THE

Knox College Monthly

—AND—

PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. X. JULY, 1889. No. 3.

GEORGE BUCHANAN, THE SCOTTISH VIRGIL.

III.

BUCHANAN now gave the finishing touches to his "*Franciscanus*" and published it with a dedication to his friend, the Earl of Murray. On the occasion of the marriage of Mary and Darnley he wrote "*Pompae*," an allegorical masquerade, and another for the festivities connected with the baptism of the infant James VI.

In the harassing struggle of the Church with the Court, Buchanan did not take a prominent part. His views were well known, but he was too much of a student to be a leader in the rough work. While of inflexible integrity, he was yet mild and conciliating in disposition, and his counsels displayed wisdom of a broad and liberal character. Drummond, of Hawthornden, preserves for us a specimen of his homely wit worth repeating. "George Buchanan said to John Knox, when he would have had the kirks razed, by the simile, 'cut the trees and the crows will build no more.'—'And if ye had rent your breeches John, would you throw them in the fire, or cause clout them? Whether would you go naked or abide their mending?'"* Buchanan did not hesitate to cast in his lot with the stern reformer. He

*Quoted in the *London Quarterly Review* for July, 1849.

frequently served on committees of the General Assembly, and has the distinction of being the only layman who ever occupied the Moderator's chair. He held his seat in the Assembly, not as a ruling elder, for there is no evidence that he was one, but as a doctor, an office which the reformers believed to be of divine appointment and permanent in the Church, at the same time distinct from that of pastor. His doctorate was the principalship of St. Leonard's College, St. Andrew's, to which he had been appointed in 1566 through the influence of Murray. On the register of the University he is honored with the designation which Henry Stephens had bestowed upon him on the title page of the first complete edition of his "*Psalms*"—"*Poetarum nostri seculi facile princeps.*" In 1567 Buchanan published another collection of fugitive poems which was printed by Robert Stephens.

The Assemblies over which Buchanan presided were the thirteenth and fourteenth, both held in the summer of 1567. This was a year of terrible tragedies. Poor Darnley was hurried to his dishonored grave, and Mary wedded his murderer, Bothwell. We need not repeat the story of that terrible time. The graphic pen of Froude has described the guilty pair in terms that never can be gainsaid. When Elizabeth refused to surrender the fugitive queen and demanded proofs of the charges made against her, Buchanan was one of the commissioners appointed to present the case for the Scottish people. To him was assigned the task of preparing the indictment. Doubtless this was as sorrowful a duty as could well have been imposed. Mary had been kind to him, lonely bachelor recluse that he was, but the girl queen with whom he had read Livy and the self-convicted murderess and adulteress, the unrepenting foe of religion and liberty, were two different persons. The first died when Rizzio was slain, and whilst the second lived there could be no peace in England or Scotland. We need not go into the hackneyed controversy again. Hume, Robertson, Laing, Scott, Mignet, Froude, Burton—nearly every historian of note has pronounced the verdict of "Guilty." The one question is, were the letters, found in the silver casket left by Bothwell in charge of Sir James Balfour, governor of Edinburgh Castle, genuine? They were submitted to the scrutiny of almost the entire English peerage, many of whom were most anxious to

acquit the queen, and by them unanimously declared to be genuine. They are confirmed by every circumstance that, in the remotest manner relates to them. To the end Mary was most anxious to have them destroyed. That others were implicated is not at all unlikely. That the letters were consequently mutilated in order to conceal this fact is also in the highest degree probable. But that they should have been wholly fabricated, and that the story of the silver casket is a myth, is utterly incredible. The contents of some of the letters were known to Murray, while the lords were endeavoring to screen Mary's reputation and procure her separation from Bothwell. They would not have been forged by men who wished to save the queen's honor in the face of Europe. "Buchanan is the real author," is the last explanation of blind sentiment or partizanship. Can we believe that a man whose life for sixty years was unstained by the shadow of deceit, should now lend himself to baseness so unspeakable? That one, on whose epitaph Joseph Scaliger could write

> Contemptisopibus, spretis popularibus auris,
> Ventosaeque fugax ambitionis, obis.

could sell his sovereign for money or position? If such a charge, unsupported by a tittle of evidence, and in the face of the unanimous belief of the time, is to be considered worthy of a moment's attention, then there is no defense, in previous good conduct, for one accused of any crime. Buchanan's "*Detectio Mariae Reginae*" was written by one whose calm judgment ratified the sentence which popular instinct had pronounced on the morning after the tragedy of Kirk of Field. Whatever we may think of the legitimacy of the court's assumed jurisdiction, the impartial historian must sorrowfully acquiesce in the justice of Mary's execution. There is not the least doubt that had she fallen into the hands of her subjects after the battle of Langside, the fate which she so narrowly escaped when sent to Loch Leven would have finally overtaken her; the principles which, we shall see, Buchanan asserted to lie at the foundation of the constitution of Scotland would have been acted upon; and a precedent would have been furnished for the tragedy at Whitehall in which her grandson was the chief actor.

As early as 1564 Secretary Maitland, of Lethington, had declared himself in opposition to the political views of the

reformers, and a famous dispute between him and Knox, in that year, made plain the points of divergence, Lethington was a royalist and a believer in the sacred majesty of kings. He would reform the Church after the English fashion, and make both Church and State subject to the royal authority. Knox and all the reformers held that rulers were as much subject to the laws of the realm as the meanest peasant in it, and might be deposed if incapable or obstinate, or punished if criminal. The Church, with them, had but one Head and one statute book; to these kings were subject as well as nobles and commons. Lethington attached himself with unswerving loyalty to Mary, and finally fell a martyr to her cause. His temporizing policy moved the contempt of men like Buchanan, who held him up to deserved scorn in his "*Chameleon*," published probably in 1570. In it the secretary is compared to the animal which gives a name to the satire. It is scarcely fair to its victim, but Buchanan's crystal honesty could not understand the crooked ways of statecraft. The following is a specimen of its style and orthography:

'Thair is a certane kynd of Beist callit Chamaeleon, engenderit in sic countreis as the Sone hes mair Strenth in than in this Yle of Brettane, the quhilk albeit it be small of corporance, noght-theless it is of ane strange nature, the quhilk makis it to be na less celebrat and spoken of than sum Beastis of greittar Quantitie. The proprieties is marvalous, for quat Thing evir it be applicat to, it semis to be of the samyn Cullour, and imitatis all Hewis, exepte onlie the Quhyte and Reid; and for this caus anciene Writtaris commonlie comparis it to ane Flatterare, quhilk imitatis all the haill Maneris of quhome he fenzies himself to be Friend to, excepte Quhyte, quhilk is to be the Symboll and Tokin gevin commonlie in Devise of colouris to signifie Sempilness and Loyaltie, and Reid signifying Manlinesse and heroyicall courage.

On the 22nd of January the Good Regent was murdered by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh. The leaders of the reformation were filled with dismay. Knox and Buchanan wept for him as for a dearly loved friend. The nation was thrown into a ferment. The intrigues of the Hamiltons and their selfish policy awakened the suspicion that, as next heirs to the Crown, they would in some way compass the removal of the young king as well as his uncle. This led Buchanan to issue a magnificent appeal to the nobility of Scotland entitled "*Ane Admonitioun direct to the true Lordis Maintainirs of the King's Grace's Authoritie.*" In this he unmasks the treachery and ambition

of the Hamiltons, proving conclusively that, with all their blatant loyalty, they were false to Queen Mary, and desired nothing more than that she should be removed from their path. He gives a clear historical statement shewing "that they desired no other thing but the death of the King and Queen of Scotland, to sett up the Hamiltons in authoritie, to which they have aspired by crafty means these fiftie yeeres agoe." Beginning with the death of James IV., he narrates the secret history of their intrigues and winds up by pointing scornfully to the man whom they professed to wish Mary to wed, namely, the Duke of Norfolk, who carried the arms of their country in the bend of Howard in memory of Flodden field, and had placed on the livery of his servants a shoulder-badge representing the white lion, his own cognizance, trampling under foot and rending the red lion of Scotland. It is a noble composition displaying a lofty patriotism clothed in sentences whose majestic rhythm reminds one of Cicero or Milton. We give one paragraph from Calderwood's version :—

> Now have I to shew you by conjecture, what fruict is to be hoped of an assemblie of such men as, for the most part, are of insatiable greedinesse, intolerable arrogancie, without faith in promise, measure in covatice, pitie to the inferiour, obedience to the superiour; in peace desirous of trouble, in warre thirstie of blood; nourishers of theft, raisers of rebellion, counsellers of traitours, inventours of treasoun; with hand readie to murther, minde to deceave, heart voide of truthe, and full of felonie, tongue tramped in deceate, and word tending to false practice without veritie. By which properteis, and manie others thereunto joined, as is known to all men, yee who understand their beginning, progresse, and whole life, may easilie remember to whom this general speaking apperteaneth in speciall.

In the same year Buchanan was appointed to superintend the young king's education. Associated with him were Peter Young and the abbots of Cambuskenneth and Dryburgh. The earl of Mar was governor. All, except Buchanan, discharged their duties with a prudent regard to their own future interests. He, however, acted with the most improvident contempt of personal consequences. Many are the anecdotes illustrative of the rigid discipline enforced upon his royal pupil. James himself, when an old man, used to say of one of his English courtiers that he could never behold him without trembling, so strongly did he remind him of his old pedagogue. On one occasion the king

wished to gain possession of a tame sparrow belonging to his playmate, the Master of Erskine. In the struggle for its possession the poor bird was killed. This of course occasioned a lusty outcry on the part of the despoiled owner, and Buchanan, appearing suddenly on the scene, "gave the king a box on the ear, and told him that what he had done was like a true bird of the bloody nest of which he had come." When some one blamed him for turning the lad into a pedant, Buchanan is said to have replied that it was impossible "to make a silk purse out of a sow's lug."

Chambers gives the following anecdote from Dr. Irving, illustrative of Buchanan's forcible style of imparting instruction: "One of the earliest propensities which James discovered was an excessive attachment to favorites; and this weakness, with the other characteristics of childhood, continued to retain its ascendancy during every stage of his life. His facility in complying with every request alarmed the prophetic sagacity of Buchanan. On the authority of the poet's nephew, Chrytaeus has recorded a ludicrous expedient which he adopted for the purpose of correcting his pupil's conduct. He presented the young king with two papers which he requested him to sign, and James, after having slightly interrogated him concerning their contents, readily appended his signature to each without even the precaution of a cursory perusal. One of them was a formal transfer of the regal authority for the term of fifteen days. Having quitted the royal presence, one of the courtiers accosted him with his usual salutation, but to this astonished nobleman he announced himself in the new character of a sovereign; and with that happy urbanity of humour for which he was so distinguished, he began to assume the high demeanour of royalty. He afterwards preserved the same deportment towards the king himself; and when James expressed his amazement at such extraordinary conduct, Buchanan admonished him of having resigned the Crown. This reply did not tend to lessen the monarch's surprise; for he now began to suspect his preceptor of mental derangement. Buchanan then produced the instrument by which he was formally invested; and, with the authority of a tutor, proceeded to remind him of the absurdity of assenting to petitions in so rash a manner."

When appointed king's preceptor, Buchanan was also made keeper of the privy seal. This gave him a seat in Parliament and he henceforth took a lively interest in public affairs. He served on several commissions. He helped the Church to revise its Book of Discipline and drew up a scheme for the reform of the universities. This latter was not carried out but was bequeathed to a worthy successor, Andrew Melville. In 1572 Knox died. In the same year Morton was elected Regent. Buchanan never was able to work cordially with him. Sir James Melville gives a reason for this of a personal character. "He became the earl of Morton's great enemy for that a nag of his chanced to be taken from his servant, during the civil troubles, and was bought by the Regent, who had no will to part with the said horse, because he was sure-footed and easy; but because he would not part with him, from being the Regent's great friend, he became his mortal enemy, and from that time forth spoke evil of him at all times and upon all occasions." It is more likely that he saw through the selfishness of the man, and despised his schemes for personal aggrandisement. It was chiefly by his advice that Morton was deposed and the reins of power put into the young king's hands when in his twelfth year.

In 1576 Buchanan prepared his "*Baptistes*" for publication dedicating it to the king in a brief epistle full of plain and wholesome speech. Three years afterwards his "*De Jure Regni apud Scotos*" appeared. Although written some years before, he now for the first time gave it to the public with a dignified and respectful dedication to his royal pupil. Immediately upon its appearance the work was eagerly read everywhere. What seem to us commonplaces, sent a thrill through Europe. A very brief outline of the work will suffice. Buchanan represents himself in friendly discussion with Maitland whom he encourages to pursue the honorable and useful political career on which he had entered. Affairs of state naturally form the topic of conversation and it is found that recent events are viewed with very different feelings. Both regard the murder of Darnley as an atrocious crime, but while Maitland looks upon the Queen's imprisonment as unconstitutional and an outrage upon the royal person, Buchanan is prepared to defend it as, from every point of view, lawful and necessary. He first lays down the doctrine

that human society is an ordinance of the Creator for the welfare of man. It is a body politic and has an organic life. A king is chosen, as a sort of physician, to heal the irregularities that break out, according to the laws enacted by and controlling the state. As the physician cannot cure disease by the use of any medicine that he may fancy, but must obey the laws of the body, so the king must be governed by the constitution and apply only lawful remedies to political distempers. The people make these laws in the estates of the realm. From them the king derives his office and power. His sole function is to see that the laws are carried out. His majesty is simply that of the people as represented by him. This he proves, by historical instances, to be the correct view of the Scottish constitution. The murderers of tyrants were never punished, but those who put good kings to death suffered the vengeance of popular justice. According to Buchanan the Scriptures sanction tyrannicide. Dr. Burns remarks, in his preface to Wodrow's history, "That resistance to lawful authority—even when that authority, so called, has in point of fact set aside *all law*—is in no instance to be vindicated, will be held by those only who are the devotees of arbitrary power and passive obedience." The principles of Mr. Rutherford's "Rex Lex," however obnoxious they may be to such men; are substantially the principles on which all government is founded, and without which the civil magistrate would become a curse rather than a blessing to any country. They are the very principles which lie at the basis of the British constitution, and by whose tenure the house of Brunswick does at this very moment hold possession of the throne of these realms." The doctrines of Knox, Buchanan and Rutherford are substantially the same. The "De Jure" was condemned by the Parliament of 1584. In 1664 a proclamation was issued forbidding any person to possess a translation of it. Again, in 1688, it was placed under the ban along with others containing similar sentiments. But "truth crushed to earth shall rise again,"—we honor Buchanan now as one of the founders of modern constitutionalism.

Buchanan's last work was his, "*Rerum Scoticarum Historia.*" It is of great value where he deals with the events of his own day, but modern criticism has wiped out his long list of mythical

kings, crowned shadows, who exist only in their fanciful portraits on the walls of Holyrood. Its simple, nervous and compact style has never been surpassed even by Caesar, Sallust or Livy. His brief geographical descriptions of the districts of Scotland in the first book may be cited in illustration. Of the Lothians he says, "*Haec regio humanitatis cultu, et rerum necessarium ad usum vitae caetaris longe praecellit.* In Fife, "*totum littus frequentibus oppidulis praecingitur.*" The Carse of Gowrie is described in three words, "*frumentarüs campis nobilis,*" Galloway, "*universa pecoris quam frumenti fertilior,*" and "*collibus tantum frequentibus intumescit.*" He gives the direction of the chief rivers, notes the mountain ranges, describes the islands, touches on varieties of climate, in short, gives a perfect pen-and-ink sketch of the chief physical features of the country with not a word too much or a salient point omitted. The character of Bruce in Book VIII. c. 59 and the speech of Bishop Kennedy in Book XII., c. 7, are particularly fine specimens of stately classic eloquence. One of the phrases found in this history has become immortal. In the sixteenth Book, describing the treaty of Berwick in 1560, he says that the English leaders warned the Scotch not to engage with the French until their allies came up, being afraid "*ne Scotorum praefervida ingenia in errorem inemendabilem rem precipitarent.*" The common form, "*perfervidum ingenium,*" is scarcely so classical or elegant.

The last sheets of the History were passing through the press when Buchanan laid himself down to die. The dedication to the King is dated August 29, 1582, only thirty days before the demise of the author. James Melville gives us a most interesting account of a visit which he paid to him about this time.

That September, in tyme of vacans, my uncle, Mr. Andro, Mr. Thomas Buchanan, and I, heiring yt Mr. George Buchanan was weak, and his historie under ye press, past ower to Edinbro annes earand to visit him and sie ye wark. When we cam to his chalmer we fand him sittin in his charre teatching his young man that servit him in his chalmer to spel a, b, ab; e, b, eb, etc. After salutation, Mr. Andro says, "I sie, sir, ye are not ydle." "Better," quoth he, "than stelling sheep or sitting ydle, whilk is as ill." Yreafter he shew us the epistle dedicatory to the king, the quhylk when Mr. Andro had read, he told him that it was obscure in some places, and wanted certain words to perfyt the sentence. Sayes he, "I may do na mair for thinking on

another matter." "What is that?" says Mr. Andro "To die," quoth he; "but I leave that an mony ma things to you to help." We went from him to the printer's wark hous, whom we fand at the end of the seventeen buik of his chronicles, at a place qhuilk we thought verie hard for the tyme, qhuilk might be an occasion of steying the hail wark, anent the burial of Davie. Therefore, steying the printer from proceeding, we cam to Mr. George again, and fand him bedfast by [*i. e.* contrary to] his custome, and asking him how he did, "Even going the way of weilfare," says he. Mr. Thomas, his cousin, shaws him of the hardness of that part of his story, yt the king would be offended wt it, and it might stey all the wark. "Tell me, man," sayes he, "if I have told the truth." "Yes," says Mr. Thomas, "I think sa." "I will bide his feid and all his kin's then," quoth he, "pray to God for me, and let him direct all." Sa be the printing of his chronicle was endit that maist learned, wyse, and Godlie man endit this mortal lyff.

It is also related that being summoned before the Council for some passages in his History while it was going through the press, he told the messenger that "he was to compear before ane higher judge," precisely the answer given by the saintly Rutherford in 1661, on receipt of a similar citation. "Tell them I have got a summons already before a superior judge and judicatory, and I behove to answer my first summons; and ere your day arrive, I shall be where few kings and great folks come."

Buchanan was never married and we know of no *affaire de coeur* stirring his youthful blood. That this did not arise from lack of the warmer emotions of human nature is evident from the friendship which he uniformly elicited from all who entered within the circle of his acquaintance. His "Neaera" could not have been merely the creature of a poet's dream, on whom he lavished platonic affection only. At his death his whole property consisted of £100 due upon his pension from Crossraguel. A story is told that finding the money he had in hand insufficient to defray the expenses of his funeral he sent his servant to give it to the poor, leaving his body to be buried at the public expense in whatever fashion they pleased. The story is not improbable. Although so far exalted above his contemporaries that none dreamed of standing by his side, his own estimate of himself was in accordance with his simple piety and true genius. He died on September 28, 1582, ten years after Knox, and while Shakespeare was a lad of eighteen.

Honored although he has been by every successive generation of his countrymen and destined to survive in well-merited

immortality, more than a century passed before any monument was erected to his memory. In 1788 an obelisk was erected in his native village of Killearn. Over his grave, in Greyfriar's churchyard, a few years ago, a humble blacksmith placed, at his own expense, the modest tablet which now marks the spot where he lies buried. His funeral was attended, says Spottiswood, "by a great company of the faithful. Though worthy to have been laid in marble, and have had some statue erected for his memory, he was buried in the common place." The very identity of the spot has been with difficulty preserved. Sir Robert Sibbald tells us that Adamson caused his skull to be disinterred and placed in the library of Edinburgh University. It is remarkable for its unusually spherical form and the translucency of the bones of the cranium.

A more worthy monument has now been erected to the memory of the great Scotsman in the shape of a memorial window in Old Greyfriar's Church. In the summer of 1873 its beauty, and the memories suggested by it, divided the writer's attention with the chaste liturgy, and the eloquent sermon of Dr. Wallace. We borrow the following description of it from the learned work of Mr. James Brown, keeper of the grounds of Old Greyfriars.

The ground work is rich, deep mosaic of an early period, of ruby and blue, studded with thistles, superinduced on which are medallions with ornamental detail of the time of James VI. In the central medallion is the head of Buchanan, carefully copied from the old portrait in the College Library. The Buchanan shield and crest occupy two other medallions in the central compartment, which are surrounded by a wreath of birch, the badge of the family. On a quaint label space is introduced, illuminated as a missal. [Scaliger's famous couplet]

"Imperii fuerat Romani Scotia limes:
Romani eloquii Scotia finis erit."

In the side compartments are the Scottish shield of the Lion and St. Andrew's cross, surmounted by the national crest, and surrounded by the motto, "*Nemo me impune lacessit*," of which Buchanan is said to have been the author. The ancient Scottish harp, with poet's wreath, together with a *facsimile* of his signature, are given on two medallions. Another contains the badge and collar of the Order of the Thistle, and one a representation of a very curious seal, belonging to Queen Mary and used by Buchanan when Privy Seal under that unfortunate sovereign. On the first and fourth quarterings of this shield Mary had introduced the three lions of England quartered with the

three *fleurs-de-lis* of France, a fact which was adduced as an evidence of her design against the Crown and life of Elizabeth.

Of all the tributes to his memory doubtless that would please Buchanan best which serves to perpetuate his name as a household word, and carries, with the imprimatur of his portrait, literature of the highest class into Scottish homes and whenever the English language is spoken. It is Buchanan's face that greets us on the cover of every number of Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.

It is good for us in these days of superficial education to recall one who sprung from a "barbarian" nation, made a niche for himself in the temple of Roman fame. As a poet, philosopher, historian and statesman he has won laurels as green as those which adorn the brows of the most famous men who made but one branch of learning, or literature, or active life their chosen employment. We do not read his poetry now, but until within a generation it was a text-book in the grammar schools of Scotland. For two centuries and a half it formed the literary taste of each rising generation. His political principles were at least two hundred years in advance of their age. The northern kingdom could boast her "*De Jure Regni apud Scotos*" more than a hundred years before, through adoption of its principles, the Stuart line was driven from the throne of England. To-day the attempt to canonize Mary Stuart can only be successful, in the estimation of impartial men, when Buchanan's "Detectio" has been proved to have been the work of one who "kindled a fire for the devil."

St. John, N. B. T. F. FOTHERINGHAM.

WHAT AN ANGLICAN BISHOP IN THE MARITIME PROVINCES THINKS OF PRESBYTERIANS.

A LADY brought up as an Episcopalian but now communicating in the Presbyterian Church, complained to the Bishop of having been prevented from partaking of the Lord's Supper in an Episcopal Church. In the Bishop's reply the following passages occur :—

The thing is plain enough. The different Christian bodies such as the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Wesleyans, have all left the Church, gone out from her and set up a new organization, each for itself, and whenever they have an opportunity to do so, they are loud in denouncing the Church of England and in proclaiming their superiority to her. The lay members of the Church cannot be allowed to keep up a perpetual see-saw between her and her avowed enemies, and if they will go to these bodies to communicate with them they cut themselves off from communion with the Church. The Church has the greatest charity for all her children and stands with open doors to welcome them, but it must be on condition that they remain with her and keep her rules. I cannot for the life of me see any want of charity in such an attitude. If you go to any one of these bodies of dissenters, I do not mean any individual minister, and say, "I am a member of the Church of England, and as far as you differ from her I think you are wrong, will you admit me to communion?" Do you suppose they would? No, not for a moment. It is only so far as you are supposed to give up your churchmanship, that you are allowed to communicate by Presbyterians.

The truth through which they win sinners to Christ, and build up believers in their most holy faith is the same which the Church teaches, and so far they have no quarrel with her, but might come back at once. But the organization of each is a standing opposition to the Church, perfectly understood by them and by her, and it is because of this organized opposition that church people who think upon and understand the merits of the question, feel so strongly when other church people compromise the position of the Church, and do her injury by communicating among dissenters, and so give color to the idea that there is no difference of any importance between them and the Church.

A few comments on this letter which has caused "no small stir about that way," down here by the sea, may not be out of place. If the spirit and substance of it be a reflexion of Anglicanism generally throughout our Dominion the tripartite alliance of this section of the Church with Presbyterians and Methodists

that was beginning to loom up, would be indefinitely postponed, and the Committees on the subject might as well be dissolved. But we are persuaded better things of many in that communion, and things which accompany enlarged and enlightened Catholicity though we thus speak. We shall be the more likely, however, to reach the desirable consummation by getting at the real "inwardness" of our views and feelings, and seeking to arrive at a common understanding. The full recognition of the validity of one another's official "orders," and of the sincerity and friendliness of one another's motives and movements, is essential to organic incorporation and even to corporate co-operation.

I. This letter *incorrectly states the attitude of the Presbyterian Church towards the Church of England.* "Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and Wesleyans," are charged, "whenever they have an opportunity to do so," with being "loud in denouncing the Church of England and in proclaiming their superiority to her." "The organization of each," says the letter, "is a standing opposition to the Church, perfectly understood by them and by her, and it is because of this organized opposition that church people who think upon and understand the merits of the question, feel so strongly when other church people compromise the position of the Church and do her injury by communicating among dissenters, and so give color to the idea that there is no difference between them and the Church."

The other branches of the Church named are amply able to defend themselves from so sweeping a charge, but in so far as Presbyterians are concerned we feel satisfied that we speak the mind of the 180 of our clergy in these Maritime Provinces, and the over 800 of our clergy throughout the Dominion, when we say that "we are *not* loud in denouncing the Church of England," and that we are *not* "a standing opposition to that Church perfectly understood by (us) and by her." It is not so "perfectly understood." It is not "understood" so on our part in any shape or form. So far from being the chief ground of our organization, to be a standing menace—"an organized opposition" to the Church of England—it is no part of our mission at all. At very distant intervals, and when necessity was upon us during our ministry of over fourteen years in this city, we have united with

leading ministers and members of the Anglican Church in testifying against ritualistic principles and practices when offensively obtruded, and the outcropping of Romanist proclivities, as injurious to them as to us. But to say that we or our brethren make a practice of "loudly denouncing" the Church of England is a gross misrepresentation. During a ministry of over forty years we have been on an intimate footing with leading Episcopalians. During my five years residence in Montreal the then Metropolitan, Bishop Oxenden, acted as a kind father and, without the semblance of patronizing, loved to confer at his own home with the clergy of other churches on matters of common interest.

When I was leaving Montreal in 1875, the present Church of England Bishop of that Diocese (Dr. Bond), came spontaneously to a congregational farewell at my church, while the present Bishop of Huron (Dr. Baldwin) came to a more general gathering at the Y. M. C. A. Hall, and each of them spoke like a brother beloved. This they would not have done had they counted us "avowed enemies." When acting for a year as Convener of a committee of thirty of our Church, appointed to confer with Episcopalians and Methodists on the subject of Union, I had pleasant correspondence with the Rev. John Langtry, of Toronto, one of those named for the Episcopal Bishopric of Nova Scotia. Indeed, it was largely from him that the proposal came, the practical outcome of which was witnessed less than a month ago, when, at the Queen City of the West, the representatives of these three churches met, and in a frank and fraternal spirit discussed for two days in succession the question of Union, the conference being presided over by a Methodist Superintendent, Episcopal Bishop and Presbyterian Moderator. Did the three Bishops of Toronto, Niagara and Huron, with the other Church of England dignitaries who took part in that delightful conference, all of whom certainly "think upon and understand the merits of the question," feel for a moment that they thereby laid themselves open to the charge of "compromising the position of the Church and doing her injury." The programme discussed embraced "a Corporate Unity, the amount of Unity in doctrine, worship and modes of action between the three bodies, the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds, the Condition of Administration

of the Sacraments, the Historic Episcopate." Did these "three bodies" feel that there was a great gulf between them? Nay, rather, had not Christian love bridged it? Did the Church of England delegates look on the others as "avowed enemies," as an "organized opposition"? Nay, rather did they not all feel, as they pondered and prayed together, that they had with them "the God of Peace and the Peace of God, and the Love of the Spirit," and Jesus in the midst whispering "Peace be unto you, that they all may be one." "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one to another," while angels hovering round, revived that ancient eulogium, "See how these Christians love one another!" In that sweet symphony, methinks this letter would have sounded as a jarring note. Its charge of antagonism between the Church of England and the other churches is further met by the inter-ecclesiastical comity that marked the meetings of the General Assembly and the Anglican Synod at London, Ont., in 1883, and in Toronto in 1884, in which Bishops Hellmuth and Sweatman participated, when fraternal delegations were exchanged and resolutions passed—at utter contrariety with the idea of "organised opposition." The action of our Pan Presbyterian Council at London last year, towards the Pan Anglican, which met there at the same time, in the World's Metropolis, comes up as a corroborative evidence. The assembled Presbyterianism of the world, representing four millions of members, and twenty millions of adherents, sent the most cordial greetings to the assembled Anglican Brotherhood, which were appropriately acknowledged by the Archbishop of Canterbury. These seemed not "as hosts encountering hosts," but rather as the wings of one Grand Army, "coming up," not "face to face," to fight each other, but back to back or shoulder to shoulder to meet a common foe. Therefore, it is most blameworthy for any one, however high his position, to charge the Presbyterian Church with being an "avowed enemy," or "organized opposition" to the Church of England.

II. This letter gives an incorrect statement of our *terms of communion*. It says, "If you go to any of these bodies of dissenters (the four already named), I do not mean any individual minister, and say, 'I am a member of the Church of England, and as far as you differ from her I think you are wrong,

will you admit me to communion? Do you suppose they would? No! not for a moment. It is only so far as you are supposed to give up your churchmanship that you are allowed to communicate by Presbyterians." In reply we say *the very reverse of this is the case.* We debar none from communion because they are Episcopalians. At each recurring dispensation of this holy Sacrament we publicly invite such. We are open communion to the fullest extent. Belief in those fundamental doctrines, "the truth through which we win sinners to Christ and build up believers in their most holy faith," which are substantially the same in both our Creeds, is the testing shibboleth. I may give instruction to applicants on points of Church government or polity, but would never make the acceptance of these the passport to communion. Our tests are founded not on wherein we differ from, but on wherein we agree with, the rest of Protestant Christendom—the truths most surely believed amongst us all which go to constitute the "common salvation."

III. Nor is it correct—I shall not say courteous—even in popular parlance to speak of us as *dissenters.* This term is used repeatedly in the letter, but, in a country like ours where there is no Established Church, it is out of place, and being offensive, should be avoided. The only part of our Dominion where there is an ecclesiastical establishment, is the Province of Quebec, but Episcopalians are "dissenters" from it as well as Presbyterians. They are also "dissenters" in Scotland, where the established religion is Presbyterian. There was point in our beloved Sovereign's rejoinder when gently taken to task for doing what this worthy woman did, sitting at the Lord's Table in the Presbyterian Church when in Scotland, and also having the ordinance of Baptism administered by a Presbyterian clergyman in the case of at least one of her grandchildren. "Would you wish me" (said the Queen), "to be a dissenter in any part of my dominions?" And, by the way, to be consistent, must not our good Low Church Queen come within the range of the Bishop's bill of excommunication, when the correspondent says, "the lay members of the Church cannot be allowed to keep up a perpetual see-saw between her and her avowed enemies, and if they will go to these bodies to communicate with them, they cut themselves off from communion with the Church." On the same principle that the

worthy lady at the Eastern Passage was debarred, should our Sovereign lady, the Queen herself, be debarred, as there should be no respect of persons; and in the Church the small and the great, the rich and poor, meet together. Suppose the recognized head of the Church of England, who is at the same time Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and Empress of India and the Colonies, visited Halifax, would she, for "communicating with one of these bodies, be cut off from communion with the Episcopal Church?"

IV. A fourth erroneous statement in this letter is that "the different Christian bodies such as the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and Wesleyans have all "left the Church, gone out from her and set up a new organization each for itself." Is this so? One would fancy that we had gone away from our Father's house and played the prodigal's part." "The Church has the greatest charity," says the letter, "for all her children, and stands with open doors to welcome them, but it must be on condition that they remain with her and keep her rules." The Right Rev. Father seems to beckon to his erring children, and somewhat patronizingly indicates that, as on the fundamentals, they "have no quarrel with the Church," they "might come back at once." But how could we have left the Church of England when we were never in it? Others with a great sum obtained their freedom, but we were free born. The principles of the original Church of England were Presbyterian, for when Augustine, the monk, was sent thither by Pope Gregory from Rome, he found churches of our Order organized, which had existed from the first century, and which, it is believed, were planted by Paul, when he took his journey into Spain.

The first form which Christianity assumed in Ireland was Presbyterian. Succat, afterwards called Patricius, a Scotchman, planted 365 churches, to each of which he assigned a Bishop or Presbyter, which were then convertible terms, with a Bench of Elders for the government of the Church. The Culdees, whose theological seminary at Iona, was the source whence the religion of Jesus circulated throughout Scotland, were Presbyterian; Columba, the Irishman, who paid back to Scotland the debt which his then favored isle (the Island of the Saints, as it was called) owed to Patrick, the Scotchman, sowed in concert with

twelve Presbyters the seeds of Presbyterianism in that land which is now its headquarters.

On the explicit testimony of some of the ablest and best known of the Church of England writers, the Primitive Apostolic Church was not Prelatic at all but Presbyterian. We can give but brief extracts from such men as Lightfoot, Simcoe, Dean Stanley, Alford, and such like prominent Church of England men, who, every one, leave us in no doubt as to who were the first to leave the original House, and need the invitation to come back again.

Lightfoot, the cultured and Catholic Bishop of Durham, is perhaps the most learned theologian of any Church. Even in Germany, where English writers are not held in such high repute because of a supposed lack of independence in mental research, Lightfoot is classed with the very best of German commentators. He is clear on the perfect identity of the Presbyter with the Bishop.

Speaking of Clement's Letter which goes back so close to the Apostolic age, he says, "It is still more important to observe that though he has occasion to speak of the ministry as an institution of the Apostles, he mentions only two orders and is silent about the Episcopal office. Moreover, he still uses the word Bishop in the older sense in which it occurs in the Apostolic writings as a synonym for Presbyter." He utterly rejects the notion that Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus and Titus of Crete. "That" he says, "is a conception of a later age." Speaking of bishops in Jerusalem and Palestine generally, up to the latter half of the second century he tells us "no trustworthy notice is preserved, as far as I know."

Referring to the Churches in Macedonia and Greece he informs us that the evidence for the very existence of bishops becomes "fainter and fainter." With reference to Philippi he says "we are driven to the conclusion that the Episcopacy *did not exist* at all among the Philippians at this time," and so of Corinth and Athens. Advancing to Rome he confirms the great Bishop Stillingfleet's saying as to the stream of the Apostolic succession being "muddy as the Tiber itself." Far from doing anything to clarify it, he says: "As we turn to Rome, we are confronted by a far more perplexing problem than any encountered hitherto.

The attempt to decipher the early history of Episcopacy here' seems almost hopeless."

He plainly inclines to the opinion of England's illustrious Chancellor, Sir Peter King, in his enquiry into the Constitution of the Primitive Church, that a primitive diocese corresponded to a modern parish, and that a primitive bishop was the bishop of but a single church.

This is the view presented in the recently published lectures of that eminent Church of England Rector and Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, the Rev. W. H. Simcoe, on "The Beginning of the Christian Church." He admits that "the Churches founded by the Apostles were originally Presbyterian and that they 'became Episcopal without any revelation at all." This is the view also of Canon Hatch in his Bampton lecture. The question: Was it Presbytery or Episcopacy which was originally set up in the Christian Church? is satisfactorily settled by Dean Stanley in these terms: "There was a time when it used to be the prevailing belief of English divines that Episcopacy, in the sense of the necessity of one presiding officer over every Christian community reached back to the first origin of the Christian society. This belief, in the enlarged atmosphere of more exact scholarship and more enlightened candor, has now been abandoned. The most learned of all the living Bishops of England, whose accession to the great See of Durham has been recently welcomed by the whole Church of England with a rare unanimity and enthusiasm, has, with his characteristic moderation and erudition, proved beyond dispute, in a celebrated essay attached to his edition of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians—"That the early Constitution of the Apostolic Churches of the first century was not that of a single Bishop, but, of a body of Pastors, indifferently styled Bishops or Presbyters, and that it was not till the very end of the Apostolic age that the office, which we now call Episcopacy, gradually and slowly made its way in the Churches of Asia Minor; that Presbytery was not a later growth out of Episcopacy, but that Episcopacy was a later growth out of Presbytery, that the office which the Apostles instituted was a kind of rule, not of Bishops but of Presbyters, and that, even down to the third century, Presbyters as well as Bishops possessed the power of nominating Bishops." In beautiful contrast to the tone and

temper of the letter we have been considering,—in contrast to the genius of Laud which thus offensively obtrudes itself and which seems in the ascendant in the Episcopal Church of a part of the Colonies even more than in Fatherland—the spirit of the Restoration as distinguished from the Reformation era.

We cannot close without referring to the very different attitude and action of the great Apostle of New Zealand, the late Bishop Selwyn, to whom, when removed to a Diocese in England—that of Lichfield—we had the privilege of listening with intense delight, some fourteen years ago, in Montreal. In the thrilling life of the Apostle of the New Hebrides, George Selwyn and John Geddie, appear as true brothers in the Lord—literally sailing in the same boat again and again, mid those coral gems that sparkle in the bosom of the Southern Pacific, with Christ in the hinder part of the ship. Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, secondary and subordinate, "on either side one, but Jesus in the midst," each finding more than the other. "He must increase—we must decrease," for He whose we are and whom we serve in all things must have the pre-eminence.

The Episcopal confesses his indebtedness to the Presbyterian Bishop for the first suggestion given him at Samoa, in 1847, of the idea which he subsequently so grandly developed in those South Sea Missions that have immortalized his name. He wrought at it among his churches in New Zealand till he got them aglow with his own generous enthusiasm. He then carried the "live coal" through the vast Continent of Australia and made many hearts burn within them for the achievement of spiritual victories beneath the Southern Cross. He was never loath to magnify the office and operations of his Presbyterian brother-bishops. Thus, for example, in presence of six prelates at Sydney, Bishop Selwyn said, "The only missionary effort of any consequence, made in this direction, was by a clergyman of the Presbyterian Church—he calls him *clergyman* just as he would any of his own Church—a clergyman of the Presbyterian Church who had been sent from that Church in Nova Scotia, a distance of 20,000 miles, and who, at present, occupies a station on one of the New Hebrides. If people so distant had awakened to the importance of this work, surely New South Wales which lay within

1,200 miles of these Islands could not be less interested in the eternal welfare of their inhabitants."

The good Bishop resolved, struck, as he confessed he had been, by the observation of his Presbyterian Brother, "that as Nova Scotia was the first, so New Zealand would be the second of the Colonies, to embark in the work."

The movement begun there spread through his means throughout Australia and promises vast results; and now that the two have met where no sect is known ("for I see no temple there;") "he that soweth and he that reapeth rejoice together." With true brotherliness," writes the Presbyterian of the Episcopalian bishop, "I send this letter by our excellent friend, the Bishop of New Zealand. He has just been telling me that he thinks he could, within the space of five years, safely locate eighty missionaries on the islands visited by him during the present voyage. If all Bishops and all ministers were men of the same stamp as Bishop Selwyn, the world would be evangelized within a reasonable period."

Such blessed reciprocity of sentiment and sympathy, betoken both as belonging to that true Apostolic succession which goes back of the fathers to the grandfathers, and right up to Him who is above all and through all and in all. "Blest be the tie that binds such hearts in mutual love." When the spirit of holy charity that welded Selwyn and Geddie together pervades Christendom—the days of heathendom will be numbered, and the rent robe will be "without seam again." And why should it not be now? Why this miserable exclusiveness—why this narrow sectarianism, with a world to be regenerated and the great enemy thundering at the gate. I speak as unto wise men. Judge ye what I say. Is it not foolish? It is not fatal? Must it not vex Christ and grieve the Holy Spirit, and inflict unspeakable damage on the common cause, when any single regiment of the common army holds aloof. We need to come up *together*. Why should there be ecclesiastical offishness now and here. Should not the scattered squadrons of the faithful be gathering for the great battle of God Almighty. It is madness in these days of Papal aggression for Protestants to turn the cold shoulder to one another. It is repeating the folly that ended in the ruin of Jerusalem and of Rome. The enemy has got the key of the situation. The wooden

horse is in our citadel of armed men. The Philistines are upon us. Is this the time to fall out by the way? Is this the time to pour shot into our own ranks, when we should be assailing in concert the common foe. We all know who the "avowed enemies" are, when the organised opposition is, as Nelson said to Rotheram and Collingwood, two of his officers who were estranged the day before Trafalgar, pointing to the enemy's ships: Now, Sirs—shake hands, etc., be friends like good Englishmen." The Captain of Salvation, wounded in the house of his friends, amid the din of ecclesiastical strife whispers, "Sirs, ye are brethren, why do ye wrong one to another." And we should say to one another as ministers and members of different churches, "Let there be no strife between me and thee, and between my herdsmen and thy herdsmen, for we be brethren.'

If in the evangelization that is before us we are to come off more than conquerors, Protestants must be Protestants. They must be knit together as one man. United we stand. Divided we fall.

With the spirit we have been testifying against in the ascendant, defeat is inevitable. With the Reformation-spirit prevailing, victory is nigh, victory is sure.

The shout which pealed over the Plains of Abraham, as the conqueror of Canada fell, "They run, they run!" will be echoed over the field of the world and the "fields of living green," as, followed by a united Church "the Lord arises and His enemies are scattered as those who hath flown before Him."

Fronting St. Peter's at Rome, stands an obelisk of Egyptian granite, brought nigh 2,000 years ago from the banks of the Nile, on which is the inscription "*Christus vincit, Christus regnat Christus imperat, Christus ab Omri Malo. Plebeam Suam Defendit.*" This is our comfort and inspiration in view of the "coming struggle." However the subalterns may fail, Christ is more than a match for many *anti-christs.*" When disposed to doubts and misgivings as to the issue of the conflict—and never more than when those who should be together get strangely apart—let us think of what good Bishop Baldwin repeated at the United Methodist, Episcopalian and Presbyterian Council of war at Toronto: "The nearer to Christ, the nearer to one another." Let us turn our eyes to that ancient inscription which foreshadows vic-

tories for the Church, which casts those emblazoned on the Trojan column over against it into the shade. Let us read these for our encouragement. Christ conquers. Christ reigns. Christ commands; and from every evil Christ defends his people Amid all diversities of administration the Christian Church is ever one.

"Though with a scornful wonder,
We see her sons oppressed,
By schisms rent asunder
By heresies distressed,
Yet saints their watch are keeping,
Their cry goes up, How long?
And soon the night of weeping,
Shall be the morn of song.
'Mid toil, and tribulation
And tumult of her war:
She waits the consummation
Of peace for evermore.
Till, with the vision glorious,
Her longing eyes are blest,
And the great Church, victorious,
Shall be the Church at rest."

R. F. BURNS.

Halifax, 28th May, 1889.

THE CEREALS: A STUDY IN APOLOGETICS.*

THE plants known as cereals, or corn producers, are peculiar and in some points unique in the vegetable kingdom. There are facts about them which botanists and biologists are unable to explain in accordance with what are called natural laws. I propose to treat briefly first on the natural history of the cereals, and then to use the facts about them which science fails to explain, as testimony to the supernatural in nature. The history of these plants will thus be found to throw light both on natural theology and revealed truth.

The cereals, or corn-producing plants, belong to the great natural family of grasses—the *Graminaceæ* of botanists. They do not by any means comprise the whole of that family of plants. They comprise only wheat, oats, barley, rye, rice, millet, Indian corn or maize, and one or two others. A goodly number they are, yet very far short of the numerous grasses known to botanists. And they are unquestionably the staple food of civilized man, the possession and the use of which leave him free to devote his energies to the advancement of his being, the multiplication of his race, and the accomplishment of the main objects of his existence in the world. Without corn, living on wild fruits or roots, or by hunting or fishing, and precariously, or from hand to mouth, man is everywhere a savage, incapable of taking a single step towards a higher and a better condition. Animal food, indeed, even civilized man eats, but it comes to him remotely from a plenitude in corn, and from the habits which tillage engenders, and in many ways promotes. But corn is man's proper food. It alone suffices, as the physiologist knows, for the highest state of robust health and vigor. It alone, as the historian knows, secures the permanence and advancement of civilized, as compared with savage and nomadic or wandering life.

*This article was sent us by A. Ingwall Fodyce, Esq., Fergus, with the author's consent to its publication in the MONTHLY. The argument is ingenious and interesting. Dr. Harvey was f... many years a distinguished professor in Aberdeen University.—[ED. R. C. M.]

They are all of them annual plants. Springing up in autumn or in spring from seed sown they attain their full maturity and ripen their seed in a single season or within a single year; and, cut down when ripe, the small residue of stalks and roots that remains in the ground perishes and disappears. That residue sends up no new plant the following year, as does that of the grasses that serve for the sustentation of sheep and cattle. These grasses we mow in due season and turn into hay, or the cattle browse upon them and eat them short. But next year the grasses in question spring up anew, from buds attached to what the scythe or the cattle have left behind uninjured, and by means of new buds, they creep along and spread themselves out on every side, overspreading the earth's surface everywhere, covering it with a sward, and so making that surface, besides a board for the sustenance of the hungry brutes, a bed also whereon they may rest their weary bodies and sleep, and a carpet for their tender feet. It is otherwise with the cereals. Being annuals, on being cut down with the sickle when ripe, they do not spring up anew the year following of themselves from buds. Here is a marked contrast between them and the wild grass of the field. How widely different for man it would be from what it is were the cereals perennial plants instead of annuals—were they to spring up anew year by year of their own accord from buds, and had man nothing to do but to put forth his hand and partake of them—living simply, as the cattle do, on the bounty of nature!

Belonging to the great natural family of grasses, the cereals themselves are all of them unnatural species of this family. Their actual state, that in which we have them, that in which we grow them, that in which alone they are of any use to us, or are known to us, is one which the botanist designates "abnormal," the gardener "monstrous"—one which both speak of as "artificial." In their actual state they correspond to such plants as the gardener gets by subjecting wild or natural plants to cultivation or other artificial processes. Take the apple as one example. The sweet edible apple of our gardens and orchards may be said to correspond to the actual condition of the cereals. But it is not a natural apple, it is not the produce of nature. It is the sour crab apple, which we reject and refuse to eat, that is the natural representative of the sweet apple; and this the

gardener procures for us by cultivation and other arts peculiarly his own. He thus gets the sweet from the crab apple. And so of other fruits and plants that we eat, as cultivated, and notably, the potato; but which we cast aside as worthless, as they come to us from the hand of nature. All these are artificial, abnormal productions. But they are made such by man. The cereals also are in this sense "abnormal" plants. But they are such naturally, and they are, I believe, unique in that respect. They are the only plants that are in the predicament of being naturally "abnormal" plants. All other plants of that sort are, or have been, made abnormal by the hand of man. But they are so naturally. Professor Balfour, of Edinburgh, speaking of the cereals, says, "They are cultivated varieties of some unknown species," and of wheat in particular he says—"wheat is an abnormal state of some plant."

These plants are known to us only in their "cultivated" or "abnormal" state: this abnormal state is their natural state. If the wild grasses that now in their transformed-abnormal state yield us wheat and oats and barley and rice grow anywhere in the world, they are unknown to botanists. This appears to be true absolutely—any allegations to the contrary notwithstanding. It has been affirmed, indeed, that oats in their wild state, and even others of the cereal tribe, have been found growing in out-of-the-way places. Stray specimens may spring up, carried far by birds or other artificial way. But it is the confident belief of botanists that the wild originals of one and all the cereals are unknown. Wild grasses, indeed, belonging to the very same *genera* under which wheat, oats, and barley are included, are known to botanists; and these may have been taken and mistaken for the wild originals of these cereals, or for these cereals in a wild state, but they differ specifically in character from those cereals as we have them under cultivation.

From what we know of the plants that are made abnormal by man, it should not be difficult by experiment to reach the originals of the cereals—their wild, natural representatives. For the sake of brevity let us take the apple again—taking it simply as illustrating the general principle now in view. When we propagate the sweet apple by grafts, slips, or cuttings—*i.e.*, from buds—we get the sweet apple again, or, peradventure, even an

improved variety of this. But when we sow the seed of this sweet apple, we get the sour crab apple. We get back to this. And so of others of a like kind. When the plants yielding them are multiplied from buds, we get the now abnormal fruit or plant. But when we propagate these from their seed, we get, for the most part at least, if not always, the original natural plant, yielding in its season the natural fruit. And thus, however widely the abnormal and cultivated may differ in appearance or otherwise from the uncultivated and natural, we reach and we get hold of this. And, surely, it cannot but be that the same law holds of the cereals, and that we may thus make nature reveal their origin. But, when we sow the cereals in the ground, what do we get? Every one knows. It is these very self-same abnormal fruits or grains. The cereals reproduce themselves from seed in their integrity as abnormal plants.

Another fact, not less curious, is that the cereals do not reproduce themselves from seed of their own accord. Even as abnormal plants, they are never found growing wild. The botanist never comes across them in his rambles in quest of wild plants. He does not meet them on river-banks, or in glens, or hillsides, or remote from the immediate vicinity of tilled fields, hence they have manifestly been derived. His herbarium is filled with natural wild grasses picked up by him in such localities. But the cereals have no place in it.

Where, then, do they grow? Solely and alone in the prepared corn-field. And how? Solely and alone as sown by man's own hand. Spontaneously, or of their own accord, even in their abnormal state, they grow nowhere. Apart from man they are never met with; and apart from man they would have no existence on this earth! This general fact is, I believe, true of the cereals alone—true of no other plant or plants in nature. It is a fact familiarly known. The author of a book called "Knight's Food of Man" says: "The corn-plants, such as they are, found under cultivation, do not grow wild in any part of the world." They might, indeed be supposed to be found growing wild or naturally in their own native countries. But as to this we are told by Professor Lindley, and Professor Bentley, of King's College, London, both high authorities in botany, that

the native countries of our more important cereals, or corn-producing plants, are altogether unknown.*

Again: left to themselves, left like other plants to nature, or in the hand of nature, how do they fare? Other plants reproduce themselves naturally; they spring up anew spontaneously, and they thus increase or multiply their numbers. Nay, more: many of them do so with such exuberance as to require the hand of man to keep them under—and so prevent them cumbering the ground as useless weeds.

It is otherwise with the cereals. Left to themselves—left to take their chance in the world with other plants, they die out. This might be supposed to follow inferentially from what I said a moment ago—namely, that they grow nowhere naturally. But the fact demands special consideration. Left to themselves in autumn, left after they have attained their full growth in summer and ripened their seed, in the cultivated fields in which they have been reared, they would die down—root and branch—disperse their seed, and like other annuals disappear. But the spring following, would they not, as these do, reproduce themselves from their seed and re-appear? A few might, yet a very few only. Leave uncut, and to nature, a field of wheat: the individual wheat plants in it will ripen, and they will cast their seed and then die. But the year following will not the seed dropped the year bygone, and dispersed all over the field, send up new wheat plants? Some will, or may, but relatively very few; and the next year, if any, fewer still, until, in a very few years at the most, not a remnant will be left. And what is true of one corn-field is true of every other, and of this whole earth as a corn-field.

I have said a very few years. I would not speak dogmatically on this point. But I believe two years at the very utmost, if not a single year, would suffice for the extinction of every one of them. A single year would, I believe, suffice.

This general fact will require a little consideration. For, strange as is the whole natural history of the cereals, no natural

* Mr. A. Stephen Wilson, one of the highest living authorities on all questions bearing on the cereals—a practical agriculturist and a scientific one—skilled in botany and in the use of the microscope, has shown that the alleged discoveries of wild cereals, and the alleged conversion of allied natural species into the cereals of cultivation, have not been verified.

reason at first sight appears why it should be so—why they should thus fail of reproduction and become extinct. Let us see how this case stands.

The birds of the air, we may be sure, led by instinct to appreciate their value as food, would make havoc of them—devour them, as we read in the parable. But we cannot suppose they would devour them all, nor anything like them all. Enough would remain to raise at least a fair crop the subsequent year—so prolific are the cereals. We must seek for some more adequate explanation.

This explanation we shall find, I believe, in two things. The first is, that they require as a condition of their existence that the ground in which the seed lies be in a free open state—such as the farmer makes it by tillage. They will not grow on bare, hard, stony ground.

But again, and more particularly: hardy plants as they are, and vigorous of growth, as every one must have observed them to be as growing in the well-tilled field, they have no chance whatever against weeds and wild plants of every kind. These choke them, overmaster them in their growth, and effectually stamp them out.

This is what I have seen with my own eyes. Many years ago I saw near Southampton a small field which had been duly sown with wheat in ground prepared for it. But the ground had been badly tilled—so badly that the weeds sprang up with the young wheat plants. The wheat had been sown, as I recollect, not broadcast, but in regular drills. It was midsummer, when everything in the field was full-grown. To my astonishment, very few wheat plants were to be seen. Such as were visible were growing in rows. It was sufficiently apparent what sort of crop had been intended. But the field presented to the eye one mass of weeds. For one wheat plant there were fifty or a hundred weeds of all kinds. I remember well being struck with the whole spectacle, and with having had brought to my mind what befell the corn of the sower in the parable that fell among thorns —how "the thorns grew up and choked it" so that "it yielded no fruit." (Matthew xiii. 7; Mark iv. 7; Luke viii. 7.) The field I refer to was not worth reaping. I was much interested by reading not long ago in an Aberdeen newspaper, a

letter there to the editor from Mr. James Alexander, of Nebraska, in which, speaking of his wheat crop this very year, and after remarking that "the wheat is light," he says, "Farmers will learn a lesson this season in regard to keeping down weeds. Many fields are to be seen that will never pay the reaping, because of the weeds having got ahead of the grain." Habitually, indeed, we sow clover and rye-grass with wheat or oats, and no harm comes to either of these. These grasses, however, do not in their growth overtop the cereals, but the reverse. The cereals overtop the clover and rye-grass.

This, I apprehend, furnishes the main solution of the fact that the cereals do not reproduce themselves naturally. Hardy plants as they are, and highly vigorous of growth in the well-tilled field, they cannot hold their ground in the world against weeds and thorns, but disappear almost at once.

I come now to another fact, already incidentally adverted to, and flowing from what we have just seen as to the action and the potent agency of weeds. The fact now in view is one relating to the essential condition of their existence in the world, and their continuous reproduction in it from year to year.

Indispensable to civilized man, the fundamental stay and staff of his life, raised annually all the world over in enormous quantities, a bad harvest, a dire calamity, a general failure of the wheat crop or the rice or the maize crop entailing the death of millions, it may be, of our fellow-creatures, what is the essential condition of the growth and of the abiding existence in the world of the cereals? Rain and sunshine apart, it is well-tilled land—land well-drained and dry—land thoroughly freed of weeds—land well pulverized. The field near Southampton which I saw, and the fields at Nebraska which Mr. Alexander speaks of, well illustrate, as far as clean land is concerned, this essential requisite for the growth of the cereals. And the stony or rocky ground in the parable of the sower may be taken to represent the natural condition of the soil in the world generally. The natural soil is everywhere unfit for the cereals. They will not grow on it—will not germinate on it. Wild plants will grow on it, but the cereals will not; and, accordingly, as we have seen, they grow nowhere naturally. Year by year, the ground must be broken up anew and carefully prepared to receive them.

Tillage, careful tillage, is absolutely needed for their growth. But by whom is tillage effected? By nature? No. It is by man. And with this condition of existence of the cereals may be linked another—viz., the process of sowing and the adjuncts of this, the harrowing of the ground over the seed sown. All this is the affair of man, not of Nature. Nor may man spread their seed broadcast on the ground once for all, and then in all time coming reap the fruit of his labour. The cereals being annuals, man may not intermit the yearly round of care and toil they need.

Here is a marvellous thing, surely! Here is a set of plants that are in the most absolute sense possible dependent on man for their very existence in the world. This holds of no other plant or set of plants that I know. I do not overlook the fact that not a few plants made abnormal by man himself, and useful to him because of their being such, are dependent on him for their continuous existence in their abnormal state. But then these, if left to themselves, if neglected by man, do not die out and perish. They only lapse into their original or primitive condition. The cereals, however, would become extinct. They would absolutely disappear from off the face of the earth. They grow nowhere apart from man and the labour of his hands. And were mankind everywhere, or all the world over, by some freak, to intermit growing them for only a year or two, they would everywhere disappear. And once lost to him, they would be lost forever. For whence or how could he recover them? He would have parted with his only available source of supply whence to recover them—that of his own annual rearing. Nature would avail him nothing—for nature herself does not grow them in any shape or way—does not grow them apart from man.

Another fact yet remains. By Nature, or from or by the light of Nature, man does not know anything about them. He has no natural knowledge of them. He does not thus know their great value to him as food—nor does he thus know their absolute dependence on him for their existence in the world. He could indeed live without them—as certain savage races do to this day, although, in his civilized state, he may be said to be absolutely dependent on them. Still, as I have just said, man may

live without them. But, as we have just seen, they cannot live without him. They are absolutely dependent on him for their existence, and that too from year to year. Here we are at once confronted by a profound mystery. Annuals in the truest sense, and dependent on man alone, and not on Nature, for their existence from year to year—lost as they would be to him, and lost, irrecoverably and forever, were man now, all the world over, to intermit the rearing of them for a single year, or two years at the utmost—how were the cereals maintained and preserved for man during the period he was ignorant of them—during what, judging from all past experience of the growth of man's knowledge, we must regard as the long ages of his natural ignorance of everything relating to them?

Take an extreme case. Suppose man (betaking himself for the time being to other food) were to intermit the cultivation of the cereals everywhere—for, say, ten years—this class of plants would be irretrievably and forever lost to him. How then did the cereals subsist from year to year as, miracle apart, they must have subsisted during the first ten years after their introduction into the world, if man was then wholly ignorant of them—knowing nothing of anything relating to them—not knowing how valuable they would be to him as food, and, stranger still, not knowing that they are absolutely dependent on him, and, from year to year, for their existence in the world—dependent on him exclusively and not in any degree on nature? Here is an insoluble mystery—one insoluble by the light of nature. Nature alone suffices to sustain all things else in nature wherein there is life, save and except the cereals. Under her alone this whole set of plants would be unknown. They could have no place in the vegetable world—no place on this earth. If man be not their creator, he is at least their upholder in the world, and, rain and sunshine and soil apart, their sole upholder in the world.

We have not far to seek to satisfy ourselves that by nature man has no knowledge of the cereals—knows nothing at all about them. "When some European missionaries (Archbishop Whately tells us) introduced into New Zealand the culture of wheat, telling the Maories that bread is made of it, they were much rejoiced. For bread, in the form of ship-biscuit, they had often tasted and much relished. But when the corn was grown

tall they dug some of it up, expecting to find eatable roots, and when they found only fibres they thought the missionaries were making game of them. . . . The Maories had derived all their vegetable food from roots, and therefore naturally supposed bread to be made of roots. That little hard seeds were to be ground—a process they had never seen or imagined—and the powder made into a paste with water and then baked, was what could never have occurred to them" ("Lessons on Mind," p. 118.)

What forty or fifty years ago was true of the Maories must hold to this day of many other savage tribes. When were the cereals first introduced into the world? and when did man first learn what, for their mere preservation from year to year, it concerns him to know? We do not know. Four thousand years ago and more, the Egyptians had them, knew their value as food, and knew their relation, as to their growth, to the annual overflow of the waters of the Nile on their wheat fields, and to their sowing of them. But they were known earlier still—or some of them. Taking the book of Genesis simply as an historical record, we there read of them, or of one of them, in a way to be presently referred to—as actually existing at the time when man first made his appearance on this earth—or is first spoken of as a denizen of it.

Had the cereals existed in nature in the wild state, as wild perennial grasses, there would be no question at all as to how they came into man's hands. The plain answer would be that he made them for himself out of those wild grasses just as he has made for himself those other abnormal plants out of their wild originals—by cultivation. But man has no natural knowledge of the cereals, and of himself he never could have come to know anything relating to them.

From the very first year that man possessed them, however remote that period may be, he must have learnt that, in order to retain continued possession of them, he must that very year or the next carefully till the ground for them and sow them. If we trace their history backwards as far as we can reach, we learn that they have been preserved in the world by an annual process of tillage and sowing, carried on by man; and knowing the conditions of their existence, and believing, as we must, that these

have evermore been the same as now, we inferentially reach the conclusion that, contemporaneously with their introduction into the world—aye, with the very first year of this, man must have come to know their absolute dependence on him.

But how? By nature ignorant of this, years could not have rolled on till he should by long experience or by lucky chance learn it. For, meanwhile, they would have passed from his hands and been forever lost to him. The conditions of their existence must then, as now, have been such that they could not wait till, by observation and experiment, he had discovered them.

How then? Here again we must needs go beyond nature and man—beyond the light of unaided reason and the discoveries of science.

The character and the conditions of existence of the cereals being such as they are, and man's natural ignorance of their use and value being such as the known history of savage tribes demonstrates, it surely needs no further argument to prove, not only that these plants (as we have and grow them) must have been specially given by God to man, but that man himself must have been directly taught of God as well the use and the value of them to him as food, as also the way to grow them. As to the mode or the manner of the communication, we affirm nothing. No account of the matter, however, other than that given us by Moses in the book of Genesis will explain the known facts of the case or supply the information desired. Had God not said to man, "Behold to you have I given them for meat" —given them for food, man never would have had them—nor, having them, would he of himself have discovered their use as food. Again: Had God not sent man forth to till the ground, acquainting him that thus, and thus only, even "to the sweat of his face," would they grow, there would at this moment be no corn in the world. Man could not of himself have known that tillage was needed—still less continuous and careful yearly tillage, without peril of losing them. This short simple history covers and explains all the known facts of the case. It solves what would otherwise be an insoluble enigma in natural science.

The authors of the admirable work called "The Unseen Uni-

verse," while affirming that this visible universe must have had a beginning in time (an affirmation of the highest value in relation to the matter now in hand, and the truth of which they demonstrate by proofs infallible); and while still further they allow and demonstrate also that miracles have occurred in times bygone (even in the advent of Life and Mind into the world) they maintain that (however strange it may sound to some of their readers) "it is the duty of the man of science to push back the Great First Cause, in time, as far as possible." (5th edition, p. 94.)

Be it so. But how far back as regards the cereals? As far as "to be pushed out of it altogether?" The geologist asks, and fairly asks, for æons of ages for the doing of the work he investigates; and the evolutionist does the same. No doubt the latter needs an equally long time if his work be done after the fashion he assumes. We would venture, however, to submit that the history of the cereals, and the fact that all the other abnormal plants known to us in the world have been made such by man and not by Nature, go far to show that we have here at any rate an exception to the doctrine of evolution; and if the evolutionist would but except these, and except man also, we should leave him free to fancy what he pleases as to the rest of the living organised world. Without affirming positively, however probable it may seem, that man and the cereals were nearly contemporaneous in the world, there are considerations in regard to man that seem to indicate that it cannot have been so very long since he came on the stage of the world, and, if so, the cereals cannot well have been very long either before him or after him.

The advocates for a high antiquity for man may hold that the human race existed before the man introduced to us by Moses as our head. If such a race was ever evolved with the inborn energies of our race, and in all respects identical with man, its members must have been pure children of Nature. Now, it admits of demonstration that such beings, with Nature alone furnishing the conditions of existence, could not have subsisted a month in the world. They would have been helpless, defenceless creatures. Whether evolved as infants or as adults, they would and must have died, one and all of them, of sheer starvation. In truth, man as a pure child of Nature has never existed save in the imagination of the evolutionist. As the cereals, the

gift of God to man, have never existed apart from man, so man has never existed apart from God. The root of his being is in Him—i.. a sense altogether special. Nature alone sufficeth for all the brute orders around us—but not for man. This is physiologically demonstrable ; and it is as certain as anything can be (because it could not have been otherwise) that the primitive ancestors of our race came into the world civilized—or became or were made civilized from the first. The savage races now existing are, as Archbishop Whately has shown, the remnants of races once civilized but long since degraded, and now incapable of themselves of taking the first step towards regaining the lost civilization.

Be the time when it may that the cereals came into the hands of man, let it suffice for us to know of a certainty and to feel assured that they were directly put into his hands by the Almighty God, his Maker ; and also that he was directly taught of Him as well their incomparable value to him as food as the way to grow them—for himself and his posterity for ever.

Well, then, may that bread from heaven, for such it is, form a part of the prayer we daily say. For, besides that we need it daily, it bears on it the image and the superscription of God. It bears on it the impress of a miracle, and the attestation of a Providence, both still in silent operation around us. And, reverently be it said, we have thus in that common bread a "Real Presence" of God.

ALEXANDER HARVEY.

University of Aberdeen.

Missionary.

AMONG KOREANS.

PERHAPS no place in the world would seem to present less of interest to write about than the village in which I am at present. I have more than once had my attention drawn to the sixty-first Psalm, as being wonderfully appropriate to its situation and surroundings, "the end of the earth," "the end of the earth," a beautiful Psalm pointing to this lonely village, and then pointing to the "Rock that is higher than I."

To one looking from the mountain pass, three miles north, Sorai appears like a cluster of old fashioned bee-hives, faded by the rain and sunshine, but alive with white coated bees who are moving here and there in great numbers. Just behind it in a valley are the rice fields sloping down to the sea, that stretches off toward China. Looking still closer we distinguish patches of cultivated ground, great tracts covered with low shrubbery, uncared for roadways between, while all the rest of the landscape has a brown and faded look, in the distance faded villages, and beyond, brown hill-tops as far as the eye can see.

There is nothing of interest on the mountains except tigers, and as the natives linger here with fear and trembling, we shall not tarry. This tiger theory is no myth, as only a week ago a poor Korean left his home for the mountains to return no more.

One glance at the path down the southern slope and you wonder how any people could ever think of a roadway in such a place. No sooner do you get started, than you are clinging to trees and boulders, looking for safety here and there, feeling how small a creature man is as you view the depths of the valley below you. As you are a foreigner, you will be some distance ahead of your Korean friends, who take this odd way of showing their respect. So not till you are well started will you hear the peculiar calls of the men who are bringing the horses by the same pathway you thought so difficult. Fortunately Korean ponies

are small. Due no doubt to this, and experience in such work, they all arrive some time later safely at the foot.

Once more you continue the journey on horseback, along a road that is very bad. You often hear in Seoul of Korean roads so fine, but they were doubtful when you started, and have been getting worse all along, and this is the two hundredth mile. But never mind the roadway, here comes a Korean. He is walking briskly. These fellows make fifty miles a day, and I have known them to keep it up for a week. You are at once struck by the dress, white, grass-woven boots, wide trousers, loose flowing robe, with ribbons and bands innumerable. His hat, though black, is transparent, and through it you see his hair done up, not as the Chinaman, but in a knob on the top of his head, while round the brow is a black horse-hair band bound very tightly. The hat strings are large, meeting under the chin.

Such is a Korean outfit. You look with astonishment at the boots, the robes, and the head-dress, not knowing which to consider the most peculiar, or furthest from anything you ever imagined. But then the face is not so strange; you have seen people at home who looked like that, whose eyes had the same expression, though perhaps the face had a less darker tinge. As he comes close he says in a deep voice and in tones showing his indifference to the presence of a foreigner, "O-day Ka-oh?" (Where are you going?) On the first interrogation of the kind you feel indignant, and wonder who this fellow is who makes such demands in such a way: but the Koreans of the party look at life differently, and answer "Sorai, Sorai."

It is now growing dark and you feel chilly, as the cold winds from the Mongolia sweep down and catch this part of the valley, so you button your coat for the remainder of the journey, wondering what Sorai is, and where the white-coated companions are leading you, whom, but a few days before, you had never known or heard of. Sometimes, perhaps, on this ride you feel a little lonely, when you think of two hundred miles of hills and mountains between you and any English-speaking friend.

But before such thoughts are mingled with tears you are into Sorai, and pass among the houses, miserable enough looking in the darkness. There are dogs to welcome you with their wolfish howling but no lights. At last the party stops before a house

where a light is struck, a door opens, and one figure appears, two, three, four, and then you lose count but still they come. You wonder what meeting can be going on and what a large room there must be to hold all these people. To this room they take you but instead of being large it is very small, low in the ceiling, and sadly in need of ventilation. Notwithstanding its defects, here you are to sleep, to eat, and to live, for how long you cannot tell, between these mud walls that are open to the street, and as public as the king's highway.

Again you ask how did all these people get in? Just wait a moment! You begin to think that after your long journey you will at last be alone, when suddenly the door opens and in walks a wild looking figure, with scanty dress, whose black locks hang in disorder over his shoulders, and seats himself in the darkest corner of the room, smoking his long pipe. Another comes, and still another, until within the little room you have before you every variety of Eastern face and features.

For an hour or so you answer in your best Korean the many questions, and thus the evening passes. Only by repeating with great emphasis the fact that you are tired, and must sleep, can you get this assembly to move. At last, one by one, they disappear through the low doorway, each carrying with him his pipe, that is as much a part of the native as the peculiar top-knot on the crown of his head.

They have made only a partial survey of the stranger, and will be back early to-morrow morning, not to complete it, but to continue it. There is something very oppressive in the fact of having, day after day, every eye of man, beast and bird fixed upon you. In time, however, you may become indifferent to it, though often, with Cowper, you will sigh for "a lodge in some vast wilderness."

They watch closely the foreigner in his life and movements, so the foreigner will find much to interest him if he balances accounts and watches them closely. Notwithstanding their gruff voice and wild appearance, they are a kind-hearted people, living here on the sea shore, separated from all the rest of the world, knowing of nothing but their own little village, once in a while hearing from a stray passer news of the capital. All they need they find at hand. They have fields of cotton, and so

manufacture their own clothing. They make their own shoes, grow their own tobacco, grind their own rice in an eastern mill (Matt. xxiv. 41).

Before noticing the people or village, your attention is attracted by the roaring of the sea. Two miles down the rice fields and over a little hill and you are seated on the rocks watching the waves as they come and go with the tide. There is no lack of company. A system of slavery prevails in Korea, so the average Korean does not work. A number of them are seated on the rocks beside you, asking you how you like the sea. "We are surprised at the foreigner, that in this their first meeting, he did not address the sea," says one jolly looking Korean. The foreigner expresses regret at the fact that he has blundered and asks what he should say. The friend answers "Pata sopang pyeng-an has-si-o?" (Why, how are you Mr. Sea?) The faces of the others present show that they understand a Korean joke. Then, lost to the presence of those around, thoughts and prayers go out with the tide across to China for Goforth, MacGillivray and others in that hot heathen land, that they may be greatly used, and that through them the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified.

But to return to the village; for a few days it remains quiet and then a most unusual uproar takes place. You find your room invaded by a party of drunken men, whom you dislodge with difficulty, placing a guard at the door to prevent their returning. An Sopang (Mr. An) says that to-morrow there will be a funeral at the next neighbor's house, and that, according to custom, the friends have gathered the evening before to drink in honor of the dead. This neighbor's father had died some months ago but the body had been kept in the house until the appointed day of funeral. Others come to watch and wail, to drink "Syoul" and to join in this heathen glee over the burial of the dead. All the long night the turmoil continues, voices and drum-beatings and mournful wailing sounds, but then the evil spirits must be kept away. Certainly he would be a bold spirit who dared enter during such a ceremony.

An oddly shaped box, hung with the sparkling colors of the East is waiting on the street. At the risk of being trampled to pieces you make a closer examination. Over the body are

pictures of dragons and hideous representations of human heads. These are to watch over the departed as he sleeps. Round about are inscriptions warding off evil and telling of the greatness of him who is gone. What a contrast between all this and John Ploughman's inscription, "Waiting for the appearing of his Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ."

But this is not the strangest sight. A few days later you are disturbed by greater sounds, and by a larger number of people, dressed in red, and yellow, and blue, beyond one's power of description. They have imitation beards of horsehair, wear tasseled hats, and in many other respects differ altogether from the ordinary Korean. With their drums, and horns, and cymbals they unite in one great noise, doubtless all to the honor of the Westerner, whom they look upon with suspicion. These are priests of Buddha, that most useless sect of mankind, with which all these eastern lands are cursed. They leave home, and work, and name, to beg their living from door to door, to sing foolish songs in honor of those who feed them, and curses on those who refuse them rice.

Looking for a moment at the village coolie: he is the working man, and has but four days of rest in the year. Yesterday, the first day of the week, was just the same as to-day, the second; no knowledge of our Lord's Day, no expectation but that this poor life ends all. Their little children have no gatherings in Sunday School, have had no one to tell them of the Children's Friend.

As for the people, you will at first be surprised that you see none but men; you never talk to any but men and boys. Perhaps the coolies' wives will be out washing at the spring running by, but it is contrary to Korean custom, and they go because they consider themselves of no account. A poor, one-sided life, perhaps you often say.

But then there is joy even though you can only get men to talk to in a heathen land. Night after night they come. At first the question arose: "What is that book about, that you read?" "About Jesus, the Divine Saviour, all about Him." "Jesus! Who was He? What did He do?"

One official, stopping for the night says "I would like so much to see that Book but there are none in my town (sixty

miles from here); try and send me one." A bright young fellow from the same city, the capital of the province, says "A queer story this, but I'm going to see it." Night after night, in an adjoining room, you hear a number of voices blended together in that peculiar fashion in which these Easterners read. They all understand Chinese characters and it is a Chinese Bible they have before them.

As time goes on you have seasons of loneliness that earthly friends know not. Months pass and no word from the dear old land across the wide ocean. In the house where you are living you see heathen customs daily, sin, sickness, and misery. Oh, what a dark, dark land. To the Word of God for comfort: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." It is said that Burns could not read these words without weeping; how doubly sweet to one if abiding in Christ.

I write this under difficulty, but write praying that those who read the words may look with pity at Korea, this whole nation that has scarce a missionary.

JAS. S. GALE.

Tjang-yen, N. W. Korea, May 13th, 1889.

PRESBYTERIANISM IN THE SOUTHERN STATES.

A FEW notes about the Presbyterian Church in the Southern States, from one who has resided there during the past year, may be of interest to the readers of the MONTHLY. Very little of an historical nature need be given; only some simple things relating to the present condition and prospects of Presbyterianism can be presented.

Previous to the late terrible civil war the main body of Presbyterianism was a unit throughout the entire United States. There were, it is true, other branches of the Presbyterian faith represented in the great Republic. There, as still, the United Presbyterian and the Cumberland Presbyterian Churches, together with some smaller bodies, were found in several States of the Union; but the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America was not divided into its Northern and Southern sections till the dreadful conflict between North and South, which continued from 1860 till 1865, came upon the country.

The causes which led to the complete separation of the Churches, which occurred in 1861, and which resulted in the formation of the Southern Assembly, need not be here recited. Space forbids such a statement as would be necessary to make these causes clearly understood, and as these two branches of the great Presbyterian family seem now to be drawing together again, it is not necessary to allude to the strife and bitterness of that terrible crisis. It is enough that some of the lessons which the Church then learned, and, perhaps, sees more clearly now, should never be forgotten.

In June, 1861, the first Southern Assembly met at Augusta, Georgia, with Rev. B. M. Palmer, D.D., of New Orleans, as Moderator, in the church of which the late Rev. Dr. Irvine, well known to many Canadians, afterwards became pastor. The attendance was good, when it is considered that armed men were in all the border States from the Mississippi to the Potomac, and the whole country was stirred with the alarm of war. Dr.

Palmer, who was Moderator of the first Southern Assembly, still lives and is even yet one of the ablest men, and most eloquent preachers in the South; while Dr. Irvine has passed away, and a fine marble statue in the grounds of the First church, Augusta, represents the form of one whose memory is still dear in the South. It is proper to mention that the correct name of the Southern Church is, "The Presbyterian Church of the United States;" while that of the Northern Church is, "The Presbyterian Church of the United States of America."

In a general way the Southern Church covers the territory south of what is known as Mason and Dixon's line; and it includes the following States:—Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Florida. In several of the first mentioned States, which lie on the border between the North and South, both Assemblies are represented by churches and presbyteries; and scattered through the entire South, the Freedman's Board of the North has agents at work among the colored people, as the South also has.

In this wide area there are 13 synods, 70 presbyteries, 1,150 ministers, 2,300 churches, 162,000 communicants, 7,200 ruling elders, 5,300 deacons, 124,000 Sunday School and Bible Class scholars. From these figures it will appear that the Presbyterian Church in the Southern States is slightly larger than the Presbyterian Church in Canada in point of numbers.

In regard to the contributions of the Church the following figures are of interest in this connection:—Pastors' salaries paid, $650,000; sustentation, $52,000; home mission, $72,000; foreign, $88,000; education, $36,000; invalid fund, $14,000; support of students in seminary, $16,000. The total contributions for all purposes in 1888 was nearly $1,500,000. It will thus be observed that while the Southern Church is slightly larger in numbers, yet its contributions are not quite up to those of the Canadian Church. This would point to the conclusion that the people are on an average poorer than in Canada, and this conclusion is no doubt correct.

The Home Mission work is carried on much in the same way as in Canada, though Presbyteries seem to take more direct oversight of this work in their bounds. The organization is not

so complete as it is with the Home Mission Committee and its work in Canada. In weak fields ordained men are sent in for six months or a year, and theological students are employed during the vacation in Mission work. Very many Presbyteries have Evangelists regularly set apart to do pioneer work. These are regularly ordained men who have gifts to do hard missionary work. Their duty is not to go to the large centres, like the travelling evangelist, but to visit neglected districts, and organize mission stations, and to hold services in weak churches. Their work is really Home Mission work.

In Foreign Mission work the Southern Church is active and earnest; and when her wide Home Field is considered she does her share of the Foreign work in a manner which compares favorably with other and wealthier Churches. Work is carried on in Brazil, Mexico, China, Greece, Italy, India and Japan. There are upwards of seventy male and female missionaries, besides teachers and native helpers engaged in these various fields. A Foreign Mission Secretary devotes his whole time to the oversight of the work at home, and renders good service in visiting the seminaries and the churches in the interest of the work.

In regard to training candidates for the ministry there are two leading theological seminaries, each founded fully sixty years ago. The one is situated at Columbia, South Carolina; and the other, known as Union Seminary, is situated near Richmond, Virginia. Both of these are fully equipped with buildings, endowment, library and faculty, and they have each given a large number of ministers and missionaries to the Church. Besides these two schools of the prophets, partial courses in theology are provided for in connection with the South Western University at Clarksville, Tennessee, and at Austin, Texas. In all there are about 140 students in theology, besides those who are in their arts courses. Altogether there may be about 250 candidates for the ministry in various stages of preparation. This number is far below the actual need, for there are about 600 vacant fields in the bounds of the Church. In the case of many of these, unless men are provided soon, there is danger that they will not continue to exist. It is a testimony to the persistence of Presbyterianism that these vacant charges continue to live as they do. The greatest need of the Southern Church at the

present day, in the way of agencies to carry on her work, is a great increase in the number of her candidates for the ministry. Her seminaries afford good facilities for their training, and the Church provides, through her education committee and by means of students' aid funds in the seminaries, for the support of the students for the ministry. Any Canadians who may desire a milder climate than Canada to live and labor in, will find a wide field and an open door in the South, There will be hard work, and many things different from what one is accustomed to in Canada, yet the field needs men, and the people of the South are a noble people to live amongst. Moreover, the type of Church life is very much like that of Canada, so that a Canadian soon feels at home therein.

Only a few general remarks in regard to Southern Presbyterianism can be added. The general type of Church life is orthodox and conservative. In doctrine and polity the Church is thoroughly Calvinistic and Presbyterian. The catechism and confession are honored. This comes out in many things. The preaching is generally of a very high order, and strong in doctrine; and the itching ear, which longs to hear something sensational, is seldom to be found. There is also a deep spiritual fervour pervading the preaching and the services generally. As in Canada, instrumental music is permitted, and yet some of the best men in the Church are opposed to it. Generally the people sit during the singing, and stand at prayer. In many rural districts in the Carolinas, the "tables" are still used at the observance of the Lord's Supper. Twice in the Northern part of the State of South Carolina did the writer unite in its observance in this way. More solemn and impressive services it was never his privilege of attending. In Presbytery also old customs prevail. Regular meetings are held only twice a year, and they usually last from Tuesday till Friday of the week. No business is done in the evenings, but a preaching service is held each night, so that the devotional element has a large place in the meetings. The synods meet in the autumn, usually in October, and are important gatherings. The Assembly meets in May, and consists of one minister and elder to each twenty-four, or fraction thereof, in Presbytery.

Many other things might have been alluded to, but these

notes may give some idea of what the Presbyterian Church, South, is, and what she is doing.

Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C. F. R. BEATTIE.

CRITICISM OF MISSIONS.

NEVER before was such fierce light turned upon missionaries and missionary methods and enterprises as to-day. Not from pronounced enemies merely, heathen opponents and blatant infidels, has the criticism come. Professed friends of the mission cause have made most serious accusations and most damaging charges. Canon Taylor and Mr. Caine, M.P. have won unmerited fame by their attacks. Following these, the friends of missions in England have to face the charges made in a series of articles appearing in the *Methodist Times*, Mr. Hugh Price Hughes' cleverly edited paper. The educational policy of mission boards was fiercely attacked. Missionaries who are much better informed than Mr. Hughes have replied with equal force and with more certain knowledge, This, however, is not the most serious charge.

Missionaries are accused of living in luxury. We have heard such accusations made much nearer home than the office of the *Methodist Times*. It is a most serious charge. If true, nothing could be more damaging ; if false, nothing more inexcusable. The character of a large number of worthy men is at stake, and we cannot afford, in their interests and in the interests of truth, to allow the charge, if untrue, to go unanswered.

From the many answers given to the *Methodist Times* articles we select, as deserving of consideration, that of the *Indian Standard*, the intelligent organ of Presbyterianism in India. The *Standard* tracks the critic of missions in the following sharp style :—

A writer in the *Methodist Times* inveighs, first, against the educational policy of missions, and secondly, against "the evils

of the position" of missionaries consequent thereon. He proposes to try democratic methods as if they never had been tried and were not in full swing in every mission in the land; and next, which is more to his purpose, to lower the position of the missionary by cutting down his salary and placing him on a level lower than any he has ever yet occupied or deserves, and all for the good of the cause, not to *ease* the friends of missions. The writer appears to have been in India, and from his style we presume that he is an educated man. There are, however, in every line of his articles, abundant evidences that he has only a superficial knowledge of the subject he is writing about. He might first try what he proposes, and so give some weight to his suggestions.

That the plan of conducting missions proposed by the *Methodist Times* is a *new* policy, as far as the democratic methods are concerned, we take the liberty of flatly contradicting. It is an old one; it has been worked alongside education from the first, and is being vigorously conducted at present. That it has been more effective than the educational we emphatically deny. We go a step further and assert without fear of contradiction, that any one means standing alone is not more fruitful than education. Take street preaching; we have been engaged in it for well nigh a quarter of a century, and have baptized hundreds of persons, and yet we can confidently point to none who were brought into the light *solely* by its means. The late beloved and sainted editor of the *Bombay Guardian* gave a similar testimony. That is no reason, however, for giving this method up, though it is a reason, and a very strong one too, for supplementing it. Something similar might be asserted of any other method taken by itself, with, perhaps, the exception of education. The additions to the Church are usually the results of a series of combined methods of work, each of which contributes its share in bringing about the breaking down of prejudice, the creation of a conviction of the truth of the Gospel, and the cause of a determination to abandon everything for Christ.

The real object of the writer appears in his second article, in which he argues that missionaries are in a false position. It never seems to have occurred to him as he sat in his elegantly furnished house (it seldom does to such people), amid all the lux-

uries of a civilization which he owes from first to last to that Divine Teacher whose principles he was misapplying, that he himself is in the false position of which he wishes to convict his brethern. We traverse his positions one and all and from first to last with a direct negative. He has not proved one of his statements which are likely to roost at home in a cooler clime than India.

A minister of the Gospel who has passed through the same classes at school or college as the Indian Civilian, and who in addition has taken out a three or four years, course of theology, cannot divest himself of his culture, his developed intelligence, and his scholarship, at the command of a society or board, in order to carry out the shallow views of irresponsible writers. His Christian faith, his culture, his developed mental power, his grasp of truth, and his whole education, give him a position which no pony carriage, no levée at Government House, and no dinner party at a civilian's bungalow can either enhance or debase. The writer has rashly advanced the charge of luxury against the missionary. Now what is luxury? The charge was hurled at the head of our Lord by the worthless religionists of Judea, and it is now in another form launched forth against his humble followers by English sybarites. Is it a luxury to give up home and friends, and with breaking hearts to take a last fond look at scenes which time can never efface from the memory, and relatives around whom the affections had entwined their tendrils which rudely snap at the one great wrench? Is it a luxury to spend weary days and nights in the study of foreign tongues and pagan religions? Is it a luxury to live in a land of pests and plagues, in daily and hourly danger of epidemic disease? Is it a luxury to be exposed to the fierce and dangerous rays of a tropical sun? Is it a luxury to do one's work six month's out of the twelve with the perspiration pouring from every pore? Is prickly heat a luxury? Are mosquito curtains and an occasional breeze from the punkah luxuries? Is it a luxury to sleep in a stifling atmosphere and rise from a hot bed unrefreshed? Is it a luxury to rear a family of pale faced children whose appetite nothing can tempt, and whose rest nothing can soothe, in an unhealthy climate and surrounded by the fœtid moral atmosphere of heathenism? And is it a luxury to turn away with breaking

heart from the ship that carries away all that one holds dear in the world, and goes back to an empty, cheerless house, which once was a home, to take up a work the most difficult which has ever fallen to the lot of man? If these are luxuries, Indian missionaries are enjoying them to the full, and the author of the proposed new departure is no doubt content to do without them.

But the missionary is guilty of sometimes driving in a phaeton, and of going to Government House to pay his respects to a Viceroy or a local Governor. He must, therefore, it is assumed, live in accord with these high functions. Is it a sin in a hot and exhausting climate to keep a conveyance? Ministers at home are never guilty of such glaring naughtinesses! Is it wrong to make one's bow to a Governor, and pay respects to the powers that be?

The writer has never had a pony carriage, and yet has been in the receipt of a salary of over £300 a year. He must plead guilty of being at a governor's levée more than once, and of dining with exalted personages. But strange to say, it did not increase his permanent establishment in the least nor his ordinary or extraordinary expenditure *one pie.* The statement that a missionary's expenses must be pitched on a higher scale than is necessary because he can mix with society, is so absurd that we are almost ashamed to notice it. The missionary who *merely* lives for society, is not worth his salt, and we believe the stigma which this writer has tried to attach to the missionaries as a body is a libel pure and simple. To do one's work *a horse* and sometimes a horse and trap are needed. Unhappily the writer is not able to afford (though in the receipt of over £300 a year) horse or trap or anything of the kind, and has to risk his bones in a hired shigram. The consequence is that the work must suffer. Alas that it should be so! Work, good, sound, earnest, thorough, is not what is wanted now-a-days, but "stories of heroism and self-denial." The ragged, tattered and torn ascetic, with clotted matted hair, roaming about in dust and ashes, would suit. The fakir's robe, bare feet and wooden bowl are the model. Work! that is neither here nor there: it does not satisfy the world of subscribers. It won't make them stare. Well! What the subscribers want they will get. The horse absolutely necessary to carry on the work; the servant which relieves the master for

higher duties; the luxuries of cart and house will disappear and with them *results* too. But "Friends of Missions" will be able to exhibit their ascetics, and with the tale of their terrible sufferings melt sympathetic audiences into tears.

Here and Away.

THE General Assembly was a regular windfall to the newspapers, and they gathered up a goodly pile of driftwood.

THE Assembly owes a debt to the Toronto newspapers for their very full and usually accurate reports. No ecclesiastical meeting in America got more attention from the secular press. This is another argument in favor of holding the Assembly in Toronto every year.

WE refer our readers to the reports in the daily and the religious papers for detailed information regarding the Assembly. We go gleaning after these sharp-eyed reapers, and gather a few of their "handfuls of purpose," as Dr. Parker would quote.

THE billetting arrangements deserve a word. How faithfully and wisely the Committee did their work is not known to outsiders; and how they managed to come near satisfying four hundred commissioners (with several wives and families thrown in), and nearly as many hosts, is a secret. If some of the ministers and elders——but we refrain from comment. The man who does not know the difference a wife and family makes to the billetting committee is not likely to be sent to another Assembly during the present generation.

OF course, Principal Grant made a model Moderator, and in many ways had the first claim. But when the *Queen's College Journal*, congratulating the Principal on his election, expresses its only regret that, being Moderator, he may be prevented from speaking on Jesuitism, the French in Canada, and other great public questions—when the *Journal* talks thus it surpasses itself as a comic paper. If the *Journal* is really in earnest, the joke is a huge one—even for the *Journal*. If Dr. Grant has anything to say on the Jesuit question, anything that will relieve the present distress, anything that will be endorsed by the General Assembly of which he is Moderator, anything truly patriotic and such as liberty-loving Presbyterians will accept—if Dr. Grant can venture to speak in the name of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, and say anything clear, and decided, and ringing, let him speak. Who ever muzzled the Moderator of a Presbyterian General Assembly? Many

other voices are heard in the land, some of them brave and strong. Dr. Grant cannot afford to be silent or uncertain. The Presbyterian Church has too much at stake. Speak! the country listens.

WHAT Job was among individuals, that the Assembly is among Church Courts. With the most long-suffering patience, day after day, did the fathers and brethren wade through the wilderness of windy words of the Galt heresy case. And notwithstanding all this, the appellants complain that they did not get a fair hearing. Brethren, life is too short. We have lost all the sympathy we had for these Galt people, especially since we saw the "Rev. N. Burns, B.A.," following them like a shadow, and leaving his mark on the papers presented. By the way, who is responsible for the title, "The So-Called Heresy Case," on the documents brought down to the Assembly? The appellants disclaim all responsibility. Perhaps "Rev. N. Burns, B.A.," who resides in Toronto, and is one of the prophets of the new school, could explain. His hand is seen in the pamphlet, purporting to give a history of the case, just published. All this sort of thing, and the well-known conduct of the appellants, may be consistent with "Holiness" as they understand it, but it bears traces of very unsanctified horns and hoof.

A FRIEND of Missions, who cannot be called finical, asks if it is not "a waste of the Assembly's time to spend the greater part of Foreign Mission evening listening to addresses, however excellent, by young, untried missionaries, who know nothing that may not be known to all, and is not known to most of the members." Yea, verily, an extravagant waste. It matters not whether it is customary or not, young fellows who never saw a heathen cannot address the Assembly for edification for more than five minutes. What can they say? Six years in the tented field will give them some right to speak; but before they put on the harness, and while yet they are drilling with toy guns and swords, what do they know of the science of war? Let us see these young recruits, and hear their voices; let us know of their determination; but beyond this, nothing. Keep your exhortations, gentlemen, for the ordinary congregations. And your theories—a little tilt with a live heathen may spoil them. Ten years hence we'll give you a patient hearing through a whole night.

Now, it will be utterly useless for any heroic defender of use and wont to rush into the lists and attack us for our criticism. We are neither unkind nor unsympathetic, but give expression to a growing feeling. The Assembly wants to hear from men who know, not from men who have heard. With many others, we believe that more attention should have been given to the India question and to Mr. Wilkie's College Scheme. This was really the only practical subject presented; and we say deliberately, with all respect for the Foreign Mission Committee's arrangements, that it seems too bad that Mr. Wilkie, near the end of a furlough which has been anything but a rest, should be saddled with the task of raising a large sum of money for college purposes in Indore, and that this scheme should receive so little attention at the Assembly.

ARE Assembly preachers and sermons exempt from criticism? Is it sacrilege to find fault with a sermon preached by appointment before the fathers and brethren? If not, here is a point in Homiletics. Text, Matt. xii. 32—the sin against the Holy Ghost. Has any man, except an Assembly preacher, the right to apply the broadaxe to this verse, take the last clause, and preach, however beautifully and poetically, on "this world" and "the world to come"? Is not this vicious interpretation? Any student found guilty of such a crime would be plucked in Homiletics. It reminds us of the minister who preached against a loud style of ladies' head-dress in fashion a few years ago, from the words, "Top not come down." It should be so, that no man, be he President, Doctor, or plain Mister, could practice this sort of thing on the General Assembly and live.

THIS Fifteenth General Assembly was, however, the largest, and, in every respect one of the pleasantest, ever held. The reports were, on the whole, encouraging. An ever-increasing number think the Assembly too large, and favor reduction. It is also thought by many that the time is at hand for the Assembly to cease its itinerating habits, and find a local habitation. Toronto is, of course, destined to be its home. An ex-Moderator suggests that Convocation Hall, Knox College, be enlarged and made suitable, or, if new college buildings are to be erected, that an Assembly Hall be attached, as was done by the Free and U.P. Churches in Edinburgh. The Church certainly should make a move, and this seems the best line. We will be glad to publish any suggestions.

WE expect a veritable battle of the giants when two universities, each calling itself great, enter the arena. We are somewhat disappointed, however, with the performances of Toronto and Queen's. There has been a good deal of "striking below the belt." After everybody has been satisfied with misunderstanding and misrepresentation and cheap declamation we may have some fair discussion of the subject of matriculation examinations which, when all's said and done, is not of transcendent importance. As yet nothing has been raised but dust. Vice Chancellor Mulock's address was decidedly undignified and unacademic, and Principal Grant's reply was a masterpiece of clever retort.

THE Calendar for Knox College for the session 1889-90 has recently been issued and may be had on application. A few changes are noted. In 1890-91 the following will come into effect in the B.D. course:—(*a*) Salmon's Introduction to the N. T. will take the place of Westcott's History of the N. T. Canon; (*b*) In Church History and Church Government, the work will be Killen's Ancient Church, 2nd part, and Witherow's Form of the Christian Temple; (*c*) Lightfoot on Philippians and Dissertations will be substituted for Ellicott on Galatians.

A LARGE number of valuable scholarships are offered for competition both in the theological and the university departments. Six of these are open to undergraduates of the University of Toronto studying for the ministry, and will be competed for in Knox College on the 1st

October next. On the same day the examination for the Bayne Scholarship for proficiency in Hebrew on entering theology will be held. We call special attention to the prizes offered for Essays:—The Smith Scholarship for essay on "The Teaching of our Symbolical Books in Relation to the Love of God;" the Prince of Wales' Prize for essay on "The Relation of Heathen Religions to Christianity;" and the Janet Fenwick Prize for essay on "The Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in Canada." No more important or more interesting subjects were ever assigned for these essays, and by the 31st October, the fixed time limit, a large number of carefully-prepared essays should be ready.

HERE AND AWAY wishes to make a few remarks on important topics. The first is that if there are any dissatisfied subscribers, any irate contributors, any aggrieved hobbyists, any to whom the MONTHLY has not given entire satisfaction or paid due respect, we would advise them to nurse their wrath for a few weeks longer. The managing editor, who was taken seriously ill during the Assembly week, is still "out of town" to all journalistic censors. If any vials of wrath are opened some innocents may suffer. Secondly, a publisher cannot possibly know of the addresses of itinerating subscribers—students, for example—unless notification is given. Thirdly, the announcement of a splendid combination offer of the MONTHLY and the *Expositor*, made among the advertising pages of this number, deserves the special attention of all ministers and Bible students. These two magazines are offered for the subscription price of the *Expositor* alone. Finally, that remarkable lecture, by the late Prof. Young, on "Freedom and Necessity," will be published in the August or the September number of the MONTHLY. As there is sure to be a great demand for the number containing this lecture those desiring copies should send in their applications early.

THE Young Memorial Fund is growing rapidly. The committee have scarcely begun work yet, but quite a number of subscriptions, some of them handsome, have been sent in. The necessary ten thousand dollars should easily be raised. Dr. Young's lecture on "Freedom and Necessity," which will appear in an early issue of this magazine was delivered in Knox College years ago and is now out of print and very rare. Dr. Calderwood says it is "a fine example of clear definition, critical acumen, and true appreciation of the difficulties besetting the problem." Hundreds of students in Canada and elsewhere will be glad to know of its publication in the MONTHLY. It gives the strongest evidence and finest illustration of Dr. Young's marvellous power of analysis.

WE have recently received three tractates of which we can give but the briefest notice. Rev. Dr. Burns, Halifax, in "A voice from Nova Scotia on the Jesuit Question," gives utterance to strong and stirring words on this question of the hour. At greater length the same author discusses the equally important "Sabbath Question." (Toronto: D. T. McAinsh.) The other pamphlet is the sermon preached before the General Assembly, by the now ex-moderator, Rev. William Thomas McMullen, D. D., on "The Christian Ministry," and published in neat form by the Presbyterian News Company. These tracts can

scarcely be called light literature, and are not likely to be ordered for summer reading; but they deal with subjects of interest to thoughtful people in all seasons, and are deserving of perusal.

WHAT a panic was created in Presbyterian circles by the announcement of the election, by a sweeping majority, of Rev. Dr. Marcus Dods, to the chair of New Testament Exegesis in New College, Edinburgh. The American religious newspapers display a good deal of ignorance of current movements in the Free Church, and regard this election as an indication of the reign of Wellhausen, Kuenen and Co., in Scotland. The appointment is called a "calamity" and the Free Church is represented as sailing away from the fleet of evangelical Churches into the blackness and darkness of Naturalism. Dr. Dods is made out to be the incarnation of advanced criticism and one Toronto weekly, *The Canadian Advance*, with amazing ignorance of both scholars, declares him to be more advanced than Robertson Smith. There is no need for anyone to pose as the defender of the Free Church Assembly, but one does grow impatient when reading such misleading and ill-informed rubbish. We have an article ready for the printer which professes to show reasons for believing that the election of any other man than Marcus Dods, any man of a different attitude of mind, would, in the present condition of things in the Free Church, be a calamity. After the dust has cleared away and men are prepared to consider the matter we may give it to our readers. In the meantime, without endorsing or apologizing for Dr. Dods' confessedly unsatisfactory views on several important doctrines, we may assure Canadians that his election is not, as our *Record* calls it, a "revolt against Calvinism," and that truth will not suffer at the hands of the new Professor.