

Pages Missing

THE THEOLOGUE.

Vol. 4.—APRIL, 1893.—No. 4.

Presbyterian College, Halifax.

THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

SAMARIA was captured, and Israel carried into captivity, about the year 721 B. C. Colonists from the east were sent to supply their place, probably by Sargon. The country was still insufficiently peopled, and another colony was sent by Ezar-haddon, about 678 B. C. The first colonists, perhaps at the suggestion of a friendly Israelite, obtained from the Assyrian King the services of a priest who re-established the ancient sanctuary at Bethel, and taught the new inhabitants of the country how they should fear Jehovah. But they still retained their own national gods. This mixture of Jehovism and idolatry subsisted for at least a century and a half. In the long run, however, the worship of Jehovah prevailed over the paganism with which it had been associated. There was probably a considerable remnant of Israelites, especially in the more remote and inaccessible parts of the country. Being poor, scattered and defenceless, they would naturally be willing to enter into friendly relations with the new settlers—trade with them, earn wages by cultivating their lands, intermarry with them, and to ultimately coalesce with them into one people. Religious differences would present no serious obstacle, because the religion of Israel was already tolerant of the ancient cults of Canaan and Phœnicia. As the community became more and more homogeneous, the intrinsic superiority of the religion of Jehovah seems to have gradually asserted itself. One external advantage was in its favor. It was the one religion common to the whole community, Jehovah being recognized by the immigrants as the God of the

land. But its elevation of thought, its reasonableness, its merciful character, would also tell on its behalf. The ultimate disappearance of the pagan features of Samaritanism would seem to indicate that the priest of Bethel was a good and faithful man, who did not limit himself to a re-organization of the ancient ritual, but taught the people to serve Jehovah in spirit and in truth. Had he no written manual of instruction, for his own guidance and that of his people? Ask a Samaritan to-day, and he will show you the Pentateuch. The higher critics object, however, that the Pentateuch was not in existence so early as 721 B. C. The burden of proof lies on those who maintain that position. Meantime let us note that the book of the law was discovered in the temple at Jerusalem about a century later—say 624 B. C. That book—be it the Pentateuch, or Deuteronomy, or a part of Deuteronomy—is not likely to have been written during the long reign of Manasseh. A reign of misrule for two generations had made the law and its records obsolete. We must go back at least to the reign of Hezekiah; and to the beginning of his reign, for he set out from the first as a religious reformer. He clave to the Lord, and kept his commandments, *which the Lord commanded Moses* (2 Kg. xviii. 6). Of course he had these commandments in written form. One would suppose he had the Pentateuch. He entered into friendly relations with those who found the Lord in northern Israel near the time when Shalman-ezer besieged Samaria; (2 Chr. xxx, 11). If they needed copies of the law, no doubt he would have supplied them. The first year of Hezekiah's reign afforded a favorable opportunity for obtaining a copy of any book of the law of Moses which he possessed. Or, if a few years later, the priest of Bethel wished to procure a copy, he had only to apply for it. The enmity between Jew and Samaritan had not yet begun, and did not begin till after the return of the exiles to Jerusalem—nearly two centuries later.

Unpleasant things sometimes have their uses. It is the alienation between Jew and Samaritan—an alienation extending from 535 B. C. to the present day—that gives its special interests to the Samaritan Pentateuch. We have here a text of the first four books of the Old Testament that has come down to us through a line of transmission quite apart from that of the Masoretes of

Tiberias. Precisely how far back we can trace it is a question of interest for Old Testament students at any time. But the interest is deepening to-day, and on two grounds,—for its bearing on the authenticity of the Pentateuch, and for its bearing on the adjustment of the text in detail. As regards authenticity, the further back we can trace a special line of transmission the stronger is our proof of the antiquity of the book. As regards correctness of text, let it be remembered that the science of textual criticism has passed through these stages. When the remains of Greek and Latin literature were first printed, editors compared the readings of different copies, and adopted that which yielded the best sense. The vote of a majority of manuscripts had considerable influence, but intrinsic probability might overbear it. In course of time it came to be realized that textual errors in a recent copy are an accumulation of copyists' mistakes made in the course of a long line of transmission, and so criticism reached a second stage when special pains were taken to discover the very oldest manuscripts, and special importance attached to their readings. Even that method, however, may prove misleading. An old manuscript may be very inaccurate; whereas a recent one may preserve faithfully the readings of a separate source that was more accurate than any manuscript now in existence. So attention came to be given to the genealogical classification of manuscripts; the lines of transmission being discriminated from each other as far as possible. Of course other considerations come into account. But, speaking broadly, the question now is, not what reading is supported by the largest number of manuscripts, or by the oldest, but what reading has the largest support from distinct families of manuscripts. Now, as it happens, there are only two families of Hebrew manuscripts, the Masoretic and the Samaritan.

For these reasons the question is coming to be a live one. How far back can we date the Samaritan text? Three answers may be given—the time of Solomon, the time of Hezekiah, or the time of Sanballat the Horonite. The Samaritans of Nablous go a great deal higher, ascribing this old manuscript to Abishua the son of Phinehas, who lived 3500 years ago. The book is much worn, and patched in places, but neither handwriting nor vellum seemed to Dr. Robinson to be of very high antiquity. So long

as the Pentateuch was held to have been written by Moses, or under his direction, there was no difficulty in supposing that Jeroboam might have provided copies for the two priests who had charge of the ritual he instituted at Bethel and Dan. There would thus be an Israelite text, possessed by the priest of Bethel, and used by him when he was sent back from captivity to re-establish the worship of Jehovah in its ancient seat. The subsequent transfer of this worship, for convenience, from Bethel, where Abram built his second altar in Canaan, to Shechem, where he built his first, or to the hill-top overhanging it, was a matter of small moment, and made no material change in the law. An interpolator introducing the name of Gerizim adapted the book for local use, from that time forth. But so high an antiquity does not suit the critics. Their position is temperately stated by Professor Ryle. After referring to the scrupulous conservation of the Samaritans he concludes, 'the limitation, therefore, of the Samaritan Canon to the Torah affords presumptive evidence that, at the time when the Samaritan worship was instituted, or when it received its final shape from the accession of Jewish malcontents, the Canon of the Jews at Jerusalem consisted of the Torah only.' There are here two dates to choose between. The Samaritan worship was instituted 721 B. C. The temple in Gerizim was built 432 B. C. There is an interval of nearly three centuries between the two. Can we decide as to the likeliest of the two alternatives? The Gerizim interpolations throw no light on the subject. They were made, no doubt, in 432. But it was as easy to interpolate a copy brought from Bethel as a copy brought from Jerusalem. Our principal source of information about the temple on Mount Gerizim, is Josephus. He tells us that Manasseh, brother of Jaddus the High-priest, and great grandson of Eliashib, married the daughter of Sanballat, governor of the province of Samaria. This gave great offence, and he was given the alternative to divorce his wife or give up the priesthood. Unwilling to do either, he explained his dilemma to his father-in-law. Sanballat offered to build him a temple on Mount Gerizim. Other priests and levites married strange wives, and followed Manasseh to Shechem. Alexander the Great in the meantime conquered the king of Persia. Sanballat transferred his allegiance to the conqueror, and obtained permission to

build the temple. He promptly carried out the work, and installed his son-in-law. The place became a resort for refugee Jews, who were accused of eating unclean food, breaking the Sabbath, or suchlike violations of the law, and complained to the Shechemites that they were accused unjustly. The names of Eliashib and Sanballat in this account suggest Neh. xiii, 28. There are difficulties. Manasseh is brother of Jaddus the High-priest. The brothers are sons of John, son of Judas son of Eliashib. In Nehemiah, Eliashib seems to be still in office as High-priest, and the culprit is a grandson, one of the sons of Joiada. The incident in Nehemiah dates about 434 B. C. Alexander captured Tyre in 332 B. C. A difference of one generation in the descent from Eliashib cannot solve an anachronism amounting to 102 years. If the dismissal of Manasseh belongs to Alexander's time, it could not belong to the time of Nehemiah. But if we eliminate all connection with Alexander, it seems not improbable that Josephus may have had some source distinct from Nehemiah, which supplied him with the name of Manasseh and the record of the erection of the Samaritan temple in the old age of Sanballat. Jaddus will be a Greek form of Joiada. Whether Manasseh was his brother or his son is a matter of little consequence. It is surmised that Manasseh brought a copy of the Pentateuch with him to Shechem. But Josephus does not say a word of that. The only book he mentions in connection with the story of Sanballat and the temple is (of all books!) that of Daniel. And it does not seem probable that after a century of mutual antipathy the Samaritans would have accepted a new religious code from the Jews. The Jewish malcontents must have formed only a small fraction of the Samaritan population; and the opinion and feeling of the body of the people could not be disregarded. It seems more reasonable to suppose that the Samaritans had their Pentateuch before the cleavage separating them from the Jews, began, i. e., in 535, when the Jews refused to recognize them as fellow-worshippers, and so in 721 when their special type of religion took shape. One cannot go much further back with the same confidence, because the relations between Israel and Judah were sometimes friendly, and there was less difficulty than after the rise of Samaritanism, in recognizing their religious unity. And we cannot go quite back to

Jeroboam the son of Nebat, because the Samaritan text does not provide for his feast on the 15th day of the eighth month. Still, something may be said in favor of the written law having found its way to the northern kingdom, as soon as the priests of Bethel became aware of its existence and value.

Here, then, is a type of the Hebrew text coming down to us through a channel kept apart, by religious antipathy, from the main stream of Jewish tradition. The antipathy dates from the restoration of the Jews in 535 B. C. A partial approximation on the Samaritan side a century later, implies that the teaching of the law had already brought about a practical adoption of the Jewish religion, so that the Samaritans could readily accept Manassehas, their High-priest. Three centuries of oral teaching at Bethel, without aid from books in the possession of the priests, would scarcely have led to such a result. We are thus carried back to the rise of the Samaritan religion, seven centuries before the Christian era. Of course many copyists' mistakes have crept into the text in the course of twenty-six centuries. The marvel is that they are so few, and in importance so insignificant. So long as it cannot be shown that the Samaritan text is dependent on the Masoretic, the substantial agreement of the two argues strongly for the care with which such documents were copied in very early times, and so far the historical value of the books.

The Samaritan Pentateuch deserves to be critically edited. Kennicott and DeRossi give the readings of some eighteen manuscripts scattered over the libraries of Europe. The collations should be tested, and, if found inaccurate, new collations made. The history of the manuscripts, so far as known, should be studied, with a view to marking out distinct lines of transmission. It is to be expected that there should be an Egyptian variety, a Damascus variety, and so on. Even Nablous manuscripts may have been copied from divergent sources. The ultimate test of genealogical relation is agreement or difference in characteristic writings; but the known history of sources will be of great service towards finding out what readings are characteristic. These groups, when found, have to be estimated as to their relative age and general accuracy. These preliminary labours over, a critical text has to be constructed by weighing the testi-

mony of the several groups or sub-families on each particular point: its due influence being also allowed to the Samaritan Targums. It is only after this work has been achieved that we shall be in a position fairly to bring the Samaritan text into comparison with the Masoretic, and with that which underlies the Septuagint.

THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY.

II.

A KNOWLEDGE of the checkered history of the Bodleian serves only to intensify one's desire to know what the Bodleian contains. Accordingly it will be the purpose of this paper to draw attention to some of the distinguishing features of the collection, and to enumerate at least the choicest of those acquisitions with which each the eager visitor hastens to acquaint himself.

ITS CHIEF TREASURES.

A complete catalogue of the contents of this Institution would constitute a little Library by itself. In so far as it already exists, it fills probably over one hundred bulky volumes. He therefore who would gain some impression of the resources of the Bodleian must permit his curiosity to be restrained. A whole week might profitably be devoted to examining the various objects of interest which invite inspection in each successive apartment; but under competent guidance half a day may be made to suffice, or even (as on the present occasion) a judiciously employed half hour, spent in those parts of the Building which most fully reward the explorer.

A glance should first be made through the valuable COLLECTION OF ENGRAVINGS which the University possesses,—a goodly store indeed, and certain both to delay and delight even the casual sightseer. Then, mounting a long stairway, we reach the large chamber in which is displayed the University's COLLECTION OF COINS. This department, equally with the one previously visited, has an interest for persons who are neither scholars nor specialists. Many who have never entered upon the study of Numismatics feel themselves constrained to linger in this room, attracted

by the choice and curious examples of the Minter's art which it contains. The coin most highly prized is a good specimen of a "Petition" crown,—long in possession of the Bodleian and worth to-day probably not less than \$3,000. Time must also be taken to gain some acquaintance with the series of HISTORICAL PORTRAITS which adorn the Library's walls. These richly-hued canvasses, in infinite variety of size and style, fill every inch of space above and between the heavily-freighted shelves. Many a rugged countenance will attract our gaze, but there is one in particular which awakens a universal interest. It is but fitting that the visitor should pause for a moment before the speaking likeness of the man who has given the whole great fabric its name. Bodley is not even now separated from the scene of his unselfish unwearied labors; but surrounded by his books, and encircled by the portraits of other large-hearted benefactors, he looks down benignly upon each visiting group of grateful admirers. And this appreciation is merited; it is mere justice that

"This hero's deeds and well-won fame shall live."

It is manifest then that, apart altogether from its strictly literary contents, the Bodleian contains a vast amount of other material which will amply repay examination. It is no place to go, at least where any hope of gaining an adequate idea of its varied collections is entertained, if one is unhappily in a hurry. Since the beginning of the Seventeenth century, possessors of rare objects of every kind have brought them voluntarily to Oxford. It has come to be regarded as one of those national storehouses where, in security and in association with other historical trophies, unique treasures of every description may suitably be deposited. Many of these gifts find their way ultimately into one or other of the numerous University MUSEUMS, where they are assorted and arrayed according to the department to which they belong; but certain classes of them, in virtue of usage and of a traditional right, are retained by the Bodleian. It secures, for example, all MSS that become available,—of which it possesses to-day about 30,000 volumes. Some of these valuable documents, not catalogued until within the last twenty years, have been unconsciously owned by the University for over a century; but they had been stowed away in odd corners of the building with such excess of

care or of carelessness that their very existence had ceased to be remembered. Likewise all printed books belong by right to the Bodleian, which can now boast of possessing well-nigh 500,000 volumes. It is with these MSS and books that the present paper is more immediately concerned; hence the character and extent of the other collections may perhaps be passed by without further mention.

In the matter of literary curios, the Bodleian is only slightly outdistanced by the Vatican Library at Rome. It contains the scripts and prints of all lands and of all ages. Its Archives are of a quite cosmopolitan order. It furnishes all readers with a veritable mine,—a mine that as yet is only half-explored, the richness of whose ore is unrivalled, and the productive capacity of whose deeper levels is practically inexhaustible. It possesses quite a number of *very ancient* writings. Take for example the fragmentary Homer MS. It is said to be the very oldest transcript of the Greek poet's work which is known to exist; and surely if books (like Proverbs) derive much of their value from the endorsement of each age through which they chance to pass, a MS. of Homer which is itself over 2000 years old may deservedly be held in highest esteem. And no Bible student will look with a mere glance upon the handsome Codex Landianus. This volume is a MS copy of the Acts of the Apostles, dating from the sixth century: and a fact which lends to the venerable document a tenfold interest is the testimony that Bede used this identical writing when translating this portion of the Scriptures into Anglo-Saxon.

The Bodleian possesses also a large number of *very gorgeously illuminated MSS*. "The Romance of Alexander" (1338) is probably its choicest specimen of this sort of work: yet it is only slightly in advance of the elaborately-decorated Norwich Psalter (1340), and of some of the older Flemish parchments.

Then there are several large groups of important affiliated Documents,—State and Historical Papers of various kinds,—much less ancient and outwardly less attractive than those which have just been specified, but intrinsically quite as valuable. Take, for instance, the Clarendon Papers, which make this Oxford Library so unequalled a thesaurus for the records of the Seventeenth century. The Rawlinson Collection too,—an assemblage

of rare Books belonging to the departments of History and Biography, and embracing in addition nearly 5000 MSS,—was presented by Bishop Rawlinson in 1755, and is probably the most valuable single gift ever received by the University.

Of the thousands upon thousands of ordinary bound volumes which are stored away on tier above tier of shelving, it is impossible and needless to speak. Practically *every* Work for which any student can find occasion to ask may be consulted at pleasure in this huge yet well-ordered Depository.

It cannot be accounted strange, therefore, that new and eager faces are to be found in the Bodleian building on each successive day of the whole revolving year. Very many of those who visit us are of course sightseers. Others, however, are the bearers of names revered throughout the world for pre-eminence in some department of secular or sacred learning: and their presence of itself reveals the seriousness of their purpose. Not a few of the most notable strangers who sojourn from time to time in Oxford are attracted almost exclusively by its Library. When within its walls, no one is permitted to speak above a whisper,—the regulation concerning "*Silence!*" being strictly enforced. But were it possible for its readers to engage occasionally in audible conversation, they would doubtless frequently be found to speak in almost as many different tongues as the books by which they were on every side surrounded.

It is strange, however, that the Bodleian, notwithstanding the inestimable advantages which it places within the Oxford student's reach, is often singularly little made use of by those who come to study in this city.

ITS VALUE FOR THE STUDENT.

Carlyle used to say that "the true University of these days is a collection of Books." In one sense, I feel inclined to agree with him. During the last three years, whether here or on the continent, I have made it a point to attend during each college session not more than two or three Courses of Lectures. In this way much additional time has been secured for private reading: and, instead of acquiring my information at second or third hand, I have been able to procure it from the sources myself. Every one who makes this experiment becomes speedily convinced that

knowledge thus won gains at once freshness and a fulness which cannot possibly be obtained under any other method. Such knowledge, moreover, besides being much more likely to be permanent, soon comes to exercise over the student a sort of alluring charm, which serves infallibly to inspire him even under the conditions of prolonged and exacting study.

But there are many who graduate at Oxford who rarely enter the Bodleian. They may indeed be sometimes seen in the Reading Room of the CAMERA, but there their literary quest appears to be satisfied. A well-known politician, who made a visit to this city a few months ago, declared on that occasion that during all his undergraduate career he did not know the Bodleian structure *even by sight!* Certainly he is the very last man of whom any one to-day would suspect this statement to be true, for he is universally recognized to possess the qualities and multifarious information which go to make up a prompt and successful leader; nevertheless it seems that never, until recently, did he cross the threshold of this unique world-famous building.

And such unexpected indifference to the special opportunities of student life in Oxford is unfortunately by no means exceptional. There are many here whose one ambition is to become, not an honor man in classics or science or history, but "a Blue" in the arena of athletics. The whole of each afternoon, therefore, is devoted to sports of some kind, either on the river or in the parks. Rowing is probably the most popular form of recreation, and both Summer and Winter the *Isis* is fairly alive with boats. The annual Varsity race, fixed this year for March 22nd, is now a daily topic of conversation; it is already a couple of weeks since the men of both Universities took up their residence beside that part of the *Thames* which is once more to witness this keen and stirring contest. But cricket and football can claim almost as numerous a following. As for football, it is impossible to describe adequately the eagerness with which its features are canvassed. I used to think, when I was a student in New York and New Jersey, that the undergraduates of Harvard and Yale and Princeton carried this craze to excess; but the men at Oxford and Cambridge are only a few stages behind them. They talk and train, and work tirelessly in the field, as though there was nothing else worth a thought. It is not surprising therefore

that, although each separate college, has its independent library and two or three of these *collections are of quite noteworthy excellence, their contents are seldom disturbed by a considerable proportion of the students.

Of course any privilege, however great in itself, is capable of being abused. I dislike to see a man ignore the advantages of a library, and I quite lose patience if compelled to witness the wanton mutilation of a book. Milton says somewhere that it is scarcely more criminal to kill a man than to put an end to a book; for while he who kills a man destroys a reasonable creature, he who destroys a good book kills reason itself. But, on the other hand, a man ought not to bury himself among books. A great library was never intended to be a sarcophagus, —least of all the tomb of living, breathing men. One may be a Bibliophile without becoming a Bibliomaniac. ; Too much reading becomes at length a weariness of the flesh. Too much reading, unless it be rigidly regulated and ordered unswervingly towards some definite goal, becomes an actual dissipation. It unhinges and unbends one's mental elasticity. A man cannot avoid living in a state of chronic indigestion who sups out of too many dishes. Bacon reveals genuine penetration when, in his own incisive way, he declares that "some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few are to be chewed and digested." The thoughts of man furnish us indeed with necessary mental nourishment; but

*Books cannot always please however good;
Minds are not ever craving for their food.*

Libraries achieve their high purpose only when they are legitimately used, and then they become rare luxuries of a simply inestimable value. Here one can cultivate an intimacy with all that is best and most elevating in the past. Within these favored precincts, one can hold converse with distinguished theologians and philosophers, poets and savants, the choicest spirits of all the ages. These various teachers, long missed from their places in the schools, here resume once more their abdicated functions. And they are never now in a hurry: they are never abrupt, never supercilious, never distant, never

*E. g., ALL SOLES, with its 70,000 select volumes in Law and History.

impatient. They are equally accessible, and equally affable and painstaking, in the experience of all who venture to consult them. Moreover, here they do not dissemble their meaning: they have invariably the same message for every intelligent reader. A Book is a friend that never plays one false. Here at last, and here only, does a man discover those companions and allies that may be relied upon for a lifetime, the thoughts that give new impulse and significance to every varying phase of human existence, and the substance of many of those shadows which people the domain of our dreams.

The Bodleian is a magnificent storehouse of the chief Authorities in Learning: he therefore who would make himself acquainted with the master products of this world's master minds does well to tarry within its walls for a season. Inasmuch, moreover, as the age in which we live is not in any notable sense an original age, but gives itself largely to the preparation of Commentaries and Dictionaries and Encyclopedias, and works of similar character, a reliable Reference Library like the Bodleian renders invaluable service to scores of diligent compilers. For the patient investigator, however, pursuing his laborious researches with the aim of broadening some of the boundaries of our knowledge, there are very few spots on earth which exert so powerful a spell and prove so stimulating an aid as the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

LOUIS H. JORDAN.

Oxford, England.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PETER.

1. . . . But of the Jews none washed his hands, nor Herod nor one of his
2. judges. And as they did not wish to wash Pilate arose. And then Herod the King bids that the Lord be taken over, saying to them, All that I have
3. bidden you do to him do. But Joseph the friend of Pilate and of the Lord was standing there, and seeing that they were about to crucify him,
4. he came to Pilate and asked the body for burial. And Pilate sent to Herod
5. and asked for his body. And Herod said, Brother Pilate even if no one had asked for him, we should have buried him, seeing indeed that the Sabbath is beginning to dawn; for it is written in the law that the sun shall not set on one who is slain. And he handed him over to the people before

* This literal translation which is divided according to Harnack's arrangement of verses is based on the most recently amended Greek text.

6. the first day of unleavened bread, their feast. But they took the Lord and thrust him along as they ran and said, Let us mock the Son of God as we
7. have power over him. And they clad him in purple and set him on a seat
8. of judgment saying, Judge justly King of Israel. And one of them brought
9. a crown of thorns and placed it upon the head of the Lord. And others stood and spat upon his face and others smote his cheeks, others pierced him with a reed, and some scourged him saying, With this honour did we honour the Son of God.
10. And they brought two malefactors and crucified the Lord between them,
11. but he kept silence as though he had no pain. And when they had set up
12. the cross they wrote upon it, This is the King of Israel. And they placed his garments before him and divided them and cast the lot upon them.
13. But one of the malefactors reproached them saying, We have suffered thus on account of the evils we have done, but this man who has become a
14. Saviour of men in what has he wronged you? And being angry at him they bade that his legs should not be broken that he might die in torture. Now
15. it was mid-day and darkness covered all Judea, and they were troubled and in agony lest the sun had set, for he was still alive; for for them it has been
16. written that the sun shall not set on one who is slain. And one of them said, Give him gall with vinegar to drink: and they mixed it and gave him
17. to drink. And they fulfilled everything and completed their sins on their
18. own head. But many went about with lamps thinking that it was night and
19. they fell. And the Lord cried out saying, My Power, My Power thou hast forsaken me, and having said this he was taken up. And at that hour the veil of
20. the temple in Jerusalem was rent in twain. And then they drew the nails from the hands of the Lord and placed him on the earth, and the whole earth
21. quaked and great fear arose. Then the sun shone and it was found to be
22. the ninth hour. But the Jews rejoiced and gave his body to Joseph that he might bury it, for he was treated with regard for the number of good deeds
23. he had done. And he took the Lord and washed him and wrapped him in linen and brought him into his own tomb which is called the garden of Joseph.
24. Then began the Jews and the elders and the priests when they saw what evil they had wrought for themselves to lament and to say: Woe for our
25. sins, the judgment and the end of Jerusalem has come near. But I with my companions was in grief, and wounded in mind we hid ourselves; for we were being sought for by them as malefactors and as wishing to set fire to
26. the Temple. But over all this we fasted and sat in sorrow and wept night and day until the Sabbath. But the scribes and the pharisees and the elders gathered themselves together when they heard that the whole
27. people was murmuring and smiting their breasts, saying: If by his death these greatest of all signs have taken place, behold how very just a man he
28. was. The elders were afraid and came to Pilate and they besought him and said: Grant us soldiers that we may guard his tomb for three days, lest
29. perchance his disciples may come and steal him, and the people suspect that he has risen from the dead and do us evil. And Pilate delivered to them
30. Petronius the centurion with soldiers to guard the tomb. And with them
31. elders and scribes came to the tomb, and all who were there, together with the centurion and the soldiers rolled a great stone and placed it at the door
- 32.

33. of the sepulchre, and placed seven seals upon it, and pitched a tent there and
34. watched. But in the early morning when the Sabbath was beginning to dawn, a crowd came from Jerusalem and from the country round about to see the sealed sepulchre.
35. But on the night on which the Lord's day began to dawn while the soldiers
36. on guard two by two were keeping watch, there arose a mighty voice in heaven, and they saw the heavens opened and two men coming down from thence in great brilliance, and they stood over the tomb. But the stone which had been placed against the door, of its own accord rolled away and withdrew a space, and the sepulchre opened and both the young men entered. Now when the soldiers saw this they awakened the centurion and the elders—for they also were with them keeping guard. And while they were relating what they had seen again they see three men coming forth from the tomb, and the two supported the one and a cross was following them; and the head of the two reached unto heaven, but that of him whom they led rose beyond the heavens. And they heard a voice from heaven saying, Didst thou preach to these that sleep? And from the cross was heard the answer, Yea. Wherefore they were taking counsel with one another to go away and make known these things to Pilate. And while they were still reasoning, the heavens were seen again opened and a man coming down and entering into the tomb.
45. When those who were with the centurion saw this they hastened by night to Pilate leaving the tomb which they had been guarding, and they related everything which they had seen in great alarm and said, Truly he was the
46. Son of God. Pilate answered and said, I am clean from the blood of the
47. Son of God but this was well pleasing to you. Then they all drew near to him and besought him and implored him to command the centurion and the
48. soldiers to tell nothing of what they had seen. For they said it is better for us to be guilty of the greatest sin before God than to fall into the
49. hands of the multitude of the Jews and be stoned. So Pilate commanded the centurion and the soldiers to say nothing.
50. But on the morning of the Lord's day Mary Magdalene, the disciple of the Lord, in fear on account of the Jews, for they were kindled with anger, had not done at the tomb of the Lord what it was the custom of women to do.
51. for their well beloved dead. Taking her friends with her she came to the
52. tomb where he had been laid. And they were afraid lest the Jews should see them, and they said, If indeed on the day on which he was crucified we were unable to weep and to lament, now at least let us do this over his
53. tomb. But who will roll away for us also the stone which was placed at the door of the tomb that we may enter in and sit by his side and do what is
54. meet for us to do? For the stone was great and we feared lest some one should see us. And if we are unable, then we should like to place at the door what we brought in memory of him, and we shall weep and lament
55. until we reach our home. And when they arrived they found the tomb opened, and they drew near and stooped in, and they see there a young man sitting midway in the tomb, comely and clad in brightest raiment, who said to them, Why have ye come? Whom seek ye? Him who was crucified? He has arisen and gone away. But if ye do not believe, stoop down and see the place where he lay that he is not there; for he has risen and has gone
57. away thither whence he was sent. Then the women fled in fear.

58. And it was the last day of the feast of unleavened bread and many were
 59. departing, returning to their homes as the feast was ended. But we, the
 twelve disciples of the Lord, wept and were in grief, and each one in grief
 60. on account of what had occurred went away to his own house. But I,
 Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, taking our nets went away to the
 sea ; and with us was Levi, the son of Alphaeus, whom the Lord * * *

During the past winter the theological world has had its activity stimulated by the publication of a find brought from an Egyptian tomb, and historical and critical interest has been roused as it had not been since the discovery of the *Didache*. The fragment was at once identified by scholars as part of a gospel they had known from references in early writings to exist in antiquity. It is first mentioned in 190 by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, with disfavour as being the work of Docetists in support of their own tenets, and his reference to it leads us to suppose that its composition was recent, probably between 170 and 180, A. D.

From points of similarity between Peter and Justin Martyr, and the Didascalia, a part of the Apostolic Constitutions, Harnack and others infer that it must have been used by these as an authentic source of the life of Christ. But as Schürer says all that is required is that Justin Martyr and the author of Peter should have relied on common tradition. The advanced school of critics are jubilant over their treasure-trove, and by levelling down our gospels and levelling up this fragment, one of their number reaches this conclusion: "Peter is not a post-canonical shoot springing from the literary development of gospel-making that arose on the completion of our canonical gospels, but it owes its origination to the same process as these four, and must be measured by the same measure, though the Catholic church has denied it a place in its canon." That is, the gospel of Peter is as worthy of a place in the canon as the other four. Now that this fragment has its champions, a discussion of its merits has more or less of apologetic interest. For those who are free from the bias of a theory as to the formation of our gospels that constrains such a judgment as has been just quoted, it is not difficult to see that these verses are a stray piece of seawrack stranded on a rock whose foundations are embedded in living growth.

These *literary qualities* are prominent in our gospel. The

style is jerky with none of the terse and picturesque phrasing that often makes short sentences effective; and flat from frequent repetition of clauses beginning with "and," "but," and other connective particles, showing a poverty we might expect in a writer whose words and ideas have been culled from other sources. The verses give us the impression of being literary patchwork. A first-hand writer wins our attention by freshness and a frequent surprise of vivid detail. But here there is little of this, nor of the flow and grace that come from a mastery of the situation.

Without dignity it limps far behind our canonical gospels as they move forward with the sure tread of grand simplicity. The tone is light, and the unskilled hand is at once apparent in the childish, even comical, details such as those in verses 6, 18, 33, 37, betraying as they do lack of taste to appreciate what reverence and a sense of literary propriety would enjoin. In verses 26 and 27 we seem to have gone back with Homer to the infancy of the race, when we read of Odysseus in his old man's talkativeness telling of fears and griefs and distress of heart. Verses 39 and 40, again, transport us to the time when myths were beginning to gather round the life of our Saviour as accretions of mere wonder-loving fancy, without any of the congruity that makes New Testament miracles credible.

One of the characteristics of the canonical gospel is their severe objectivity. Their purpose is to put Christ before us in all the majesty of His life and death so that He may speak to us with His own authority. The writers never obtrude themselves on their work. This fragment on the other hand is subjective and episodic. The narratives, so far as these few verses will allow us to judge, do not revolve round one person and focus all their light on him. They are a loose succession of scenes with not a little repetition and inconsistency, and contain a wealth of detail which does not serve to bring the central figure into prominence. Instead of allowing its truthfulness to spring to light from the reality and vividness of the narrative itself, it rests for its authenticity on the external, the affirmation in the first person of an important eye-witness. This was the well-loved device of the forger who knew that his work was deficient in internal evidence.

Another very marked feature of this gospel is the utter absence of historic imagination. To the position of ecclesiastical and political parties, religious sentiment, and the spirit of the times, the author is a stranger, and it is not his facts so much as the setting in which they are placed, that show second-hand work. Herod is put in the position of Pilate; the preparations for the crucifixion and its execution are all assumed by the Jews, ignoring the fourfold narrative of our gospels with a naïve forgetfulness that the Romans were then masters of Judea.

Jews, elders, priests, scribes and pharisees are thrown together in confusion, as though they were a happy family with which the author has such a slight acquaintance, that he is ignorant of the dissensions within, and Jew will do for scribe, priest for pharisee. A late date is the only explanation of the frequent use of the terms *Son of God* and *Lord*, allowing time for a stereotyped theological mode of thought to take the place of the historical and human Jesus, who was gradually vanishing from sight amid gnostic tendencies. The words of the thief on the cross also are an echo from an age when Christ had long been preached as the Saviour of men.

A piece of composition with these literary qualities cannot to my mind be the work of an eye-witness, nor of one who was working up authentic accounts. It is most natural to suppose that he was an eclectic whose sources were in the main our four gospels. He pieced his materials together to suit his plan and let his fancy run riot on minor point; but this very fact and the tone of his production reveal his ignorance of the spirit of the age he would delineate.

Relation to the canonical gospels. While there is not a close verbal agreement between Peter and any one of our canonical gospels, there seems to be most literary dependence on Mark. This is what we should expect, for one of the best accepted results of criticism is that Mark based his gospel on materials supplied by Peter, by whom our fragment purports to have been written. This affinity with Mark has been greatly exaggerated by those who have a theory to serve, the words actually quoted from Mark being few, their connection often distorted, and their tenor unimportant. A comparison of verses 6-9, 20-21, 50-60 of Peter, with corresponding passages of Mark will render this clear.

I am inclined to think that there is almost as much literary dependence on the other gospels, and certainly there is quite as much similarity in regard to remarkable incident. But if such is the case, it is inadmissible to hold that our author had the original of Mark alone before him, and gathered his other matter from the tradition still in solution, but just beginning to crystallize into the gospels we now possess.

Points of contact with Matthew are; the motives and request of the Jews for a guard from Pilate for three days; the earthquake at the crucifixion; the appearance to the disciples in Galilee. It is possible that Matt. xxvii., 52, may have suggested Pet. 41, though it is more likely that it owes its origin to the gospel of Luke, or even more so to the first epistle of Peter. Hardly less evident is the influence of Luke, as shown by the share Herod takes in the judicial examination of Jesus; the story of the thief on the cross; the interest in the disposition of the common people; and the tribute (in different circumstance it is true) to Christ—this is a just man. John also was drawn upon in the treatment of the Resurrection, where the presence of other women at the tomb except Mary Magdalene is hardly referred to; the Jews are prominent as they are not in the other gospels; the incident of breaking the legs of the malefactors is peculiar to John, and is probably the origin of the different account given in Peter; Jesus is buried in the garden of Joseph, and as in John Jesus apparently makes Himself known to his disciples by the Lake of Galilee after his Resurrection. The agreement as to the day of the crucifixion is also worthy of notice.

Professor Armitage Robinson of Cambridge, is persuaded that the author of this fragment had our four gospels as they are before him, and Schürer, most candid of advanced critics, admits that this conclusion is probable.

The origin and aim of the writing. The way to decide this is to have regard to the outstanding divergencies from our gospels. One of the most remarkable is the keen dislike of the Jews, insomuch that the whole guilt of Christ's death is laid upon their shoulders. The Resurrection is more fully dwelt upon than the death of Christ, the terrible import of which indeed our author hardly seems to comprehend. The historical Jesus of the Gospels is always spoken of as *the Lord* as in the

Epistles of Paul, and the term *Son of God* is of frequent occurrence. In verse 10 we are told "He was silent as though feeling no pain;" and the cry before his death was, "My Power, My Power, thou hast forsaken me"; on which follow the words, "and having said this he himself was taken up." To the women at the tomb the angel says it is empty, "for he has arisen and gone away thither whence he was sent." From this we should judge that the Ascension followed immediately on the Resurrection, though the end of the fragment leads us to expect a return of Christ to the disciples in Galilee.

These utterances have a flavour of Docetism and seem to accord with the doctrines of Marcion who was counted among the Docetæ. His well-known antipathy to the Jews and their Messiah would account for some of the above peculiarities and for the complete absence of the name "Jesus Christ" from these verses, as well as the variation from Mark in verse 56. Marcion also held that in the 15th year of Tiberius God sent down His Son to Galilee as a full grown man in an apparent body. In the absence of the beginning of the Gospel of Peter we can only say that this would agree with its account of the Death, Resurrection and Ascension. Marcion laid stress on the miracles and the sufferings of Christ, but taught that He Himself as incorporeal was not affected, and he further taught the descent into Hell. What is said as to the absence of pain, the cry of our Lord, and the departure of Himself, would naturally come from one who had no clear idea as to the humanity of Christ.

Marcion we know was the pupil of Cerdo who lived in Syria about 140 and had a large following in Asia Minor or Northern Palestine. Now if our Gospel originated in Cilicia between 170 and 180, is it improbable that it may be either Marcionite, or the work of one who sympathized with similar tendencies then in the air, but of which we have the fullest account in the writings of Marcion who had made his headquarters at Rome?

What *value* are we to place on this new discovery? Some maintain that we have reliable traditions preserved only here and in Justin Martyr, as in vs. 34 and 58; but there seems to be little of importance to be gathered from this source, nor yet is

there any light thrown on the formation of our Gospels. Its chief result may be after all the witness it gives along with Justin and Tatian to the widespread acceptance of our Gospels before 170; and without wishing to be ungrateful for small mercies, can we say that the fragment is much more than flotsam on the tide showing how the current had strongly set about the middle of the second century?

R. A. FALCONER.

ON PRAYER.

PHYSICAL NECESSITY AND HUMAN FREEDOM.

THE subject of this essay is one which in various forms frequently presses with great stress upon the human spirit. Even to the man of comparatively simple faith often comes the question, generally made sharp with sorrow and darkened with doubt, "how is it that God's word has led me to believe that the prayer of implicit faith would be granted, and yet desires, as dear to me as life, and as holy as I am capable of, have been denied even though I asked in the full belief that God would grant my requests." To another who has gained a wider outlook upon life and existence this lurking doubt has gained force perhaps from a firm grasp of the great facts of physical necessity and human freedom. Without professing to give an adequate treatment of so broad and difficult a subject in so small a space, the writer offers a few lines of thought along which he has himself found some of that confirmation of faith which can come only from comparative mental rest.

As a starting-point, we shall take one of the promises of Our Lord, in which the power of believing prayer appears to be represented as without limit:

"All things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." (Matt. 21:22). This remarkable promise was given by the Master to His disciples on the occasion of their expressing surprise that under the curse the fig tree had immediately withered away. He took advantage of their wonder at this display of His power to impress upon them the greatness of a power at their control, namely,

believing prayer. He tells them, they may remove mountains—yea, all things asked in faith shall be granted by the same Supreme Power that blasted the fig tree, because it had disappointed the expectations that its appearance had awakened. Now, taken in its proper connection, we see that this promise means a great deal. Jesus says in effect,—“you wonder at the power I have shown but I tell you that by the exercise of proper prayer, all things are possible for you.”

When we think of God as the Sovereign Lord of the Universe, at whose bidding the planets move in their courses, and for the fulfilment of whose purposes empires rise in majesty or fall into decay, it is indeed a subject of wonder that even the most momentous desires that men are capable of should reach the ear of the Most High, still more that they should move His Divine will. Well then, may we be unspeakably amazed when we find the word of His revealed will declaring in such unmistakable clearness that “All things asked believingly by us will be granted. The mind which guides the destinies of the Universe, moved by the desires of little man!

Let us consider more definitely what the text implies, as well as some of the questions which its sweeping promise suggests.

In the first place, we may see the importance of the subject from the fact that it lies at the very foundation of religion. All religion is the expression of the relation of the individual to the Universal Intelligence—of the relation of man to God. Now, the necessity of prayer grows out of the essential nature of man as an intelligent free being, in his relation to the Sovereign mind of God. When we religiously look upon nature, accurately obeying in every part the laws of its being, and passively fulfilling the Divine purpose inherent in it, we are filled with admiration for the wisdom and power of God. But when we turn to look at man we find instead of unconscious obedience to law, self-conscious experience, and intelligent devotion to designed ends. Instead of finding passive submission to law, we find a principle working, which lifts man out of the limitation of necessary change, and by which he is enabled to look upon himself as the subject of experience. More than this he is enabled to contrast his actual state with a possible one, and thus is capable of desire and will. Not bound down to the real, he ever sets

some ideal before him, *and so is characteristically a creature of aspiration and hope.* Because the rest of nature works out the purpose inherent in it unconsciously, in a sense, it does so peacefully. But man's progress on the other hand, goes on through a continual strife to make actual the ideals which he from time to time sets before him. Thus, when in his religious consciousness, he views himself in the light of the Infinite, naturally the question of greatest moment to him is "In what relation do my aspirations and hopes stand to the mind and purpose of God?" Since I am ever consciously devoting myself to the fulfilment of plans set before me, how do these affect, and how are they affected by the Divine Purpose? This must ever be the question, on the answer to which will hang much of his peace and possibility of progress. Consequently revelation can contain no message of greater import to hoping, aspiring man than that which our text contains, "All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." How wise and merciful in God to give a message so necessary to our peace and progress.

But, while in a burst of loving praise we may be constrained to exclaim with David "Oh how great is thy Goodness, which Thou hast laid up for them that fear Thee, which Thou hast for those that put their trust in Thee," yet in calm reflective moments when emotion gives place to reason, we are compelled to bring such thrilling promises into consistent relation to other facts of our experience. While none would pretend to a knowledge of all the mysteries of the Providence of God, yet so far as our knowledge goes, consistency ever the criterion of truth, demands that we must have all its facts in harmony with one another. Faith cannot long rest on a basis which refuses mental rest. Once reflective thought has revealed an apparent discrepancy between some promise or principle in which we have placed faith, and something else which we recognize as a fact—try to hide it as we will—we shall still hold what we previously believed as open to question. By this means faith is paralysed. Now in the face of the promise of our text we find two fundamental difficulties.

First. Since knowledge pre-supposes our looking upon all about us as the expression of a single intelligent principle, working out in orderly change the good of the whole, it would seem

that prayer would be either unavailing or superfluous. In other words, if God is day by day, conducting the progress of all things, natural and human, towards the culmination of His all wise purpose, prayers which are contrary to such purpose, would seem to be unavailing; while prayers which are in line with His purpose would appear to be superfluous. To put it in Spinoza's form, nothing can come of prayer which would not come anyway through the course of nature. In a word, God's laws being inviolable there can be no objective answer to prayer.

Again. Man is both short-sighted and wayward. His ideals are not always in line with what, even in his own better reason, he knows to be the highest end for himself and for the rest of men. In Scriptural language, owing to the influence of "the flesh" man's prayers are often such, that a God of wisdom and goodness could not consistently answer them. More than this, examples of men in the Bible and in history teach us that often prayers delivered in the most implicit faith have not been answered—at least not in the way that the petitioners expected.

Let us consider these difficulties.

The first—namely that prayer must be ineffectual in the face of the order of nature, arises from an inadequate conception of the "order of nature" or through an attempt to explain existence by an inadequate principle. It is true that knowledge implies that under the same conditions the same phenomena will always occur. But the universe of which we form a part requires a higher law for its explanation than mere external causality—a more adequate one than the mere action and reaction of atoms and bodies. In organic life we have a principle superseding unchangeable law, while in self-consciousness, we have a reality which in turn transcends mere organic unity. Hence we see the necessity of looking at the world, not in the light of mere succession, but of looking at it as the outward embodiment of an intelligent principle, steadily in its changes advancing to a more complete unfolding of the end inherent in it. Now in the light of this conception of existence we shall find that the first difficulty—namely, that the answer to prayer would disturb the order of nature, originates in the assumption that we understand not only the ultimate goal to which the self-conscious organism of the world is tending, but also that we have

before us all the possible means by which that goal is to be reached. We have spoken of the universe as an organism. Now the characteristic of an organism is that *inherent in it is a principle, which is gradually working toward realization of an end.* This principle transcends and transforms mere mechanical law and change. Instead of a mere succession of changes we now have a progress. Instead of independence in every part, or arbitrary control exercised over the parts by the whole, every part is in such unison with the whole, that the self-realization of the whole cannot be attained without that of the parts; while the ordinary succession of changes in the parts has often to give way to, or be transformed by, the principle prompting the good of the whole. For example:—I have my finger stung by a poisonous insect. Immediately around the sting the ordinary free blood circulation is impaired by the swelling which immediately sets in. Wise "mother nature" suspends her usual order that the injured part may be quarantined for the time. Nature is not violated; but she is simply operating in an abnormal way *in a part*, so that the highest good of the *whole* may be attained. Hence the organism honors itself most, not in invariable succession, but in promoting the fulfilment of the end for which it exists, *by whatever means may be necessary.* Thus the only inviolable law here is what may be called the law of teleological advancement, and its ways of advancement may be various. From this point of view therefore we can see that to say, that a real answer to prayer would imply a violation of natural law, would be true according to a conception of law as *mere invariable order of succession.* But while this is true, God in answering prayer may be honoring a higher law, and acting most in line with the ultimate fulfilment of His wise purpose. To say that he cannot in any case answer prayer *literally*, means that we are fully acquainted with the ultimate goal of being, as well that we know accurately all the means by which the goal may be reached, and so able to see that such an answer would mean a frustration of the end that He has in view. This principle does not mean that we can never tell whether a prayer can be answered or not. Nor does it put a barrier in the way of the advancement of knowledge by stating that we can never know what is, or is not, possible. It means simply that our knowledge

is only partial: that while no mere experience is possible which will contradict the conditions of knowledge, at the same time that there is room for much to take place which we cannot yet fully understand and adequately explain. Hence we must admit a sphere of the supernatural, not in the sense of a sphere into which intelligence can never penetrate, but in the sense of the great region of possible knowledge which is ever being explored, but which will ever yet yield greater possibilities until "we shall be like Him for we shall see Him as He is."

Now not only does the conception of our organic unity with God as the soul of the universe, remove the ground of Spinoza's objection to prayer-answering, but when we unite with this, the fact that through man as an intelligent free being—through history—the loftiest schemes of the world known to us are being accomplished, it follows that God must often give literal answer to prayer. Being organically connected with Him a want or an injury, through the nerve of prayer at once must solicit His attention and remedy, even if it may require a suspension of the normal cause of events, as *these appear from a partial point of view*. Though we are insignificant parts, yet our wants will be satisfied out of His fulness, when our wants are in line with the fulfilment of His great purpose.

But the finger must telegraph its ills so that redress may be given, and in line with this the Lord says even more emphatically than in the text, "Ask and it shall be given, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you."

Hence we see, first, that the obstacle of natural law to prayer is removed by showing that causality is not broken, though in an organic system it takes higher forms. Secondly we see, in the light of this conception, that not only are prayers not unavailing, but that they are both necessary and effectual.

God's plans are consummated by the devoted desires and efforts of consecrated men, who show the presence of His spirit in the formation of high ideals, and whom He honors by giving of His power to make their ideals actualities, and to attain ends in line with the perfect consummation of all things.

We now come to our second difficulty. Our answer to the first only proves that God can and does answer prayer without violating natural law, not that He ALWAYS does answer it. Yet our

text says plainly that all things "asked in faith" ye shall receive. "But we know that men in ignorance and waywardness often ask amiss. Moreover we know of good men whose prayers, offered in implicit faith, were never answered literally. There arises before our minds not only a Jonah selfishly praying for God's vengeance to be meted out to Nineveh, but a Paul piously imploring the removal of the thorn in his flesh, and the Saviour of the world in "Dark Gethsemane," pleading "Father if it be possible let this cup pass from me." How shall such cases be reconciled with the sweep of the promise of our text? The key will be found in the word "believing" or better still in the way Mark puts the same promise, (R. V.), "All things whatsoever ye shall pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them. "Believing" implies a childlike faith which will present the petition and be abundantly satisfied to allow God to answer it as He sees best—"not my will but thine be done." This was far from Jonah's spirit, and so he had to do without an answer in peace. But the cases of Paul and Christ show us that while God did not harmonize the *circumstances with their desires*, by an increase of Divine grace, He brought peace to their souls by harmonizing their *desires with their circumstances*. Thus Paul was able to "glory in his infirmity" when through it the power of Christ was upon him. Christ with the bitterness of hell in His cup, was likewise enabled to say "nevertheless not my will but Thine be done," showing forth to the world in the extremest of known suffering the sublimest triumph of peace-giving faith. These examples show with sufficient clearness and power the meaning of "believe" in our text, and the mystery of how believing that ye have them, insures the answer. Thus since every prayer is the expression of a desire arising out of the lack of harmony between the ideals which from time to time we set before us, and our actual circumstances, the burden of our prayer is really the yearning for the peace which can come only through a reconciliation between this ideal and our actual circumstances. Now we have seen that since God's purposes are often fulfilled through the fulfilment of the ideals of Godly men, God will often answer our prayers literally. Nature with her myriad voices, the course of the human history, as well as the Word of Revelation, all teach us that we may depend upon this

On the other hand we have seen that if we approach the Mercy Seat in the spirit of childlike love and faith, God just as really grants the burden of our petition, when by the operation of His gracious spirit He gives us peace by bringing our wills into harmony with dispensations of Providence which He cannot see fit to alter.

But here at first sight one more difficulty seems to arise. If God so influences our minds by His Spirit, that we are reconciled to the inevitable in His purpose, is not our freedom interfered with? No. This influence of one intelligence upon another is a psychological operation which is being constantly repeated in the daily contact of man with man. When I am influenced by another to change my mind and become reconciled to a truth or line of action, formerly uncongenial to me, my freedom is not violated. I am merely enabled through contact with my fellow-man to see in the ideal which he presents to me my own higher self. And so I freely identify myself with it. Thus between intelligent beings, mind is ever influencing mind, and heart moving heart without freedom being in the least violated. Thus in our wrestlings with God in prayer, by flashing His promises upon our memories, by bringing in review before us His past acts of saving care, He transforms our present yearnings into calm peace by the power of renewed love and confidence in Him. He gives us, in the light of increased faith, glimpses of noble ideals of ourselves, and so weans us away from what we before in our waywardness sought. We recognize then that we have penetrated further into the secret council of the Most High, and though we cannot see all the way clearly we are ready to find sweetest comfort in him who has said "as one whom his mother comforteth so will I comfort you." Thus we find the highest freedom in conformity with the laws of our moral nature, and by such gracious contact with God our religious consciousness enables us to find our highest ideals ever nearer and nearer the line of all-wise purpose. In such a religious consciousness then we shall ever find a mainspring for our moral progress, and through the vehicle of believing prayer an influx of power to shape our aspirations and hopes more and more towards that blessed goal of all being—a goal known to us yet only in dim outline, but a goal which will become more definite as we ap-

proach it in knowledge and obedience. The nearer we approach the more literally our prayers shall be answered; because they are more and more in accordance with the will of God; while at the same time in the growth of our faith we shall find a fulfilment of His promise—"my grace shall be sufficient for you, my strength made perfect in weakness." Here shall we ever find the most enduring peace, and the most powerful motive and courage for action. By such close connection with God through prayer, we shall ensure the only true success, namely, the accomplishment of something in line with the full self-realization of the grand whole of which we form a part, and of which God is the energizing principle.

J. A. SINCLAIR.

CHRIST AND SOCRATES.

NOTWITHSTANDING the dictum of Rousseau it was simply inevitable that "the son of Sophroniscus" and "the son of Mary" should be compared. In the life and work of the Athenian sage there is so much that is distinctly reminiscent of that other life that unconsciously a reader finds himself turning in mind and imagination to that

Man Divine
The pallid Rainbow lighting Palestine.

It has been well and wisely written—"when we contemplate the contented-poverty, the self-devotion, the constant publicity, the miscellaneous followers of Socrates, we feel that we can understand better than before the outward aspect at least of that Sacred Presence which moved on the busy shores of the Sea of Galilee, and in the streets and courts of Jerusalem. When we read of the dogged obstinacy of the court by which he was judged—the religious or superstitious prejudices invoked against him—the expression of his friend when all was finished—'such was the end of the wisest and justest and best of all the men that I have ever known'—another trial and another parting inevitably rush to the memory. When we read the last conversations of the prisoner in the Athenian dungeon, our thoughts almost insensibly rise to the farewell discourses in the upper chamber at

Jerusalem with gratitude and reverential awe. The differences are immense. But there is a likeness of moral atmosphere, even of external incident, that cannot fail to strike the attention."

Yet it is well that we should remind ourselves of the many who view any such contact between Socrates and Christ with feelings of intense repugnance. Nor are their scruples to be treated haughtily or dismissed with epigram and sneer. The personality of Jesus, the Christ has impressed itself so deeply on the mind—His power and grace are associated with experiences of the supremest importance—the relations existing between Him and the souls of Christian men is of such a tender and awful nature—that almost instinctively some will recoil from linking His name with that of any other. "No other name" stands for so much in their past and in their future, and there is none they can bear beside Him either in honour or comparison. That there is an element of danger no one will deny; yet surely it may truly be said that "Christians deem it no irreverence to compare Socrates with the Founder of their religion." Indeed if they do not undertake the comparison they will find the task carried out by others—and carried out, too, in a spirit entirely inimical to the interests which they must ever hold dearest. It is sometimes well to make a virtue of necessity—and if necessity compels us to make a comparison between Socrates and Christ, the present writer believes that necessity will give place to interest and interest to delighted surprise at the results the study will yield.

It has been said again and again that the points of contact between the story of Socrates and that of Christ are almost entirely confined to externals—none of them spring from essentials in life, character or mission. Now this may be so and yet the light and help derived therefrom may be of very considerable value. As this paper will be concerned with the difference between Socrates and Christ it may not be judged out of place if at this point a very striking coincidence should be referred to—and this shall be done for the most part in the graceful words of another. No one who has the slightest acquaintance with unbelieving attacks on the Christian records can forget the iterated vehemence with which attention was called to the silence of Josephus and the divergencies of the Four Gospels. On the one side there is an historian depicting the times during which Jesus

Christ is said to have lived, but never once referring to Him in one way or another; and here on the other side there are to be found four brief monographs purporting to tell the story of Jesus, three of which present a fairly consistent portrait of the same person, but the remaining writer offers a portrait that cannot possibly be identified with the first. These criticisms have been made again and yet again; the statement has been ventured that the thing is without parallel in the annals of literature, and can only be accounted for on the hypothesis of "fraud and wilful imposition." To all of which the answer to be returned is simply this—the thing can be paralleled and that too in connection with the story of Socrates. "When we are perplexed by the difficulty of reconciling the narrative of the first three Evangelists with the altered tone of the fourth, it is at least a step towards the solution of the difficulty to remember that there is here a parallel diversity between the Socrates of Xenophon and the Socrates of Plato. No one has been tempted by that diversity to doubt the substantial identity, the true character, much less the historical existence of the Master whom they both profess to describe. . . . Nor, when we think of the total silence of Josephus, or of other contemporary writers, respecting the events which we now regard as the greatest in the history of mankind, is it altogether irrelevant to reflect that for the whole thirty years comprised in the most serious of ancient histories, Socrates was not only living, but acting a more public part, and, for all the future ages of Greece, an incomparably more important part, than any other Athenian citizen; and yet that so able and so thoughtful an observer as Thucydides has never once noticed him directly or indirectly. There is no stronger proof of the weakness of the argument from omission, especially in the case of ancient history, which, unlike our own, contained within its range of vision no more than was immediately before it for the moment."

The brief series of contrasts between Socrates and Christ which follow may very fitly be opened with an attempt to state briefly the difference that is seen in their function in history. We have been recently told that "the Christian movement was, in many respects, analagous to the philosophic movement begun with Socrates. . . . Ideal righteousness, the search for

divine perfection, the endeavour 'to be as good and wise as possible,' these were the true and only means of 'escape,' or salvation contemplated both by Socrates and Jesus. To the truths already uttered in the Athenian prison, Christianity added little or nothing, except a few symbols, which, though perhaps well calculated for popular acceptance, are more likely to perplex than to instruct, and offer the best opportunity for priestly mystification." It is hardly to be wondered at, in face of such statements as this, if popular Christianity should display that "great solicitude" to establish a radical difference between Jesus and Socrates which Matthew Arnold so loftily contemned. A difference which is radical is certainly of more importance than an analogy which at best is only superficial; and, though in presenting it, "transcendental distinctions" should be insisted on, the solicitude betrayed by its supporters is not the less justifiable. This difference begins to appear the moment a just account is taken of the respective functions in history discharged by Socrates and Christ.

It has been cleverly said that "Socrates was a literary Melchizedek." The method adopted by him was certainly original, and he has left no worthy successor in operating with it. Much that is of value and interest has been written of the Socratic method, but like the sword of Goliath, though there is none like it, no one has been found with strength and skill sufficient to wield it. In this he stands alone—"without father or mother"—and in nothing else. When the subject-matter of his teaching is considered then we are on different ground, and the attempt to trace his progenitors in philosophy has not been without success. There was not so much diversity between him and the Sophists as we are sometimes tempted to suppose—we have not been as ready as we should have been to listen to the warning of Grote against that opinion which "represents Socrates as one whose special merit it was to have rescued the Athenian mind from such demoralizing influences—(that is, from the Sophists' influence)—a reputation which he neither deserves nor requires." The truth is that Socrates is the product of his times: the best man of Athens, he is yet only the "flower and fruit" of the entire past course of Greek thought. There is no need in maintaining this view to dispute the celebrated utterance of Cicero—"Socrates called Philosophy down from heaven"—for the Latin probably

meant no more than that Socrates made philosophy a common possession of men. He constrained every one he met to become a philosopher. This, and one thing more, constitutes his function in history. It is to his genius we owe the supremacy of moral philosophy over natural philosophy. To begin with, Greek philosophy was mainly concerned with "things seen and temporal:" but with Anaxagoras a change is effected, which ultimately leads to the principle enunciated by Socrates "that the moral universe is ruled by mind." This was Socrates' contribution to the universal movement of thought. But although his method was on occasions more expository and less interrogative, he must ever be regarded as having given direction rather than form to ethical inquiry.

Over against this statement it is only necessary in a single sentence to suggest the function of Christian history. No one can read the story of the "man of Nazareth" without feeling that he is of the order of Melchizedek in a deeper and truer sense than can ever be predicted of Socrates. It is true that the "terms" of his teaching may be found in the utterances of those who have preceded Him in the prophetic office—but as for life and character He is distinctly "a root out of a dry ground." There is nothing in his surroundings which can explain Him—although when one has learned to know Him and understand His mission, one recognises a mysterious and significant consonance between the Man and the Times. The part which Jesus plays in the "universal movement" is not merely to create a new method—though that He may be truly said to have done: nor to give direction, or form either, to ethical inquiry: He goes deeper into the mystery of the universe than that and comes nearer to the sons of men than these services could bring Him. He comes to give a basis of reality to the ethical life—to give strength and liberty to the moral powers—to present to the imagination an ideal which will furnish inspiration and hope in face of all distractions and oppositions. It is His own word, and Jesus like all "other Masters" must, in the last resort, be judged by his own words—"I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." A recent writer has said—"So long as man is in this world, the struggle between good and evil within him must continue. That it is neither

hopeless nor unequal, Jesus' life is the sole guarantee." The statement is not beyond very grave criticism, but there is a sense in which it cannot be impugned, and this of itself is sufficient to justify any degree of solicitude which may be manifested to differentiate radically between Socrates and Christ.

If Socrates and Christ may justly be contrasted in their functions in history so they may in their persistence in history. This, too, may be called a "transcendental distinction;" but oddly enough we are under debt to Matthew Arnold for a very striking presentation of it. I shall do little more than quote what he says. Those who have looked into this writer's little book *St. Paul and Protestantism* will remember the interesting discussion he undertakes on the Pauline term "faith." Says he: "When Paul said, *Have faith in Christ!* these words did not mean for him: "Give your hearty belief and consent to the covenant of grace; receive the offered benefit of justification through Christ's imputed righteousness." They did not mean: "Try and discern spiritual things, try and taste, see, hear, and feel God." They did not mean: "Rest in the finished work of Christ the Saviour." No, they meant: "*Die with Him!*" This is what Arnold himself calls a "true criticism of a great and misunderstood author." It does not come within our scope to criticise this criticism, nor to describe what our author calls "the doctrine of the *necrosis*"—it is sufficient for our purpose to observe that with all his limitations of the fact and the doctrine, Arnold recognises the immense difference that his statement establishes between Christ and Socrates. He impressively describes it thus—"What makes for scientific criticism the radical difference between Jesus and Socrates, is that such a conception as Paul's would, if applied to Socrates, be out of place and ineffective. Socrates inspired boundless friendship and esteem; but the inspiration of reason and conscience is the one inspiration which comes from him, and which impels us to live righteously as he did. A penetrating enthusiasm of love, sympathy, pity, adoration, reinforcing the inspiration of reason and duty, does not belong to Socrates. With Jesus it is different. On this point it is needless to argue; history has proved. In the midst of errors the most prosaic, the most immoral, the most unscriptural, concerning God, Christ, and righteousness, the immense emotion of love and sympathy in-

spired by the person and character of Jesus has led to work almost by itself alone for righteousness; and it has worked wonders. The surpassing religious grandeur of Paul's conception of faith is that it seizes a real, salutary, emotional force of incalculable magnitude, and reinforces moral effort with it." No better statement of the fact—apart from the criticism—could be had. It is not possible for us to forget that for Arnold, this Jesus, whose personality is equal to the tremendous moral force here attributed to it, was no more.

Now he is dead ! Far hence he lies
 In the lone Syrian town ;
 And on his grave, with shining eyes,
 The Syrian stars look down.

It is for Arnold to solve the problem, how a dead man can be a permanent personal factor in history : it is for us to accept "the sweet reasonableness" of Paul and find in the risen Jesus the explanations of the momentous power which he wields and the persistency with which His presence and purpose meet us in the course of history. A dead man can exert no living influence on men—though the truth be bequeathed to men may : but this is just the difference which Arnold himself drew between Socrates and Christ. The one influences by means of truth working on reason and conscience, the other by the vital personal influences of love and sympathy. Jesus is thus the Supreme Person of history, and whatever other factors in its development may emerge and increase and decay, He remains the one constant and persistent factor in the life of the world and man.

The difference between Socrates and Christ may further be emphasised by their relation to a word—"a little word" Mrs. Humphrey Ward has told us, "and yet one containing a whole theology." It stands between these two teachers and is sufficient to drive them wide as the poles asunder. For the Athenian teacher sin, it may be said generally, is simply ignorance. "Every one who is bad is evil by a kind of ignorance. He does not know himself, is unaware of the good, and so fails to practice that virtue, which his very nature preaches, were he but acquainted with it." The Delphic oracle—*Know Thyself*—was the beginning and end of Socrates' gospel : it had made him a philosopher and liberated in him that love of virtue and temper-

ance with which his name has always been associated, therefore he bore ungrudging and unhesitating testimony to its efficacy. It seems strange to us looking back on his life and work that one who saw so clearly in other directions failed almost entirely in his scrutiny of this. The keen and astute manner in which he lays bare the intellectual short-comings of men, makes it all the more surprising that his criticism of human nature in this direction should be so futile. Sin is merely intellectual aberration—it does not find a deeper source. One is reminded of the startling criticism of Emerson by John Morley: “He has little to say of that horrid burden and impediment on the soul which the churches call sin, and which, by whatever name we call it, is a very real catastrophe in the moral nature of man;—the courses of nature, and the prodigious injustices of man in society affect him with neither honor nor awe. He will see no minister if he can help it.”

Now it is just to this burden and impediment on the soul that Jesus Christ devotes his attention. In the entire roll of teachers who have been among men there has been none who so thoroughly understood the nature and cause of this very real catastrophe in the moral nature of man.

He took the suffering human race,
He read each wound, each weakness clear ;
And struck his finger on the place,
And said, *Thou ailst here and here !*

But he did more. It is the glory of Jesus Christ that he made an “end of sin.” Never was there any heart in which the world’s life rose higher than in the heart of Christ. The emotions of the world’s woe and sorrow touched their highest level there—and thus He became “the Man of Sorrows.” In the lives of many of the great and good the world’s agony has broken into cries, but in presence of the Cross all other voices are hushed and silent. “Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow”—“Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrow . . . but He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities : the chastisement of our peace was upon Him ; and with His stripes we are healed.”

The nearer we get to the two teachers the more clearly does the essential difference between them become. There is no evi-

dence of it more striking than that which arises from the consciousness of the two men. On the one hand Socrates was conscious of failure and limitation. "He knew that the end was not yet, for, like other wise men, he felt that he could not utter the whole burden of his message." And this sense of failure held a place in his mind alongside of the consciousness that he was the best and wisest among them. Socrates' sense of failure did not arise from gloomy and pessimistic views any more than it produced them. There is something sublime in the naïvete with which he addresses his judges on the day of his condemnation. "If you kill me" said he, "you will not easily find another like me, who, if I may use such a ludicrous figure of speech, am a sort of gadfly, given to the State by God; and the State is like a great and noble steed who is tardy in his motions owing to his very size, and requires to be stirred into life. I am that gadfly which God has given the State, and all day long and in all places am always fastening upon you, arousing and persuading and reproaching you." Even if the figure be pardoned it does not seem to be the loftiest of all tasks for the son and messenger—and yet he has to confess failure. He, himself, looks for another and speaks hopefully of the charmer who is yet to come and who will charm men to his side in love and virtue and truth. In Socrates or his message there is no finality—the man does not carry any suggestion of the absolute with him.

The moment, however, you pass from Greece to Judea the whole aspect of things is changed. Jesus speaks a word that is absolute. He does not look for any other who shall follow Him to accomplish that wherein He Himself had failed. He recognises His place in the development of the purpose of God—"last of all He sent His son." It is quite true that on the night in which He was betrayed He spoke of "another Comforter" who was yet to come: but the coming of that other was conditioned by His own departure; and even when the Spirit did come His task was only that "exhibiting the things that were Christ's." There was no sense of failure even under the shadow of the cross: death was fruitful in the highest sense, and already He felt Himself the centre of the world's desire and drawing to Himself in sympathy and love the sons of men. History has corroborated the testimony of His consciousness, and no less the

witness of that of Socrates. Four centuries after the deadly hemlock had done its work, the charmer did come ; and now nineteen centuries after He walked "those holy fields" there are countless thousands who gladly bear their testimony,

He drew me and I followed on,
Charmed to confess the voice divine.

This brief statement is only a suggestion of what the study will yield if any one will trouble himself to look over the facts. In writing the closing sentences let me recommend an interesting volume to the notice of those who may desire to follow the subject further. Four years ago, through the house of the Messers. Blackwood, Mr. Wenley, a thoroughly equipped scholar, issued a study in the philosophy of religion under the title of *Socrates and Christ*. It will be found extremely interesting, reliable, and valuable for what it suggests as well as for the matter it provides. The comparison is neither irreverent nor barren—we wrong the Light of the world by fearing its contrast with the light of Greece or Asia either. Christ's word and work remain supreme—

One common wave of thought and joy
 Lifting mankind again !

VALEDICTORY.

(J. A. MACGLASHEN, B. A.)

Reverend Principal and Professors, Fellow-Students, Ladies and Gentlemen :

GRADUATION, or "capping day," may be called the apotheosis of the student. The dream of his life is realized. He enters the sacred shrine, and is placed among the number of the gods. On that day his whole solid universe of lectures and examinations, in which he lived, moved and had his being, seems to melt into a glorified confusion in which many, though not very clearly defined elements mingle. He is sure, at least, of a convocation of more or less flattering dimensions, in which he occupies a front seat among his equally ecstatic classmates. The venerable Principal has the chair, and is supported by his Staff and some prominent and interested ministers. The audience

deserves more than a passing word. Despite the sometimes tedious programme, they gather in goodly numbers within St. Matthew's historic precincts to honor the students and to show their devotion to their church and college. The solemn Psalm having been sung, reports are given, prizes awarded, diplomas presented, the valedictory is read, parting advice is given by church warriors who have more than scented the battle, and the meeting is brought to a dignified and solemn close. The graduate staggers to his feet to receive congratulations from sympathetic friends who have long watched him in his Alpine climbings, and who have often wondered as chasms yawned before, and the rugged and precipitous crags towered above him, whether he would ever gain the coveted summit. Then he steps forth from the rarified atmosphere of intoxicating abstraction into the cool air of an April evening, already oppressed with a sense of his isolation, to face the stern concreteness of life.

The senses, hitherto stimulated by the exceeding interest of a college course, and now by the stirring exercises of a Convocation, soon discover their loss as the student meanders, perhaps unattended, home, to take up the graver tasks of his calling. He soon finds that his wild dreams, that all grinding and study will be over, and henceforth life will be turned into blessings and handshakes, is too truly a dream. He is already waking into the realization that the victory won means only that now the real battle of life is on. Nevertheless, he has reached a crisis in his life. The divinity that shapes men's lives has laid his coarser chisel down ere taking up a finer, to carry on the sculpturing process. In other and well-worn phrase, "the consummation so devoutly wished" in our academic and earlier college days, but which we sincerely dreaded as it drew on in later years, has at length been realized. The end has come. Our past relations with you, our Professors, must cease. To-night we who have sat at your feet with great profit and delight for a course of years, reluctantly arise, and with hat and staff in hand we stand before you, as we pause for a moment to say farewell.

We have as little relish as you can have for heartless formality. But we feel the present duty too much athrob with life and reality to be regarded as merely formal. Standing, therefore, on the threshold of the college where we have lived and laboured for

several years, and before the Professors whom we have always respected, but whom we have learned to love; surrounded by sorrowing and almost disconsolate students, by kind and we trust tearful friends who have come to see us off, we glance for a moment back, in regretful retrospect, over the many happy and helpful scenes in which we have been actors during the years of the course which to-night terminates. This sad and somewhat embarrassing duty falls to me. I am constituted the Jeremiah of the class; and so must gather up and represent their feelings, as they see the love-cords, which bound them to the happy past, severed.

Thus valedictories have a form imposed upon them as well as a definite content from which marked departure is well nigh impossible. An unvarying reference to *retrospect* and *prospect* is inevitable. These are indeed fruitful words to conjure with. Nothing is more natural, and few things can be more profitable on an occasion like this, than to glance back from the summit of our academic mount upon the tortuous and toilsome path by which we have come; to seek to gain wisdom from the failures; to gather up the sunbeams and in their focussed and brilliant light more clearly read our duty towards our fellow-men, our college, and our God in the future. Here we feel like the dazed disciple on the Mount of Transfiguration as he gazed through the glory gates ajar—"It is good to be here." In the present rosy light our college experience seems an almost un-blurred page. A halo surrounds it, in the well-nigh sacred light of which the darkness disappears. Embowered in the beauties of nature which she has so lavished on North West Arm, within the peaceful walls of our loved college we have for a period withdrawn "from the madding crowd's ignoble strife." And "with an eye made quiet by the power of harmony and the deeper power of joy," we have been seeing into the life of things. The greatness of this privilege rendered very great our responsibility, and it would be misleading for me to say that a survey of the past gives unalloyed satisfaction. It is thus our pleasant thoughts "bring sad thoughts to the mind." It is too true that man at his very best is but a blundering creature, and leaves a stain upon his whitest record. Even theological students are to some extent subject to human limitations. And so the pages we

have turned in the diary of our college course, and which have gone into the presence of God, where they will meet us when the books are opened, sometimes flutter back as they do to-night, to sadden us in the hour of mirth or to add to our depression in despondency. It is thus that the retrospect both of the joys and sorrows of the past produces, though in varying degree, those pathetic regrets which all have felt, and which we now feel as we pause to glance back.

What, then, are some of the things which impress us most as we briefly review the past; the things that will blaze brightest on memory's picture in the years that are to come? There is *first* the college by the Arm, henceforth to teem with other human form. Even now it seems a thing of the past and already "fades the glimmering landscape on our sight." But this cannot be, for that splendid scenery which painted itself panoramic and bewitching on the eye that in rapture gazed upon it from the college cupola in the mellow light of September's setting sun, will live and glow in memory "where'er we roam whatever realms we see." These things will continue with us, and cause us to often and devoutly thank God that he has given to the "Sons of the Prophets" such a goodly heritage. But it is when we in thought will enter the building, and walk through the halls and rooms, and there listen to the many voices which speak to us, that our hearts will be most deeply stirred. These sound out on every hand, voices speak from the old clock which has ticked itself to death in the hall, from the awe-shrouded senate chamber where we handed in our certificates and paid our little fees; where we presented our petitions when we felt our health required less work or more holidays. Voices come from the class-rooms with their familiar furniture where we patiently sat, listened to, and tried to report lectures. In those seats we sat surrounded by dry and dusty volumes of Owen and the fathers, facing John Knox who looked down not very inspiringly upon us from the wall. Before us, too, sat the oracles in theology, history, Hebrew, and Greek, who uttered their oft-times too rapid responses over an antique desk from a capacious and historic chair. What shall I more say? Can I speak without emotion of the voices which speak to us from the rooms where we have talked and talked and

sometimes studied? Of the oval walnut railing around which we clustered and enjoyed our post-prandial talks, songs or gambols? Of the lovely window at the head of the stair, which the pen of a former valedictorian has perhaps immortalized; where the more æsthetic loved to linger to be thrilled with the golden glory of the setting sun, as he mingled his flames with twilight and gloriously sank to rest behind the western hills? Of the College family altar, around which we gathered morning and evening and blended our voices in song, or poured out our hearts in prayer, united by the blest tie that binds our hearts in Christian love?

But however much we might love to linger we dare not do so here. I have other duties to perform. Designedly I have not dwelt upon the serious side of our student life, nor shall I touch but lightly upon the graver aspects of our calling. I trust I am duly impressed with both. But I do not consider this the time or place to discourse upon the weightier matters of the sacred office of the ministry. We, too, magnify our office. At no time have we felt more keenly the seriousness, the sacredness of our calling, than the present hour. We may well fear as we launch forth upon the sea unknown to us, as the disciples on the stormy Galilee. But we have also the comfort that was theirs. The same Saviour is with us to silence the storms, to calm our fears, and to guide us with his eye upon us to the Haven. To resume my retrospect, I may say this session makes an epoch in the history of the college. A crisis was reached and successfully passed. The tide taken at the flood has led on to fortune. The shallows and the miseries in which we were bound live only in memory, and a new and hope-haloed era has dawned upon us. It would be superfluous for me to even outline the history of the problem that last year pressed upon the church but which is now satisfactorily solved.

My predecessor told you from this spot a year ago, what the church deeply felt, that the *time* had come when the over-burdened Staff should be strengthened. I have simply to say to-night, and I am as proud to be able to say it as you are to hear and know it, that "the *time* and the *man* are baith come." Mr. Falconer, lecturer-elect in New Testament Greek and Exegesis, is before you. He is of age, I think, and can speak for himself. In fact

he has spoken in no uncertain way during the past six months. The answer which he has given to the confidence you reposed in him, is before you in the eulogies his students heap upon him. And when his work comes further before you in the future, in your calm summing up, as you form your judgment not by enthusiastic rumour, but by the good that he has done, I doubt not your verdict then will be "Well done." The residence of Mr. Falconer in the building is another step in the right direction, of which the students heartily approve.

The changes in the curriculum which are the fruit of this appointment are thoroughly appreciated by the students. The course of study has been readjusted and is better balanced, the practical with the critical. If we consider the present dimensions of the Staff, the course is well-nigh perfect.

If this were a time for adulation, it would be easy to say flattering and patriotic things about our College. She deserves and enjoys our highest confidence. Why should the name of any other Seminary in Canada be sounded more than her's? But some one whispers she has no name. If so, how inconsistent in a Pede-Baptist institution to delay the christening of this child of the church so long. Name or no name, I shall let her speak for herself, and by the answer she gives to the needs of the church she shall stand or fall.

A retrospect of the session has its shadows as well as sunshine. In our roll-call to-night, our hearts are saddened by the thought that one who studied with us almost through the session cannot answer "here." Henry Chase Dickson has been called to a higher service. His Master who loved him even better than his friends and fellow-students had need of him, and so took him from us. In the very flush of his bright young life, which he had consecrated to the Christian ministry, the call of God came and found him ready. He was in the first affiliated year. But he was with us long enough to impress us deeply with the gentleness yet manliness of his Christian character. With his grief-stricken parents and friends we clasp hands to-night in deepest sympathy, and commend them to Him "who hath torn and will heal; who hath smitten and who will bind us up." The call comes from those lips which God has sealed to our christian young men to close up the gaps in the ranks where our comrades

have fallen ; to do as they have done, give ourselves "living sacrifices holy and acceptable unto God which is our reasonable services."

Citizens of Halifax, to you we must say, farewell. The sunshine from your homes has made many a rift in our college clouds. To the more than ordinary citizen the ordinary student must seem a rather insipid character and a somewhat unworthy object upon which to bestow even the common courtesies of life. Yet, notwithstanding our rustic manners, even when strangers you took us in. It is no small privilege for the theological student to enjoy the social intercourse to which you have admitted us. Our obligation to you we here gladly and gratefully acknowledge. We have sometimes thought that the part you play in equipping our ministers for an important part of their pastoral work should receive more recognition. Why should not these social exercises be considered necessary for a full course diploma under the head of "practical training?" Of this you can rest assured that the students appreciate your many kindnesses and keenly feel the pang of parting. And so, Farewell.

To our loved Principal and Professors it is harder still to say, Adieu. Although we may often seem to have acted as if lectures were a necessary nuisance, and examinations a burden rather than a blessing, yet by all these, and especially by your wise and loving counsels, we have been almost infinitely broadened and bettered. Our great regret to-night is that henceforth we must thread our ways without you. We rejoice with you in the bright outlook of our College. You have given to it the greatest gift that men can give—*yourselves*. In the day of small things, when hope seemed slight for anything larger, you stood like Spartans in the pass, but not like them to die. The shock of the battle with the stubborn and fierce foe debt, is over. The smoke is cleared away and the foe has fled. To-day a thronging college greets you and a loyal church congratulates you. Not only for what you have done for the Institution and its graduates, but for what you have done for and have been to us, we are inexpressibly grateful. While reverencing you as Professors, you have constrained us to regard you as personal friends. From our hearts we can say, in parting, distant be the day when the college is deprived of the ripe experience, the sanctified scholar-

ship, and the self-sacrificing devotion you have brought to and continued to manifest in it. But now we must say, Adieu!

Fellow-students, "if you have tears, prepare to shed them now," for we must say to you, Good-bye. Your loss to-night may seem irreparable; but we hasten to assuage your grief. You have *some* good material left, and there is not as much cause as you may suppose for alarm. As it is expected, we shall give you some advice. Be loyal and loving towards the College and Professors. Come back next year every man of you. Don't leave your Criticals and other class exercises till the last year. Don't go home a day or two before and come back a few days after Christmas vacation. Don't be late for breakfast. Don't slam the doors to make Pine Hill's foundation shake. Be generous towards the Seniors and the *Theologue*. Enlarge the latter if you can. Be as law-abiding as possible. And if you are in need of any further counsel we will not be far away. Do not hesitate to send for us, for we will gladly come. Sad tho' it seems, we must say, good-bye.

Classmates, we too must part. While the bright visions of unbroken intercourse played around us we put the day of parting far away. We felt like the youths

" Who thought there was no more behind ;
But such a day to-morrow as to-day,
And to be boy eternal."

It is hard to realize that we have finished our course, that we have entered upon the realities of a more mature stage in our existence, and that we must put away childish things. Not *play* or *pleasure* but *work* is the keynote of the kingdom of heaven. The fellowships of college are sweet but we must be about our Father's business. We cannot if we would, and we should not if we could, remain, although "it is good to be here." *Amplius* should be the Christian's watchword as it was our Master's. He preferred action to the sweetest communion and the most sacred rites. He left the last supper table with the words on his lips which sound in our ears to-night—"Arise, let us go hence." But we should not part without remembering our heroic classmate who took up the cross of duty and who now, instead of standing with us, is toiling in isolation on the bleak and barren coasts of Labrador. His is the true spirit of his Master, "for even Christ

pleased not Himself." We are proud of Fenwick Williams Thompson, and to-night we pray that God may sustain, cheer, and richly bless him. But we dare not linger longer. We have met to-night to part. As we grasp the torch of truth from the hand of our *Alma Mater* and dash on to display it, may we resolve in God's strength that through the course of our lives, be they long or short, no cowardice shall ever hide it, that no carelessness shall ever dim it, that no storm shall ever quench it. And may our light so shine, that all who love the truth of God as taught in our college may find "the mother featured in her sons."

And now to one and all from whom we part to-night we say :

" Think not of any severing of our loves !
Yet in our heart of hearts we feel your might,
We only have relinquished one delight,
To live beneath your more perpetual sway."

And so, once more, FAREWELL.

EDITORIAL.

THE spring air, so rich in life and music, is also full of farewells. Valedictories are the order of the day. There is sighing and crying on every hand for things that are no more. We feel inclined to believe in the theory of the universe held by a certain Greek philosopher, "everything flows." It is not spring but neap-tide in our colleges, and even editors cannot make time or tide wait for them. And so, as we cross the bar and turn again home, we must send our moan back to our friends from whom we part.

In the first place the THEOLOGUE as a whole must make its bow, as it closes another volume. We hope and feel assured it has been helpful and interesting to many in our church during the past winter. It has sought for another year to fulfil the chief end of its existence, and so has striven to keep our ministers in touch with college life. This is no easy task, and almost impossible without such an agency as a college journal. After graduation from the institution and matriculation into the multifarious cares of congregational life, it is too easy to lose interest in the college. If far away they seldom get to the convocations and hear little about its trials or triumphs. Now the college cannot afford to lose the sympathy of even a limited number of its sons. These two are mutually dependent. As in the physical world, action and reaction are equal and opposite. The College life and spirit is echoed in its graduates and they in turn react upon it, strengthening it by their active sympathy, or sapping its vitality by their apathy. We must pipe to the college if we expect it to dance. Despite our feeble faith the college is bounding along on the highway to success. The church has done her duty in helping it out of the miry pit of debt. However,

"'Tis not enough to help the feeble up
But to support him after."

In order to do this, join the *Alumni* Association, and attend its meeting and festal gatherings. Come to convocation if possible. Take the *Theologue*. And if after all this the college drags or fails it is not from your fault. But failure has passed from our vocabulary at Pine Hill.

With the present issue three Editors drop their weary pens. Ere doing so they must say, adieu. There has been considerable labour connected with our official duties, but it has indeed been a labour of love. It has been our ambition and intention to enlarge the *Theologue*. But we felt the time had hardly come to warrant such an action. We have been giving extra pages in the different issues and particularly in this one.

To our successors we would say, enlarge and increase the number of issues if you think it wise. But weigh well the cost "lest haply, after having laid the foundation, etc." But we need not advise, for men are getting wiser as the days are going by.

To our readers and contributors, who have made our existence possible and profitable we are very grateful. To one and all of our friends we say, *farewell*.

COLLEGE NOTES.

To the many it concerns:—

Out of the small number of subscribers to our Journal, more than one-half owe for this year, and a few for several years. We would like very much to square accounts with our printer, and—ambitious dream—bequeath a small balance to the succeeding Financial Editor. But from present appearances the legacy promises to be of the nature of a debt. We referred to the matter in our last issue, but we fear it was in all too modest a manner. It is a small thing, of course, and for that reason the more readily overlooked. We cheerfully make all reasonable allowance, and trust on the other hand, that this hint will be taken in all good part. Finally and pointedly, *please pay up.*

We are sorry that the "Summer School of Theology," suggested by Dr. Pollok at the last fall Convocation and referred to in all of our issues of this session in one way or other, has not taken deeper hold on those that have read or heard. From some, indeed, we have received hearty words of commendation, and we feel assured that many others are of the same mind. Evidently, however, it must be given a twelve months' hoist, as it will not now be practicable for next summer. It is the intention of the THEOLOGUE not to let the matter drop, and we trust that by the close of next session arrangements will have been definitely made for the summer following.

Since our last issue, the T. & L. Society has had but two meetings, stopping at a safe distance from the spring examinations. The two subjects discussed were, 1st, the clergyman and his relation to politics. 2nd, the Church, (a) as figured in Ephesians; (b) in its *ecclesiastical* aspect. Looking forward to next year, an elaborate programme has been prepared, which is given below. It might be well to state that it is printed *solely*

for the convenience of next year's students; it is not supposed to be of interest to outside readers. Part of it appeared in a city paper the other evening, but without our knowledge or consent.

PROGRAMME FOR 1893-94.

	<i>Subject.</i>	<i>Leader.</i>	<i>Critic.</i>
Nov. 9.	Introductory Lecture.....	Mr. Falconer	
" 16.	Matthew Arnold	A. D. Macdonald	P. M. Macdonald.
" 23.	The Christian Ministry	M. S. McKay	D. Maclean.
" 30.	The Sabbath Sunday question. . .	A. Craise	
Dec. 7.	Cardinal Newman	G. E. Ross	W. H. Smith.
" 14.	Song of Solomon	A. J. Macdonald	F. L. Jobb
Jan. 11.	Buddhism	G. S. Milligan. . .	J. A. Crawford.
" 18.	Wordsworth	G. Arthur	
Feb. 1.	Prayer and Natural Law	J. F. McCurdy . . .	
" 8.	Lapses from Presbyterian Polity. .	A. M. Thompson . .	
" 15.	Browning	R. J. Grant	
" 22.	Seat of Authority in Religion		
Mar. 1.	Hinduism	E. Anand	E. Johnson.
" 8.	Swinburne—Rossetti School. . .	J. B. Maclean	M. F. Grant.
" 15.	Work of the Holy Spirit	S. J. McArthur. . .	J. D. McKay.
" 22.	Bazaars	P. K. McRae and J. H. Kirk.	
" 29.	Tennyson	E. A. Douglas . . .	
		Essay— $\frac{1}{2}$ hour limit ; Critique— $\frac{1}{4}$ hour.	

BOOKS RECOMMENDED.

- (1). Matthew Arnold :—Selections (Golden Treasury Series), Contemporary November, 1867.
- (2). Cardinal Newman :—" Apologia," (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) " Dream of Gerontius" (McMillan's 6d.) Contemporary Review, March, 1866.
- (3). Wordsworth.—Selections (Golden Treasury Series). Lectures by Hudson. Life, by F. W. H. Myers (Eng. Men of Letters Series.)
- (4). Browning.—Selections (McMillan's, 2 vols., or Crowell's, 1 vol.) Introduction by Corson : do. by Alexander. Jones' " Browning as a philosophical and religious poet."
- (5). Swinburne.—Selections (Crowell), Contemporary Review, September, 1866, November, 1867.
- (6). Rossetti.—Selections (Crowell.)
- (7). Tennyson.—Edition of McMillan. Holt Hutton's Essays, " Essays Theological and Literary : " " Modern Guides to Faith."
- (8). The Holy Spirit.—Handbook by Candlish. " Lux Mundi," by Gore. " Veni Creator," by Moule.
- (9). Prayer and Natural Law.—" Methods of Divine Government ;" McCosh. *Century*, Vol. X: " Faith and Healing." " Systematic Theology ;" Dorner. *The New Review*, Jan. 1893. " Faith Cures," by Charcot. Dr. Buckley on Faith Cures & Christian Science. Egglestone's " Faith Doctor."
- (10). The Christian Ministry.—Lightfoot; Dissertations on Philipians. Beet; " "
- (11). Seat of Authority in Religion.—Bruce, " Apologetics," " Chief End of Revelation." Candlish, " Reason and Revelation." Westcott, " Christianity the Absolute Religion ;" Contemporary Review, 1866.

- (12). Song of Solomon.—Newton : Delitzsch : Driver (Introduction.)
 (13). Lapses from Pres. Polity.—The Westminster Standards.
 (14). Hinduism.—Monier Williams. Dr. John Robson.
 "Manual of Comparative Religion ;" De la Saussaye.
 (15). Buddhism.—Coplestone, "Light of Asia," Kellogg.
 "Light of Asia," Arnold.
 "Mohammed, Buddha and Christ," (Dods).
 T. Rhys Davids. Non-Christian Religious Systems (2s. 6d.)
 (16). The Sabbath.—Beet on Galatians.
 Bunyan's Dissertation.

The closing days of the College this year have been of more than usual interest. On Tuesday evening the Alumni Association inaugurated their annual dinner at Pine Hill. About fifty clergymen with a small sprinkling of laymen, were present. On Wednesday evening, Convocation was held in St. Matthew's Church. The chair was filled by our good principal, Dr. McKnight, who was supported by Professors Pollok, Currie and Falconer, and Messrs. Sedgewick and Carruthers. The large church was well filled with a sympathetic audience, a pleasing indication of the growing interest of our people in the college. After the singing of a paraphrase, Rev. J. M. Robinson read the 126th Psalm, and Rev. J. R. Munro offered prayer. Rev. Dr. Currie, being called upon, read the report of the year just closed. It has been an auspicious session, entered upon free of debt and with the hands of the professors strengthened by the addition to the staff of a fourth professor. Already the increase in the number of students in the junior year is indicative of the day of better things. The total number of students was 35, —20 in the first year, 6 in the second, 9 in the third. Touching reference was made to the death of Henry Chase Dickson, a first year student; and an appropriate tribute was paid to his character, so amiable, manly and full of promise. Several of the needs of the College were noted, but especially the bettering of the Library. At the close of the report, the principal called for the usual offering for this purpose.

The prizes were then awarded.

The Hebrew prize was given to Mr. A. J. Macdonald.

The Elocution prizes belonging to the two divisions, were given to Mr. A. M. Thompson and Mr. P. M. Macdonald.

The following gentlemen were then graduated from the college.

Donald M Campbell, Duncan Campbell, Simon A. Fraser, F.

Grierson, B. A., John A. McGlashen, B. A., Albert V. Morash, B. A., Christopher Munro, B. A., Homer Putnam, M. A.

The ninth member of the class, Fenwick Wms. Thompson, has been taking the year extra-murally in Labrador, and expects to present himself for examination after his return in June.

The honorary degree of D. D., was conferred upon Rev. Thos. Sedgewick, of Tatamagouche.

Mr. McGlashen was then called upon to deliver the Valedictory for the graduating class. It eloquently speaks for itself in another part of this issue. The speakers of the evening were Rev. Mr. Bruce, of St. John, and Rev. D. McGillivray, of Lunenburg. Both spoke forcibly and impressively, the former upon the need and the benefit of an educated ministry, the latter on the need of workers for the harvest whitening throughout the world. Rev. P. M. Morrison then came forward and read a letter from the venerable Dr. McCulloch of Truro, expressing regret at his inability to be present at the dinner and at Convocation; he rejoiced with the Alumni in the bright outlook for the college. The singing of the doxology and the pronouncing of the benediction, brought the meeting to a close. Thanks are due the choir for their valuable contributions to the services of the evening.

The following requiems we sing to the memory of our late fellow students:

Campbell, D. M., had good possibilities as a student, and had the well-deserved respect of his class in a competitive contest, but he was rather too much of a *peripatetic* and *dialectician* to sustain the hopes that occasional intervals of study would lead us to cherish for him. He goes to his home in P. E. Island for the summer, possibly to settle there permanently, but his plans are not yet definitely formed.

Campbell, Duncan, joined the class last fall. Coming to this country from Scotland last spring, he spent the intervening summer in Cape Breton. He returns to the same island and we hope to hear of his soon being agreeably settled.

Fraser, Simon is the last of these sons of Anak, but by no means the least. He has been for some time well-known to the church as missionary for one summer to Couva, and for three summers to Labrador. Last summer he spent in Hopewell, N. S., to which he returns at the beckon of a unanimous call.

Grierson, Robert, was indeed one of the things that are "lovely and of good report." A character more beautiful than Grierson's in its utter unselfishness and free-hearted goodness, one seldom meets. The meanest spirit would ever be disarmed in his presence. Though one of the most active men in all that makes up college life throughout the seven years of his course in Arts and Theology, he never made an enemy because in the nature of things it was impossible. He goes to Amherst for two months to relieve Rev. D. McGregor, and expects then to return to the city to commence medical studies in view of the Foreign Mission field.

McGlashen, J. A., the bright, breezy "master of sentences," is the next imprinted name. His perennial smile and his laugh-provoking humor we shall long miss from our social circle: and his thoughtful presence and suggestive remarks from all our meetings, literary, business and devotional. He was wanted in Bridgeport, C. B., and we had not the heart to keep him. He goes to that congregation by call, but expects from them a six months leave of absence next winter in order to attend classes in Edinburgh.

Morash, A. V., is another man that has caught the Edinburgh fever. His halting-place for the summer is Caledonia. He will be much missed from the social life of Pine Hill, and especially from the *musical circle*. Morash was more than a musician: he was weighed in the balances and found—a man, a manly man, an honest man, a man of his word. We follow him with our best wishes, wherever his lot may be cast.

Munro, C., always impressed us with the anomalous idea "strength in weakness." Physically delicate, he has manfully fought through his course in Arts and Theology and is to-day a stronger man than when he entered college. Intense in feeling, weighty in argument, he ever added strength to any cause he espoused. His voice will be missed in our meetings, and his absence felt in all departments of college life. The THEOLOGUE too will miss him: for the past three years he has been on the staff, this year as Senior Editor. He goes to Oxford, N. S., as ordained missionary.

Putnam, H., came to us this year from the second year of Princeton. But to many of us Putnam was no stranger. He

was well known in old Dalhousie days. He goes to Hopewell to minister to the loyal kirkmen there. Hopewell has good reason to be grateful to Pine Hill, as she gets this spring two of her best men.

Thompson, F W., has taken this year extra-murally. Last year when the call came for an ordained missionary for Labrador, Thompson responded. He was specially ordained by the Halifax Presbytery for work in that field, with the understanding that on his return he should take the final examinations. We missed him very much this session but have had occasional letters from him. He also expects to go to Edinburgh next winter.

And so they pass from the scene of Pine Hill student life. Good men were they all. We hope to meet them again at Assemblies, and at College re-unions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

Ross, the Hatter, Standard Life Insurance Co., \$3.00; Rev. Dr. Pollok, Barnstead & Sutherland, Freeman Elliot, Gordon & Keith, E. Maxwell & Son, Latham and McCulloch, Knight and Co., D. Faulkner, \$2.00 each; Rev. J. K. Bearsto, Hon. D. C. Fraser, \$1.50 each; D. O. MacKay, Prof. McGregor, Rev. J. F. Dustan, Rev. S. Rosborough, H. G. Gratz, R. Baxter, Rev. G. Bruce, Rev. R. A. Falconer, Rev. D. McDonald, Wm. Macnab, The Haberdasher, Drs. Woodbury Bros., H. A. Taylor, Rev. Thomas Stewart, Rev. Geo. Millar, Rev. T. Fowler, Rev. J. S. Carruthers, Rev. D. M. Gordon, Rev. T. Sedgewick, \$1.00 each; F. L. Jobb, M. F. Grant, D. McGregor, Rev. W. H. Ness, Rev. J. H. Cameron, Rev. Willard Macdonald, G. E. Ross, Rev. A. E. Chapman, Rev. D. McDougall, Rev. G. S. Carson, H. Putnam, Rev. A. Laird, Rev. F. W. Murray, E. Johnson, Rev. A. McMillan, Rev. D. Sutherland, Duncan Campbell, R. Grierson, Rev. J. A. Forbes, Rev. A. Dawson, Rev. A. W. Mahon, Rev. H. H. McPherson, Rev. J. R. Munro, Rev. J. F. Forbes, Rev. E. D. Millar, Rev. A. Simpson, Rev. Donald Fraser, Rev. J. A. McKenzie, Rev. W. J. MacKenzie, 50 cents each.

Business communication addressed to

J. B. MACLEAN,
Shelburne, N. S.

WM. MACNAB,

Law and Commercial Printer,

3 PRINCE STREET, HALIFAX, N. S.

LARGEST AND BEST EQUIPPED PRINTING HOUSE IN THE
LOWER PROVINCES.

ROSS, SEDGEWICK & MACKAY,

Barristers, Solicitors, &c.

31 GEORGE STREET, HALIFAX, N. S.

H. B. ROSS, Q.C., JAS. A. SEDGEWICK, ADAM A. MACKAY.

WM. NOTMAN,

Photographer to the Queen.

39 GEORGE STREET,

HALIFAX, N. S.

GORDON & KEITH,

Dealers in every sort of

FURNITURE,

CARPETS, RUGS, FLOOR OIL CLOTHS,

—AND—

General HOUSE FURNISHINGS,

41 to 45 Barrington Street,
HALIFAX, N. S.

Agents for the celebrated Nordheimer Piano.

ROSS,

The Grandville Street

FASHIONABLE

HATTER.

British Woolen Hall Building.

"CUT PRICES."

Latham & McCulloch,

47 BARRINGTON STREET,

—SELL—

Patent Medicines, Perfumes,
Toilet Soaps, Brushes,
and all Toilet Articles,
Stationery, Purses and Fancy Goods,

ALL AT "CUT PRICES."

H. WOODBURY, D.D.S.

F. WOODBURY, D.D.S.

DRS. WOODBURY BROS.,
DENTISTS.

157 HOLLIS STREET, HALIFAX, N. S.

J. CORNELIUS,

Jeweller,

99 Granville Street, Halifax, N. S.

JEWELLERY, WATCHES, CLOCKS,
GOLD PENS AND PENCILS,
SPECTACLES, &c., &c.

SPECIAL DISCOUNT TO STUDENTS

PEART'S CENTRAL BAZAAR,

33 George Street, Halifax, N. S.

Picture Frames and Mouldings.

FRAMES MADE TO ORDER.

ROBERT STANFORD,

IMPORTING TAILOR,

156 HOLLIS ST., HALIFAX, N. S.

Special Discount to Students.

WHEN YOU REQUIRE

BOOTS,

SLIPPERS, RUBBERS,

OVERSHOES,

or anything in FOOTWEAR,

—GO TO—

T. G. A. WILSON'S,

107 Barrington Street,

BARNSTEAD & SUTHERLAND,
CENTRAL HOUSE, --145 & 147 BARRINGTON STREET, HALIFAX,
 --IMPORTERS OF--

Staple and Fancy Dry Goods.

Gentlemen's Furnishing Emporium,

163 HOLLIS STREET,

(DIRECTLY OPPOSITE THE HALIFAX CLUB.)

FREEMAN ELLIOTT keeps on hand all kinds
 of **Gentlemen's Furnishing Goods.**

**STANDARD
 LIFE ASSURANCE CO.,**

EDINBURGH.

Established 1825.

Assets	\$38,000,000
Investments in Canada.....	7,500,000
Bonuses Paid to Policy Holders...	27,000,000
Annual Revenue.....	5,000,000

For Rates and Plans apply to--

ALFRED SHORTT, Agent,

135 Hollis Street, Halifax, N.S.

Telephone No. 653.

UNGAR'S LAUNDRY

--AND--

DYE WORKS,

66-70 BARRINGTON ST., | 26-32 WATERLOO ST.,
 HALIFAX, N. S. | ST. JOHN, N. B.

Goods called for and delivered.

Goods returned same day if required.

DANIEL FAULKNER,

BOOT AND SHOE MAKER,

No. 18 Spring Garden Road.

Boots and Shoes made to order

From first-class English, French and
 Domestic Stock.

Repairing promptly attended to.
 All work guaranteed.

W. C. SMITH,
 FINE TAILORING,
 No. 145 HOLLIS STREET,
 HALIFAX, N. S.

THE HALIFAX HOTEL

Hair Dressing Rooms.

R. TAPLE, PROPRIETOR.

THIS IS THE PLACE that all STUDENTS should patronize.

Halifax Gents' Furnishing Co.,

JOHN LEPINE, AGENT.

ENGLISH COLLARS, CUFFS,
 DRESS SHIRTS, BRACES,
 Fownes & Dents' KID GLOVES a speciality.

199 Hollis Street.

Successors to LePINE BROS.