7. The appeal to the authority of our Lord in proof of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is regarded by the reviewer as "unwise and unwarranted." "Reverence should prevent us from imperilling the authority of the Saviour, unless we are very clear that He meant to pronounce definitely upon the points at issue. . . . Are we to suppose, then, that He would of himself open a discussion of this kind, and thus divest the minds of His hearers from those serious moral and spiritual issues which He was most anxious to impress upon them. How else could he quote, e.g., the Book of Isaiah, but by the name it bore at the time? Suppose these writers engaged upon First Samuel, how else can the book be popularly quoted, or quoted at all, but by the familiar name? How could the Saviour avoid speaking of the Law of Moses, or fail to appeal to what 'Moses said' and 'Moses wrote,' when the 'Law of Moses' was the authority to which reference was constantly made, and the phrase formed the only intelligible way of referring to the standard universally recognized among the Jews?"

Students of these subjects will, we believe, accept most, if not all, of the foregoing conclusions, and will agree with the following, with which the article closes: "The rashness of irreverent speculation we deeply regret; anything like jealousy of full and free inquiry we equally regret and deprecate. The present state of the Pentateuch controversy happily gives us ground to hope that those who represent both of these undesirable extremes are being swept on one side by the steady advance of a sober, reverent and fearless Biblical criticism; which, although it may distrust some long-cherished ideas concerning date, authorship and composition, will vindicate the trustworthiness, accuracy, fidelity and incomparable value of the Old Testament records, as it has already triumphantly vindicated those of the New."

Dr. John De Witt contributes a lengthy biographical sketch of the late Dr. William G. T. Shedd to the April number of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review*. It would be an injustice to the biography to condense it; but one paragraph should be quoted: "Dr. Shedd, in conversation with the writer of this paper, expressed his admiration of William Ellery Channing. Referring to Channing's objections to the doctrine of the Atonement, he said, in substance, that Channing's misapprehension of the Christian doctrine started with the misconception that the Atonement is in its essence the placation of God by man. He added that the point of departure, in all defences of the Atonement against this common misconception, should be, that in its inmost essence it is an intro-Trinitarian transaction; that emphasis should be laid on the truth that, instead of being the placation of God by man, it is the placation by God of His own justice, and that the Incarnation should be set forth as instrumental to this placation of God by Himself. On this truth, in respect to the inmost nature of the Atonement, Dr. Shedd's mind rested with confidence and joy." This paragraph is quoted, not to endorse the theological position taken, but for the purpose of letting the readers of the *Review* into what seems to have been the hiding-place of a great man's confidence on a theme confessedly perplexing. Perhaps this is a good place to say that in condensing articles for this department, no responsibility is assumed by the editors for the views presented. The object is to give those who do not see the costly *Reviews* of America and England some hint as to the contents of the more striking articles they contain.

"Christianity and the Experimental Method" is treated in lucid and interesting manner by Robert McCheyne Edgar, in the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April. This is sometimes called the Baconian method. It consists of three stages: first, the collection of all the facts procurable upon the subject in hand; secondly, the casting about for some happy hypothesis to explain these facts; and, thirdly, the verification of the hypothesis by experience or experiment. It is the evident intention of the Founder of Christianity that it should be made amenable to this method, as is evident from His words, "If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself" (John vii. 17). Here Christ anticipated Bacon in this matter of experimental method. Applying this method to Christianity we must first collect our facts. There are facts which escape the five senses, and yet the existence of which we cannot doubt. Remorse is one of these. We must, therefore, take account of facts which do not appeal to our powers of sense perception. Looking abroad, then, in no narrow spirit for our foundation facts, what do we find? In the first place a great series of facts which speak to our spirits about *order*. Alongside of these facts is a second series which speak as unmistakably of *disorder*, such facts, for

example, as sin, degradation, etc. A third series may be called *remedial* facts. Nature has a curative power. Outside of these are other facts, clearly attested: Christ, Christ-exalting literature, Christendom and the era of humanity. Having found our facts, we must cast about for some happy hypothesis to explain them. For hypothesis, substitute doctrine. Proceeding, we discover that the facts which speak of order are best explained by the Christian doctrine of Creation; the Christian doctrine of the Fall of Man best explains the facts which speak of disorder; the Christian doctrine of a Divine Redeemer explains the facts furnished in the history of Jesus Christ; the doctrine of Inspiration best explains the facts regarding the unique literature which testifies of Christ; while the Christian doctrine of an abiding Holy Ghost best explains the facts embodied in Christendom and the era of humanity. The third stage in this method is Verification. The Fall is verified, not simply by personal experience of the individual, but by the united testimony of the holiest and best of earth. Conversion verifies the doctrine of Creation. The Incarnation is verified by the experience of an incarnation in the lives of believers. Through the Divine indwelling the reality of this doctrine is attested. Inspiration is verified in the inspiring influences and effects of the Book of God. The Bible is an inspired book, not only because men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost thousands of years ago, but also and chiefly because the Spirit abides in the Book, and speaks to our souls through it. The doctrine of an abiding Holy Ghost, which explains the facts embodied in Christendom and the era of humanity, is peculiarly open to verification by experience. This missionary century has produced martyrs and heroes quite worthy of a place in the primitive Church. And, better still, we may become "living epistles," confirming the truths of Christianity by our lives.

Christian Literature for May reproduces two important articles on "The Foundations of Belief," the first by Professor A. M. Fairbairn, and the second by Dr. James Martineau. These articles are reviews and criticisms of the much-talked-of book by Mr. Balfour, of the British House of Commons. Professor Fairbairn acknowledges that the appearance of the statesman as a theologian is matter of interest not only to theologians, but also to the State; but adds, somewhat cruelly, that it does not, indeed, always follow that the statesman who studies theology either applies his religion to the State or serves it by his studies. Coming to Mr. Balfour's book, Professor Fairbairn finds in it a repetition and expansion of the author's earlier work, "A Defence of Philosophic Doubt." The new work is distinguished by many admirable qualities; it is at once lucid and subtle, brilliant and eloquent, always grave, yet often lighted up with flashes of a nimble though ironical humor, with a delicate and elastic style. But though well put, the author's position is not well argued. Though the opening chapters awakened high expectation, pleasure was turned to pain as the underlying philosophy was seen to be shifting sand rather than solid rock. The criticism that had appeared so pleasantly potent at the beginning, became sadly impotent at the middle and mischievously inadequate or irrelevant at the end. Space limits forbid a lengthy review of Professor Fairbairn's criticism. Admiration is expressed for the spirit, purpose and endeavor of the author. The book is a remarkable achievement for a statesman, and gives to the State the happy assurance that a mind which may yet control its destinies has visions of higher and more enduring things than the strife of parties, the collision of interests, or the jealousies of classes. The criticism concerns itself not so much with the end reached as the mode of reaching it. Dr. Martineau,

though writing sympathetically in reference to many of Mr. Balfour's positions, naturally opposes the view of authority in religion which is advocated in the "Notes on the Foundations of Belief." Martineau, as everyone knows, finds in reason the ultimate authority. Mr. Balfour seems to hold that "certitude" is "the child of custom," and really makes custom the final "authority."

"Evolution and the Church" is the theme of an article by the Rev. W. A. Hunter, M.A., in the May issue of the *Knox College Monthly*. He discusses the twofold question: What the result is likely to be upon the Church and upon theology if evolution succeeds in establishing itself as a dogmatic faith, and what should be the attitude of the teachers and expounders of the doctrines of Christianity towards it? Mr. Hunter feels that the possible truthfulness of evolution does not imperil the ark of God. The fundamental principles of Christianity remain untouched. The fact of a revelation being given in the person and teachings of Jesus Christ is as fully established as ever. The man who believes that God is *immanent* as well as *transcendent*, that evolution is simply a process whose main factor is God, upon whom the universe is dependent every moment, need have no fear whatever that the foundations of his faith in Christianity will be shaken, though the consensus of scientific and philosophical opinion in favor of evolution were complete.

In the April *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Dr. Hugh Foster continues his treatment of the important question of "The Authority and Inspiration of the Scriptures." Authority must be claimed for the final form which the teaching and institutions of the Scriptures take. Between the Old Testament and the New, the relation is that of the preparative and rudimentary to the final and complete. Jesus Christ is the apex of Revelation. He fulfills—fills full—the Law and the Prophets. Nothing surpasses him. Here the Bible reaches its culmination of teaching and impression. It is for this culmination that absolute divine authority is to be claimed for the Scriptures. Further, the authority claimed is authority as to the central message of salvation and the things involved therein, and is therefore authority in the moral and religious sphere. Undoubtedly the Bible claims more for itself than this. It claims, in the main, authority for its history. Many of its historical facts are so bound up with the central message of the Bible, that they must be accepted if that is. But the claim of infallibility is nowhere expressly made by biblical writers for every historical statement. Concluding his argument on this point, Dr. Foster writes: The Christian Scriptures, as a whole, possess divine authority; that is, the ethical and religious teaching of the Bible, as a whole, is without error, and is designed by God for the instruction of man. Treating of Inspiration, the position is taken that inspiration is not absolutely necessary to the existence of Scripture. Inspiration is not the citadel which the Christian apologist must defend at all hazards. The proof and concept of inspiration are derived from the Bible itself. Inspiration is claimed, but little emphasis is laid upon it in the Scriptures in comparison with revelation, which is the principal thing. The definition gained of the inspiration of the Scriptures from their contents is given in these terms: It is that union of the writers of the Bible with God, through His Spirit, which enabled them to teach without error, and in the best manner for the permanent instruction of mankind, those things which they intended authoritatively to teach, viz: all ethical and religious things necessary to the salvation and sanctification of men. Dr. Foster's last word is a protest against the use of the word "errant" as applied to Holy Scripture. Every Christian will say it is not "errant," inasmuch as it will certainly lead every one who follows it to salvation and

heaven. The objection of the application of the word "errant" to the Bible is simply this, that it will be understood as implying what the whole Church must ever deny. But just so soon as the "inerrancy" of the Bible is employed to deny patent facts, such as this, that 400 and 430 are not the same numbers, then it is important to maintain that the Bible has not *that* "inerrancy."

Prof. John S. Sewall, D.D., writes on "The Social Ethics of Jesus" in the April number of *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. Was Jesus a Social Reformer? Was the renovation of society the special object of his mission? Did he come to regenerate the individual or to rectify the community? Dr. Sewall recalls the singular fact, so familiar to students, of this question, that surrounded by social discontent, grave wrongs and undoubted evils, Jesus seems to have made no direct effort for their correction or removal. Not only so, but the Master never interferes with the constitution of things as He finds them in His day. He does not assume the attitude of a social reformer. He does not set up as an agitator. Direct assault does not appear to be part of His plan. His whole attention was concentrated upon the founding of a spiritual kingdom, which was not to be some kind of a ghostly Utopia, but a present, practical union of renovated hearts and lives. His kingdom is not of this world. *But its subjects are*, and through the creation and development in them of right character, society is to be reconstructed. Everywhere Jesus shows that He aims not only at the root of sin in the soul, but at the poisonous fruitage of it in the life. The forces of His kingdom, beginning with the spiritual, would reach only into the physical and secular, would pervade and sweeten every province of life, and would repair the damages which come from sin. The miracles of healing were samples of the complete effect which Christianity would have when in full operation among men. Set up the kingdom and in time it would carry all other good with it. Thus in founding a spiritual kingdom, Jesus set in motion causes which start with the individual, and through the individual reach out into society. His parable of the leaven is the best description of this process. The forces of social renovation are to be seen in the great principles which Jesus laid down; *e.g.*, the doctrines of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The Golden Rule is the law of this human fraternity. This rule is lifted up into a higher region than that of mere command. It is elevated into a principle and sentiment—"Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself." This precept is gradually widened out till it embraces enemies as well as neighbors. "But I say unto you, love your enemies." Christ substitutes the law of kindness for the *lex talionis* of human history. Moreover, in His kingdom the Golden Rule rises into the Christian Law of Service. Jesus stood on a higher level than the Golden Rule. He could hope for no return for what he did for others. He invites men to come up and stand with Him. Evidently, then, the method of Jesus in the purpose to regenerate society is that of spiritual evolution, the method of the leaven. Implant certain forces in the mind and let them work. Magnetize the human will, and of its own accord it will point to the pole. But in applying the remedy He went to work indirectly. He did not, on the one hand, remand the whole matter to natural evolution, to let it work itself out; nor, on the other hand, did He buckle on his armour and assault it, as Don Quixote stormed the windmill. He went to work with the individual. In our Lord's representations of His kingdom, men are never handled in bulk—in droves—but in unites. The transformation of any one man from bad to good sets a new faculty of goodness in operation. Already results are justifying the wisdom of the method. The spirit of brotherhood

has entered society, if only in minute atoms. The time is coming when this spirit will be at work among men freely, fairly, universally; when the mutual covenant of the Golden Rule will unite and purify society, and the sunshine of Christianity will melt away the inhuman conditions which now exist.

"The Life of Jesus Prior to His Public Ministry" is the theme of a more than commonly interesting article by Professor F. Godet, D.D., in the *May Thinker*. The development of our Lord is studied from a strictly human point of view. The divine pre-existence of Christ is gladly confessed, but the position taken is that Jesus did not become conscious of this sublime fact until the testimony of God was given at His baptism. The article does not lend itself easily to analysis. One paragraph will give the trend of Dr. Godet's investigation and thought: "But are there any authenticated facts of the youth of Jesus from which we may safely assume that He possessed such virtues? It goes without saying that the authenticated facts are only to be found in the recorded portion of His life. But from these we may reasonably draw retrospective conclusions as regards the character of Jesus before He entered upon His public career. At the beginning of His ministry Jesus spent whole nights in prayer; would He have done so if prayer had not hitherto been the very soul of His life? From the first, He bids His hearers love their enemies, bless those who curse them, give up their coat to anyone who would deprive them of their cloak, give to those from whom they can expect no return. In what book had He learned this life of patience and charity, if not in the book of His own heart? He enjoins upon His followers the duty of plucking out their eye, of cutting off hand or foot, if these organs, excellent in themselves, should threaten to lead them into sin. Could He have spoken thus had He not had behind Him a life of self-sacrifice and abnegation of all the joys which it had pleased God to impose upon Him as a preparation for his special mission; a life of obedient suffering which the divinely-appointed task demanded; in one word, a previous life during which self had been kept in constant check? Was there ever a being better fitted than Jesus to taste all the sweets of pure domestic bliss, had not the presentment of a different and loftier mission induced Him to forego such earthly blessedness? How tenderly He would have cherished children all His own—He who pressed so affectionately in His arms little ones that were strangers to Him, and that He never again would set eyes upon. He who, upon the cross, far from wrapping Himself in His personal anguish, provided for the future of His mother and for the consolation of His bosom friend, cannot but have displayed the greatest tenderness in the family circle; how deep, then, would have been His solicitude for those who might have been attached to Him by the closest of earthly ties! But a mighty thought governed His whole heart—that to which he assigned the foremost place in the model of prayer which He gave to His Church: 'Father, hallowed be thy name: Thy kingdom come.' This holy thought is the secret of His submission and sacrifice; it excluded all earthly thoughts and desires. The inner vision, faithfully entertained by prayer, was a constant curb upon the sentiments which the outer vision might have awakened."

In the April number of the *Review of the Churches* the editor, Rev. Henry S. Lunn, M.D., in discussing the "Progress of the Reunion Movement" from the standpoint of his late American tour, quotes this statement: "Methodism is so powerful in the States, so numerous, so wealthy and exerts such a great political influence, that she is in danger of becoming self-centred and self-satisfied; so fully content with the splendid

work she is doing as to be altogether indifferent to the value of closer relations with other denominations. Hence, 'ou will find more sympathy with the views expressed at Grindelwald amongst all the other denominations than amongst the Methodists." He adds that his limited experience supports this statement. He found the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches the most devoted workers in the reunion movement in America. How far has the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor developed this? He holds that the growing desire for Christian unity is due to the following facts: (1) That there were certain truths held *semper et ubique et ab omnibus*. (2) That the Church of Christ was something greater than any denomination. (3) That underlying every theological error there was a substratum of truth. (4) The great movement for social reform which had marked recent decades had brought men of the most diverse schools of thought and Church polity into active association with one another. He represents Grindelwald as standing for the following principles: (1) There is only one test of the Church of Christ, and that is the old patristic test—*Ubi Christus ibi ecclesia*. (2) The question of orders must be settled not by any mechanical theory of the transmission of divine grace through the finger tips, but by the sanction of the living Church, given to the divine call in the heart of the individual. (3) That in God's universe there is no waste, *i.e.*, that all religions had a purpose in the divine plan for the evolution of the Christian Church that is to be. (4) That the heritage of the faith delivered unto the saints descended by no law of primogeniture through any one branch of the Church of Christ, but was a common inheritance of them all. To all these principles the united Methodism of Canada can give its hearty assent; and having, by the action of the last General Conference, so emphatically committed itself to Christian unity, by providing for the affiliation of its young people's societies with the Christian Endeavor movement, will give such practical co-operation with all union effort as to speedily bring about the answering of the prayer of our Lord in the seventeenth chapter of John.

"The Manitoba School Case (1894): The Judgment, the Imperial Order-in-Council and the Remedial Order-in-Council." These are the documents in this now celebrated case. We have also before us, in the May number of the *Canadian Magazine*, an exhaustive article by Edward Meek, Esq., barrister, dealing with the whole case from the legal standpoint. The documents and discussions make the legal points of the case quite clear, inasmuch as they have authoritatively settled the only legal point called in question. The original acts and the judicial decisions have given us the following definite positions:

1. The Legislature of Manitoba has authority to pass such legislation as that embraced in the Act of 1890.

2. In so far as such legislation affects any rights or privileges enjoyed by the Roman Catholic minority, not only before the entrance of Manitoba into Confederation but also up to and at the time of the Act of 1890, there lies an appeal to the Governor-General-in-Council.

3. That the present case is one admitting such an appeal.

4. That the Governor-General-in-Council has jurisdiction, and that *the particular course to be pursued must be determined by him*.

5. That in case the Governor-General-in-Council directs a certain course to be pursued, and the Legislature of Manitoba fail to pass such a law as will give effect to his order, the Parliament of Canada shall have power to legislate only so far forth as may be necessary to give effect to the order.

These are the points of law in the case. The judgment of the Imperial Privy Council clearly devolves upon His Excellency-in-Council the responsibility of the policy to be adopted; *i.e.*, of the contents as well as the form

of the order which they may adopt in the case. Hence, under the judgment and the Imperial order transmitting it, it was competent for the Governor-General-in-Council, after hearing the appeal, to make an order :

1. To restore the Separate schools as they existed prior to 1890 ; or
2. To restore them in modified form ; or
3. To modify the Public school system in such a way as to make it more acceptable to the Roman Catholic minority ; or
4. To declare that the circumstances were such that the public interest demanded that the legal "right or privilege" hitherto enjoyed by the minority should be now withdrawn, as is done by the Act of 1890.

That this last alternative is within the competency of His Excellency-in-Council, would appear from the fact that the tribunal to which appeal is granted is a political or legislative tribunal and not a court of law. They are called on to decide not the law in the case, but the public policy. Of course, in the determination of that policy, the rights of the minority must be considered, as must also the rights of the majority and of generations yet unborn. All legislation infringes upon certain rights of individuals for the general good. The peculiar right with which the Manitoba Act endows the minority, is not the right to hold on to Separate schools forever ; that right could have been secured by express enactment at once for all time, and to sustain that right appeal would be necessary only to the legal tribunals of the country. But their right is *to be governed in this special matter not by Provincial but by Dominion Legislative authority*. Once they have legally enjoyed Separate schools, and they did so enjoy them from 1870 to 1890, they can, indeed, be deprived of them by Provincial enactment, but they have the right of appeal to another governing body, another sovereignty by whose determination of their case they are finally bound. On their appeal it becomes the duty of the Dominion Government to decide whether Separate Schools are or are not the right policy for the Province of Manitoba. This responsibility involves unusually grave consequences and fortunately moves forward to those consequences by progressive stages. The policy of the Dominion Government having been settled, and diverging as in the present case it does from that of the Provincial Legislature, there is first an order to the Provincial Legislature to pass remedial legislation. This remedial legislation is to restore to the Roman Catholic minority three things :

(a) "The right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes, which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890, aforesaid."

(b) "The right to share proportionately in any grants made out of the public funds for the purpose of education."

(c) "The right of exemption of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools."

The continuance, and hence the restoration of these rights and privileges (at least for the present), is therefore the declared policy of the Dominion Government. For the right or wrong of that policy they are, of course, responsible, as His Excellency's advisers, to the people of the whole Dominion. The question is without doubt an exceedingly difficult one. On the one side, there stands the conviction of the majority of a province as to what is required by the highest good of the future. On the other hand, are the conscientious convictions of a minority, protected by a guarantee that they shall not be interfered with except by the authority of the whole Dominion. That authority has decided that such interference should not take place at present. This is the present stage of the question. The outcome may be already history before these lines reach our readers.

Three courses of events are possible :

1. Remedial legislation by the Province. The decided advantages in favor of this are: (a) The educational interests of the entire province would be more carefully guarded, and so the evils of Separate schools reduced to a minimum. (b) The legislation adopted would be capable of amendment or revision at any time in the future; *i.e.*, the whole system would continue to be under the control and *intra vires* of the Provincial Legislature. It is a very grave responsibility for the Provincial Legislature to divest itself of this power.

2. Appeal to the courts on points of law. This would, of course, give rise to delay, and carry the question into the political arena of the coming election, the results of which who can foretell?

3. Refusal of the Provincial Legislature to obey the order. It then becomes the duty of the Dominion Parliament to legislate. For such legislation they are, of course, responsible, and they have the advantage of not being called to legislate under an Order-in-Council. But they legislate under this terrible weight of responsibility, that the very authority under which they act ceases forever when once their Act is consummated. They have no power to review their work, but make a law like that of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. It will be seen that very strange principles of relation between the Federal and the Provincial authority have thus been introduced into our constitution. Fortunately, they affect but a single province, but that province may yet be the largest and most powerful part of our Dominion. The introduction of such a principle seems to us a serious mistake, the consequences of which should now be, if possible, obviated.

Editorial Reviews of Books and Periodicals.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Japan: The Land of the Morning. By the Rev. JOHN W. SAUNBY, B.A.
Toronto: William Briggs. \$1.

For size, price, skillful arrangement and condensation this is the best book on Japan that we have seen. It opens with a geographical description of the country, next throws into orderly form the poetical Shinto mythology, which in all ages has formed the basis of the political and social, as well as religious, life of the country; and then, beginning with the far off obscure historical traditions of the people, spreads before us in historical order the political institutions, the great religions, the literature and philosophy, and the civilization of the country just as it has grown in course of time. To do this in 300 pages, as Goldwin Smith has done for the history of America, requires a most complete and masterly grasp of the subject. Such a grasp Mr. Saunby evidently possesses, and combines with it, a love for his theme which makes every page glow with the ardor of a fine enthusiasm. When the reader has once placed himself in his hands, he carries him with increasing interest and pleasure right through to the end. To a country and a church like our own, so largely interested in missionary work in Japan, the gift of such a work as this is of very great value. It might well take its place in our course of study, not for intending missionaries only, but for all our ministry as interested in missionary work. We are now aiming at a more intelligent grasp of the great problem and history of missionary work, and here is an almost ideal presentation of our principal foreign missionary field. We might easily select specimen topics or pages from the book, but the unity of the

presentation is such that fragments would appear at a disadvantage. The work is a bird's-eye view, of a history covering more than two thousand years, and is a picture of the Japan of to-day as it has risen out of this far-stretching past. Our entire Church must regret that a man of Mr. Saunby's fitness for work in Japan should be called home by broken health, but in this book he has done for the Mission the best that he could; he has sown seed which must bring forth its harvest of new interest in the Japanese work and of consecrated men to sustain it in days to come.

Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada, 1831-1836. By J. G. HODGINS, LL.D., Librarian and Historiographer to the Education Department of Ontario. Toronto: Warwick Bros. & Rutter. 1894.

This is the second volume of Dr. Hodgins' able and most important work. It commits to the immortal custody of the press documents of rare value for the future history of our province. The volume is of peculiar interest to Canadian Methodism, as containing: 1st, The inception of Upper Canada Academy in 1830-31; 2nd, the laying of the corner-stone of the building in 1832; 3rd, the completion and opening of the institution, and the obtaining of a Royal Charter and financial aid in 1836. The story of the faith, labor, self-sacrifice, energy and almost suffering implied in these doings of sixty years ago, which laid the foundation of Methodist education in Canada, is of course not written here; but here are the original documents from which one may easily gather a vivid conception of the whole scene, as step by step it became history. We can give but an epitome of the facts which are contained in nearly sixty closely printed pages of Dr. Hodgins' work:

1. The first definite steps were taken by resolutions passed at the Kingston Conference in 1830. The constitution of the Academy in five articles was adopted, and a committee of nine persons appointed to decide upon the location, name, etc., of the institution.

2. On the 27th of January, 1831, this committee selected Cobourg as the location, selected trustees and a building committee, who were authorized to proceed as soon as £2,000 were subscribed and one-fourth the amount paid, made arrangements for agents, for the approximate form of building, and gave the institution the name of Upper Canada Academy. On the 10th of May, 1831, tenders were called for by Mr. Conger, secretary of the Building Committee. In September of that year the subscriptions amounted to £3,954, the Rev. John Beatty was appointed general agent for collection, and the committee were finally instructed by conference to proceed with the building, the plans of which had been adopted. At this same conference an address was adopted to Sir John Colborne, the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, the reply to which is a curiosity in our day. It speaks of the Methodist ministers who had undertaken this work as "leaders of societies who, perhaps, have neither experience nor judgment to appreciate the advantages of a liberal education." The reply of Mr. Egerton Ryerson, Editor of the *Christian Guardian*, was characteristic and to the point. On the 7th of June, 1832, the corner-stone of the new building was laid with appropriate ceremonies.

In the autumn of 1835 the building, after the most strenuous labors of agents, trustees, committee and conference, was approaching completion. In the month of June of that year, £7,000 or £8,000 had been subscribed and less than £3,000 collected, and the trustees were already nearly £3,000 in debt. Mr. Ryerson was sent to England with a petition to the Imperial Government for pecuniary aid and a Royal charter. When he prepared his appeal for the Government and people of England, the home contributions had reached £4,000 and the debt stood at £2,000. Mr. Ryerson was

furnished with letters of introduction and commendation from Sir John Colborne himself, who now understood Canadian matters better, and from that patron of learning, the Hon. Peter McGill, the founder of McGill University in Montreal, and others. Mr. Ryerson reached England in December, 1835, and then commenced a long "weary and disheartening effort" to accomplish the task assigned. Any financial aid from the Canadian revenues of the Imperial Government was at first absolutely refused; but a recommendation was sent to the Colonial Legislature asking them to pass a grant. The charter was held in suspense, "and would have failed to pass the great seal had not its promoter been skilful enough to deal with perplexing questions in regard to it as they arose, and had he not been able to prove to the satisfaction of the distinguished law officers of the Crown in England that the principles which the charter embodied were quite in harmony with those that prevailed in Canada and were acknowledged by all parties in England. He was further able to show that the status which the charter accorded to the Methodist body in this country had previously been granted to it, and was so recognized by the Statute law of Upper Canada." The arguments by which all this was accomplished are now for the first time printed at length in Dr. Hodgins' work, and furnish a valuable chapter not only in our educational history but also in that weary conflict by which perfect religious equality before the law was secured for our country. It is of interest to know that a most important step, as Dr. Ryerson at one time stated to the present writer, in this victory for equal rights, was the securing of the charter of Victoria University, which is, we believe, *the first charter ever granted to a dissenting body by the Imperial Government of England* for such a purpose. The old parchment which is treasured in our vaults at Victoria, thus stands as Britain's magna charta of religious equality.

The charter passed the great seal October 12th, 1836, and Mr. Ryerson continued his labors in collecting funds until May, 1837, realizing, over and above the entire expenses of his mission, about £1,000 for the funds of the academy. Meantime, in June, 1836, the academy was opened for pupils, under Rev. Matthew Richy, M.A., as Principal. In June, 1837, Mr. Ryerson returned to his country, now in need of his services in another way, bringing with him an order from Lord Glenelg for a grant of £4,100 to the funds of the new institution, thus completing at every point the full success of his mission.

To Dr. Hodgins, for this full and accurate presentation of historic facts, Victoria University and the Methodist Church are both greatly indebted, and we feel sure that the obligation will be gratefully remembered.

The Sunday Question; or, The Lord's Day, its Sacredness, Permanence and Value, as Shewn by its Origin, History and Use. By S. EDWARD WARREN, C.E. Boston: James H. Earle, Publisher, 178 Washington Street. Price, \$1.50.

This is a useful contribution to the Sunday question which is now, as always, one of the most important subjects before the minds of Christian people. From an answer given to the inquiry, Why ought we to keep the Lord's Day? 1. Because natural religion favors it. 2. Because the Fourth Commandment demands it. 3. Because the Church orders it. 4. Because the New Testament indicates and exemplifies it. These propositions are carefully elaborated by an appeal to the Holy Scriptures, the writings of the Christian Fathers, modern history and the physical, mental and spiritual needs of humanity. The argument is cumulative and convincing.

Religion in the Common Life; or, Topics of the Day Regarded from a Christian Standpoint: A course of sermons delivered by various preachers of the Church of England. Cloth, 12mo, 168 pp. \$1. New York and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

This is a volume of applied Christianity. It is no systematic attempt to solve all the problems of life, but it is a collection of discourses by various eminent divines, each one being invited to pay particular attention to some one portion of the field. In this way variety and freedom of thought have been preserved, while unity of purpose has not been lost. The problems are just the ones for which most people are seeking solutions, and this effort to apply to them the principles of the Christian religion is happily conceived and skilfully carried out. Some of the titles of the discourses are: "Religious and Social Uses of Discontent," "Use of Leisure a Test of Character," "Religion and Politics," "Is War Consistent with Christianity?" "Fairness," "Social Power of the Holy Communion," "Amusements in the Light of Christian Ethics," "Individualism and Socialism," "Problems of the Poor," etc.

Among the authors are: Archdeacon Farrar, Dean Pigon, Dr. Wace, Archdeacon Sinclair, Canon Browne and Rev. J. F. Kitto.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

A forcible article on a suggestive subject is that with which *The Homiletic Review* for May opens. It is from the pen of Rev. George Cross, Carleton Place, Ontario, and is entitled, "Jesus Thought of Himself." It is of high apologetic value. Col. Richard J. Hinton, author of "John Brown and His Men," contributes a readable and instructive study of the character of "Joseph Mazzini." "Theosophy and Christianity Irreconcilable," is the subject treated by Rev. C. R. Blauvelt, Ph.D., Secretary of the American Society of Comparative Religion. Rev. John H. Edwards, D.D., has a timely contribution, with many practical suggestions, on "Church Machinery." Dr. Wm. Hayes Ward throws the light of recent discovery on "That Bloody City," Nineveh.

The Preacher's Magazine, of which many excellent things are justly said, is winning its way to great fame. The May number is laden with a fine table of contents. The famous Rev. T. G. Selby, furnishes a sermon on "The Springs of Christ's Authority." "A Sermon to Young People," by Rev. Albert H. Walker, B.A., is good. Rev. Mark Guy Pearse continues his series of "Sacramental Meditations" of abiding worth. The article on "Suggestive Sermon Titles," giving some of the titles of John Henry Newman's sermons, by Rev. Dinsdale T. Young, is intensely readable.

An intensely interesting illustrated article in the weird ways, strange stories and curious customs of the "Indians of America," by Rev. Dr. Pierson, opens the *Missionary Review of the World*, for June. Dr. Josiah Tyler, author of "Forty Years Among the Zulus," follows with a description of some of the ignorance, degradation, and cruelty practised in connection with "Fetichism in Africa." Two timely and able articles on "Madagascar" come from the pens of Rev. James Sibree and Rev. Geo. Cousins. "Arabia and Its Missions" furnishes the subject for another interesting paper, accompanied by a map and illustrations. The work among "The Mountain Whites of America" is also graphically described by Mrs. S. M. Davis, recently returned from a visit to those neglected and degraded people of our land.

The New World, for March, 1895. Begins the fourth year of this able review of religion, ethics and theology. These ten articles are contributed by strong writers in several religious communions, and fifty-five pages of careful book reviews sustain the high reputation of *The New World* in this field: "The Devil," C. C. Everett; "Race Prejudice," Maurice Bloomfield; "Oliver Wendell Holmes," T. T. Munger; "The God of Zoroaster," L. H. Mills; "The Truth of the Christian Religion," Allen Menzies; "The Preaching of Phillips Brooks," Henry G. Spaulding; "Some of Mr. Kidd's Fallacies," James M. Whiton; "The Origins of the Religion and History of Israel," F. Meinhold; "The Poet in an Age of Science," Charles J. Goodwin; "The Song of the Well," Karl Budde. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Publishers. 75 cents a number; \$3 a year.

The African M.E. Church Review, April, 1895. Among all the good things in this number, "Municipal Franchise," "Educated Fools," and "Afro-American Women" seem specially good. The whole Review is for the uplifting of the African people, spiritually, educationally and socially.

"Political Parties of Great Britain and Ireland" are considered in a popularly written article by Edward Porritt in *The Chautauquan* for June. The following is a characteristic extract:

"We are sometimes blamed," said an Independent Labor candidate, "for attacking the Liberals rather than the Tories. But it is no use throwing water on a drowned rat. We have always recognized in the Conservative party the hereditary enemies of progress and reform, but the reason we devote most of our time to the exposure of Liberalism is that more of the working classes are attached to the Liberal than to the Tory party." This statement was made in answer to complaints from Liberal platforms and Liberal newspapers that it was always a Liberal seat that was attacked and endangered by the Socialistic Labor party. The statement makes clear the attitude of the new party toward existing parties.

The Labor party desires a working day of eight hours; the abolition of overtime and piece-work and a total prohibition of child labor; provision for the sick, disabled, and aged from funds to be obtained from a tax upon unearned incomes; free education; remunerative work for the unemployed; taxation to extinction of unearned incomes; and, finally, the substitution of arbitration for war and the consequent disarmament of the nations. In the 1892 Parliament, as has been stated, Mr. Keir Hardie was the sole representative of this new Socialistic party; but since 1892 the party has been exceedingly busy in the constituencies, and one of the results of the general election awaited with greatest interest by politicians of all schools is the ascertainment of the real strength of this new Socialistic organization.

The Cyclopedic Review of Current History. Fourth Quarter, 1894. Buffalo: Garretson & Co. This collects in convenient form for permanent reference the current events of the quarter.

The Methodist Review, March-April, 1895. Published for the M.E. Church South, Nashville, Tenn. This is a very superior number of our able contemporary. The articles on "Freeborn Garretson" and on "Methodism in Eastern Canada" have a special interest for our own Church, while all must read with pleasure and profit the studies of the editor on the making of Methodism and the article of Dr. Millen on the "University and the City." Dr. Tigert's discussion of John Wesley as the original Methodist bishop is exceedingly good. It shows us on the one hand, that the foundations even of English Methodism were laid in Episcopal ideas; but, on the other hand, it cannot but suggest that the modern

forces, which have made the English Methodism of to-day so largely Presbyterian, must have in them some power of great efficiency. It has always seemed to us a peculiar fact that the democratic America has maintained her *Episcopal* Methodism, while monarchical England has developed a presbyterial Methodist polity, while in Canada we have retained not a few elements of both.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March, 1895. With its usual excellent table of contents, the present number brings us an article of special interest by Dr. Bourinot on "Elected or Appointed Officials." In this article Dr. Bourinot outlines first the Canadian system of appointed officers for all executive work. He then compares with this the American system of filling these positions by popular election. As this has become a living issue in our Canadian politics, we add the conclusions of this eminent publicist on the subject: "It would be, indeed, an unhappy hour for the good and efficient government of Canada were the intelligence of any section to be so blinded as to lead it away from the sound doctrines that have hitherto preserved us from the evils that have weakened the political structure of the Federal Republic." "Once adopt the elective principle in the provinces, it is obvious the consequences would be most serious to the Dominion. The result would be that Canada would be no longer English as respects a fundamental principle of government. She would become Americanized by the adoption, not of these features of the system of her neighbors which might give her additional strength and unity, but rather of those methods which would be more or less destructive of political morality and in direct antagonism to those principles of sound and efficient government which true Canadians are ambitious to see gather force, while they are laboring to establish on durable foundations a new nationality on this continent."

From "The Progress of the World," in the *May Review of Reviews*, we take the following on the success of South Carolina's liquor system: It seems to have been taken for granted throughout the North that the South Carolina State Dispensary system is a dismal failure. The people of South Carolina, outside of the old liquor interest and certain political circles, have become almost unanimous in the opinion that the system is a splendid success. Governor Evans, when in the Legislature, was the chief promoter of the dispensary law, and now that he is in the executive chair he is quite as staunch in maintaining and enforcing the system as was Governor Tillman. Railway roadmasters and other men familiar with conditions throughout the State, are enthusiastic in their account of the good effects that the law has already produced. Drunkenness and disorder have decreased to a remarkable extent; and whereas the negro laborer was formerly accustomed to spend his week's earnings in carousing on Saturday night and Sunday, he is now spending more upon his family, or else saving his money to buy land. The ten or twelve State dispensaries in the city of Charleston, which have taken the place of scores or hundreds of saloons, are as openly conducted and as orderly as any drug-store, and are absolutely closed at sundown. The effect upon the quiet and order of the city has been too transforming to admit of any denial. Reports from country towns throughout the State are to the effect that the closing of the old bar-rooms in favor of the new dispensaries has been attended with results that have converted almost every good citizen to a belief in the present system. In view of the widely circulated reports in disparagement of the South Carolina dispensaries, these facts ought to be given a wide publicity.