

THE  
Presbyterian College Journal.

VOL. X — JANUARY, 1891 — No. 3.

Our Graduates' Pulpit.

THE COMPASSION OF JESUS.

A SERMON

BY REV. G. D. BAYNE, B.A.

Mark vi: 34-44.

THE outstanding feature in this miracle is the compassion of Jesus, and that is the theme which I propose to illustrate.

This is the only miracle recorded by all four Evangelists and there would seem, from this circumstance, to be something of unusual value and impressiveness in the lessons which it embodies. Its picturesqueness, no doubt, made a deep impression on the minds of those who witnessed it, and the rich display which it made of the Savior's kindness and love must have rendered it one of the most precious and ineffaceable of the "memories" of after years.

It is a parable as well as a miracle. It is not only a wonderful work of God, fitted to attest the divine mission of Him who wrought it; it is also an object-lesson laden with spiritual truth, and it is to the latter aspect of the transaction that I invite attention.

It is, indisputably, a miracle, and I hope the ingenious naturalizer will let my subject alone. One of the inscrutable things of these latter days is that apparently sane men should feel it incumbent upon them to explain, on the principles on which things usually occur, the miracles of Jesus Christ. Is not Omnipotence equal to any marvel recorded in the Bible? Does not the Biblical hypothesis cover the facts? And what more should any man ask? Certainly, no philosopher can ask more, but, unfortunately, all critics are not philosophers. The wonder is not how one possessing the character of Jesus Christ should work miracles; the wonder would be how such an one could move about in this world and not work miracles. The leader of modern agnosticism admits that a miracle must have been performed once, at least, in order to bring matter into existence. But, if a miracle occurred once, it can occur twice, and ten times, and a hundred times, and a thousand

times. There is a feeling abroad, vague and undefined indeed, distilled through the magazine, the novel and the jest of our day, that many of the miraculous events described in the Old Testament are merely legendary. Occasionally one meets a man,—a decent enough man, a church-going man, a man whose “wife is religious,”—who declares himself as quite ready to believe that Jesus Christ performed miracles and that he wrought by divine power, but who would say, if he would speak his mind frankly, that the account of the Deluge, of the destruction of Sodom, of the adventure of Jonah and a score of other things, recorded in the Old Testament, draw a little too heavily on faith. Of course, it is easy to remind him that his salvation does not depend on the amount of credence that he can give to this, that or the other event of Ancient History. But he ought to be told that *Jesus Christ referred to these things as facts*. Let us be severely logical. Either the cities of the Plain were destroyed by fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven or Jesus Christ said what was not true. Either the “fish story in the Book of Jonah” is a fact or Jesus Christ falsified. Either Lot’s wife was killed in the manner described in the Old Testament or the author of the New Testament is unreliable. You cannot mince the Bible and why should anyone attempt it? Almighty God *can* do anything recorded there and always could, and, if some of the miracles cannot be explained in terms of what are called the “laws of nature,” why should any of them be? I, for one, can see neither sense nor profit in the well-meant attempts of good, ingenious souls to “naturalize,” as Horace Bushnell said, the miracles of the Bible. Better expend your energies, ye nervous souls who tremble for the ark, better expend your energies in helping General Booth with the “submerged tenth” than in endeavoring to make the Gospel “easier to believe” for men who don’t want to believe it and who would not believe it “though one should rise from the dead.”

The Gospel account of any event is not what one of the Evangelists says about it, but what all of them say who speak of it. Gathering the facts from the four Evangelists, we find that a short time before this the twelve apostles had been sent out on their mission of mercy. They now return and report to Jesus. They declare that they had been well-received; that their work had been blessed, and that even the devils had been subject to them in Jesus’ name. Jesus now says to them: “Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place and rest awhile.” They then cross the Sea of Tiberias to a desert region in the neighborhood of Bethsaida, to rest and to get rid of the crowd. Observe that Jesus said “come,” not “go”; and, notice also that the disciples, in going to take a holiday, took Jesus with them. Who has not seen people—at home in the city staid, sedate, religious, the very pink of ecclesiastical propriety,—in the country resorts display an entirely different character? One is tempted, sometimes, to be uncharitable enough to sus-

pect that their religion has been left in the city, packed away with their fashionable outfits in the closely-shuttered mansion, to be donned again at the opening of the "season." My friend, you had better take no holidays than leave Jesus Christ behind, and where you cannot take Christ you had better not go.

The multitude, having witnessed the departure by boat of Jesus and the twelve, followed around the bend of the sea to meet them at their landing place. Jesus, having reached the Bethsaida shore, looked up and beheld a vast multitude crowding after him to hear the Word of Life. Mark tells us that, "Moved with compassion, he taught them many things." Matthew says that "he healed their sick." Luke tells how that "He received them, and spake unto them of the Kingdom of God and healed them that had need of healing." That is, he continued his work of mercy notwithstanding that he and his apostles were weary and had need of rest.

What an impressive scene that was! I think it was McCheyne who said that he never looked upon a great crowd without being deeply moved. On shallow and selfish minds the sight would probably produce no deeper impression than would the flitting of a shadow, but in the mind of Jesus, who understood the motive of everyone; who discerned the inarticulate longings, the undefined desires and, above all, the dire needs of all, it stirred the depths of pity and compassion. Five thousand!—nay, more than that. "Five thousand men, besides women and children," says Matthew. If there were five thousand men it is safe to say that there were more than that many women, for women are usually in the majority in such gatherings. There may just chance to have wandered into this assembly the little man who affects to sneer about there being "more women than men in the churches." I will say nothing of the poor compliment he pays to his own manhood. I will not remark on the motive or desire which may prompt the jibe. You take me to the door of a church and ask me to look within and you say, "there are more women than men there." But I will conduct you to the door of another institution, and I will ask you to look within; and you will observe, as you do so, that there are more men than women in that institution. And the name of that institution is the *penitentiary*. Yes; there are more women than men in the churches, and more men than women in the penitentiaries and, unquestionably, there is a connection between the two facts. It is not worth sneering about. Is it?

So, then, it must have been a vast multitude. It must have been an impressive sight. And, as Jesus beheld them pressing around him, he was deeply moved. Instead of being irritated at the interruption, he was moved with compassion. What would have annoyed and disturbed a mere man, stirred in the God-man his mighty master-passion,—pitying love.

1. I ask you to contemplate, in the first place, the *objects* of Jesus' com-

passion. And, let us remember, this was not a momentary ebullition of feeling on the Savior's part. It was the expression of the constant—the normal—feeling of His mind. It was that feeling which is expressed in such language as this:—"God is love." "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son." "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us." "God commendeth His love toward us."

In the case before us, this compassion was manifested

(1) Toward *his own disciples*. They had returned from their missionary tour, encouraged indeed, but weary in body, and Jesus, out of compassion for them, said: "Come ye apart and rest." Now, I take it, there is something peculiar in the compassion of Jesus for His own. We shall probably never know all that is implied in the language of Jesus: "God *so loved the world*"—the lost, wayward, ungrateful, rebellious world. But there is something in advance, even of that, in the feeling described when it is said that "Jesus, having loved *His own* which were in the world, loved them unto the end." So, also, in the statement: "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." God's love toward the world is greater than we can conceive. It is an ocean without a bottom and without a shore. But in that love the predominating element is *compassion*. In the love of Jesus for His own, there is compassion too, but the predominating element is *complacency*. It is attachment, as well as compassion, based on similarity of character and disposition. It is a pity of peculiar tenderness. You feel for the poor victim of poverty or misfortune, but you feel also for your child and, I need not say, that the feeling for the one is not quite the same as it is for the other. And so, God cares for us with a peculiar tenderness and love. We may be absolutely certain that He has for us the same consideration and pity that he had for the tired disciples when he said:—"Come ye apart and rest." Weary worker, God's eye is upon you in all your toil. He cares for the body as well as for the soul. He meets all your wants and is able to supply all your need, for "My God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus." I love to think that this Bible still utters God's invitation to the weary and heavy-laden—as they wet it with the tears of sorrow and thumb it with the horny hands of toil,—  
"Come unto me and rest."

(2) It was compassion toward the *shepherdless people*. Mark tells us that "Jesus was moved with compassion toward them because they were as sheep not having a shepherd." It is sad to see people naked and destitute of daily food; to meet strong men willing, but unable, to find work; to listen to the piteous cries of the children of the poor; to hear the disconsolate father or the weeping mother tell them that there is no bread. It makes strong men weep to enter the habitations of the poor in our larger cities,—no food, no fuel, scant clothing, no comforts. I know some of the things that

cause this misery. But, account for it as you may, it is a melancholy sight and one fitted to excite the strongest feelings of pity. But, there is one thing that is worse. Worse than gaunt hunger, worse than pinching poverty, worse than the direst bodily distress is spiritual destitution. Physical sufferings have an end. The longest night of earth wears on to morning. But the consequences of spiritual destitution have no end. The worst neglect is spiritual neglect and the worst destitution is spiritual destitution. That was the spectacle which met the eye of the Savior as, looking up, he beheld the multitude—forgetful of all else—pressing upon him to hear the Word of Life. True, these people had their ministers of religion. They had the broad phylacteried Pharisee, and the Scribe doling out his fruitless traditions and citations of authorities. There was any amount of religiousness in the country. There were swarms of priests and Levites, selfish and haughty, but

“The hungry sheep looked up and were not fed.”

Jesus had something for them that satisfied the cravings of the immortal mind. His words fell on their ears like rain on the parched ground or like a snatch of heavenly music amid the discords of a tempest. He discerned in their eagerness the inarticulate longings of the human heart for the truth that saves, and he pitied them. And can we, who have entered into fellowship with His sufferings, can we think of eight hundred millions of human beings, destitute of the truth that saves, and not compassionate them? Can we think of those numbers—numbers in the contemplation of which the mind is lost in their vastness—and not pity them as “sheep not having a shepherd.”

“Can we, whose souls are lighted  
With wisdom from on high,  
Can we to men benighted  
The lamp of life deny?”

(3) It was compassion toward the *suffering* people. In Matthew's account we read that “Jesus went forth and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and he healed their sick.” We often lose sight of the magnitude of Christ's work of healing. His preaching and sufferings eclipse it. Or, we think only of the cases described in detail and overlook the significance of such expressions as these:—“As many as touched him were made perfectly whole.” “And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.” “He healed their sick.” “Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick of diverse diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them and healed them.” From such passages as these, which might be greatly multiplied, it is seen how that Jesus' compassion ever flowed out to those suffering in the body, and from such glimpses of his ministry we can infer how wide-spread and beneficent his work of healing

was. It would be idle to attempt to calculate, but surely tens of thousands were healed by him—victims of all sorts of diseases;—and many more had occasion to remember him with gratitude for the restoration of their kindred and friends.

Now, he is still the same Savior and Healer. His laws and the principles of his administration have never changed. Human interests and necessities are substantially the same now as then, and why should we not go for healing to the same almighty and compassionate friend? People have erred in this matter by "throwing away medicine" and thereby rejecting the gifts of Providence. For the *Materia Medica* are as much the gift of God as is the Savior of sinners, and God will honor his own gifts and institutions in the healing of the body as well as in the salvation of the soul. But men have gone astray quite as far in the other direction, like Asa, who, "in his disease sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians." James shows that faith and medicine are to go together, and "what God hath joined together let not man put asunder." "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil (the symbol of medical treatment) in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up."

But the very magnitude of Christ's work of healing suggests another enquiry. The two great departments of the Savior's ministry were preaching and healing. Now Christianity is Christ's continued life in the world. His Church—that is, the body of believers—is left to continue, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, His work in this world. Is one half of the work "which Jesus began to do" to be dropped? Why should the Church be so careful as to the character and qualifications of those who preach, and so indifferent as to the character of those who heal? Yet the slightest departure on the part of a minister of the Gospel, from the course of rectitude and propriety, dooms him, while the physician—the family physician of even the Christian household may drink or gamble, or practice the well-known "political arts" and suffer no professional damage. We should insist that the man who represents one-half of the Savior's ministry in modern times be, at least, a clean and morally exemplary man.

(4) It was compassion toward the *hungry* people. There were thousands there so eager to hear the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth that they forgot to take bread. Now Jesus provides for their physical hunger, and, in that act, has left on record one more proof that he cares for the body as well as for the soul,—*one more proof*, I say, for there is as much in this Bible about men's bodies as about their souls. If Christ had been a pretender or a fanatic, he would have disregarded the wants of men's bodies, as almost every religious pretender before and since has done, but the very scope of his kindness, as well as the common sense of all his words and works, stamps his mission as divine. God sets high value on the body, and

thereby rebukes at once the false humility of the ascetic and the degraded conception which holds life cheap. And it is a remarkable confirmation of this that the religion of Jesus Christ everywhere teaches, not only the value of life, but the importance of the body. Who are they that build hospitals and orphanages, and "homes" and asylums? It is the friends of Jesus Christ; for the friends of God are the friends of man. The enemies of God make the subjects and victims for these institutions; the friends of God care for and heal them. If you want proof of this, just take the trouble to reckon up the millions of dollars that have been contributed, on this continent, for educational and benevolent purposes, and you will find—perhaps to your astonishment—what a small proportion has been given by any but God's friends.

Yes: God cares for these bodies. And, child of God, sooner shall ravens bring you food; sooner shall manna fall, than that you who trust Him should want. There once lived a man—a mighty man—a great statesman and warrior, as well as a most beautiful poet and eminent Christian, who said: "I have been young and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." David's greater son has said: "Your heavenly father knoweth that ye have need of these things," and his knowing it is enough. A thousand years after David, lived the greatest apostle, whose testimony is the same: "My God shall supply all your need according to His riches in glory by Christ Jesus."

So, the compassion of Jesus covers all our interests and needs. It was manifested toward the weary disciples, the Shepherdless people, the suffering and the hungry people.

We have looked at the picture of human need and suffering,

II. Let us now look at the picture of divine compassion in its expression—the *provision of Jesus' compassion*—and

(1) Let us notice, first of all, that it was a *wise and orderly* provision. "Make the men sit down by fifties in a company," said Jesus. We, in this new country, know little of what is meant by a great crowd. It is a heartless and cruel thing. The weak and lame: the women and children are sure to suffer. But Jesus would have such order in the arrangement that none would be made to suffer, though there were so many. Besides, the arrangement was of the highest importance from the point of view of supply. By it none would be overlooked. The feeblest as well as the strongest would be supplied. Moreover, there would be a grand impressiveness in the order and quiet of the plan. All could witness the miracle, and it was a scene never to be forgotten. It was a feature of the transaction that brought out most strikingly the kindness and wisdom of the Savior. So it is still. The humblest and weakest of God's children are as much the objects of God's compassion and care as are the strongest. And so also, in all His works

and ways, God is the God of order. "God is not the author of confusion. Confusion is the devil's work; order is heaven's first law." One principle never to be forgotten in all Christian activity is, "Let all things be done decently and in order."

(2) It was a provision from *apparently slender resources*. "Five loaves and two fishes." Impossible. "What are they among so many?" said one. "Send them to the villages," said another. "No," said Jesus, "they need not depart; give ye them to eat." "With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible." The supply was so ridiculously inadequate to the need that we would think it not worth while to use the five loaves and the two fishes at all. It would have been quite easy for Christ to have *created* the supply. Creation, for Him who made the worlds, would have been quite as easy as multiplication. But we must learn not to waste the little we have. God will not do for a man what he can do for himself. God undertakes to bless us in the use of what he has already given us, however little it may be, and there must be no waste. Strange as it may seem, it is those who have the little who are most tempted to waste what they have. The prodigality of the bankrupt is notorious. In the parable of the talents, it is significant that it was the man of *one* talent who went and hid his Lord's money. The lesson is that we are required to use what we have. The man of one talent is not responsible for the use of ten talents, but he is responsible for the one. In Christian work our talents, influence, opportunities all together may be equivalent only to the few loaves and fishes, but we are to use them. God can make them sufficient. And, my friend, you know not what you can do until you try. There is a service that even the child can render. "There is a lad here," said Andrew, "who has five small loaves and two small fishes." After all, it was a little boy who furnished what Christ made sufficient for the thousands. The law of all service, as of all giving, is—"If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath and not according to that a man hath not."

(3) It was a *provision which had to pass through human hands*. "Give ye them to eat," said Jesus. The disciples were for sending them away from Christ and from themselves, just as many heedless people to-day say: "Go to philosophy, to culture, to 'the Church';" unload your responsibility and duty on the shoulders of some cadaverous priest." "No," says the Master, "keep them right here and feed them." So, God honors human agency. The disciples could not provide, but that was no reason why they should not distribute the Savior's bounty. We cannot create the bread of life, and we are not required to do it, but we can offer it to others. The Redemption is divine, but the form of dispensation is human. Here, again, God will not do for us what we can do for ourselves. The manna ceased as soon as the Israelites were in a position to sow and reap. This world is to be won *for*



Christ and *by* Christ, but it is to be done *through* human agency. And the inadequacy of what we can offer or the littleness of human means is to be no hindrance, for God can make them sufficient. This gospel is to be heralded by no archangel; we are to expect no mutterings from the deep, no new Gospel, no other Savior. We shall hear no new voices from heaven, and no warnings from the lost. This Gospel is to be preached and practised by living men and women, and, if we understand God's purpose at all, it is by such means that His kingdom is to be advanced and established in this world.

(4) It was a provision which *depended for its sufficiency on Christ's blessing*. "Bring them to me," He said, in answer to their objections and fears. "How can we feed so many?" was the question that troubled those good men. "*Bring what you have to Me,*" was the divine solution. "Let me touch them," said the Savior. And, commonplace as it may sound to many of you, that is still the solution of the "Missionary Problem" and the secret of power. You say, "My talents are small." "Bring them to Me" is the Master's word. "I am so retiring and timid." "Bring them to Me," says Christ. "My early education was neglected; I have no social influence; Lord, I am a man of slow speech, they will not hearken to me." There is only one answer: "Bring them to me." The Bible is full of proofs of this. Time would fail me to tell of Moses, who had all sorts of disabilities and excuses, but whom God used for the accomplishment of the most gigantic task ever committed to man; of Shamgar, who with his ox-goad turned back a whole regiment of Philistines; of David; of Paul, who has stated the principle which they all exemplify:—"But God hath chosen the foolish things *of the world* to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things *of the world* to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence."

I may add that all power and usefulness depend on His blessing, and that, with that blessing, the smallest ability is a mighty power.

I may add, too, the oft-forgotten lesson that we are responsible not for *success* but for *fidelity*. God's workers are to hear at last not "Well done, good and *successful* servant," but, "Well done, good and *faithful* servant." And the same is true of the Church. The Church is not responsible for the *conversion* of the world, but for its *evangelization*. Duty is ours, results are God's. Why should we pray, as we often do—"Let not thy word return unto thee void," when God has said: "My word, which goeth forth out of my mouth, *shall not* return unto me void." God will do what he says he will do. Let us do our part. If some of us were half as anxious to be found *faithful* as we are to be accounted *successful*, we would be successful.

(5) It was a provision secured *through obedience to the great command*: "Seek ye, first, the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." This is the Sovereign law of the Gospel. It is the divine order of seeking and, corresponding to it, is the divine order of provision: "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not, with him also, freely give us all things." The multitude sought *first* the kingdom of God and, in their seeking, forgot 'all these things.' But Christ did not forget them. He provides the lower good for those who seek the higher. And it is just as literally true to-day as it was then. All our blessings come through obedience. Make Christ all and in all, and you will never want. Put God first and highest and you will be provided for.

And, the reason—even apart from the positive guarantee in the promise—is plain. We are urged to seek first God's kingdom. What then? What is a kingdom? A kingdom is the realm of a king. A kingdom implies government, and government implies law. Therefore, when we seek and find God's kingdom, we come under the laws of that kingdom. And what are the laws of that kingdom. They are such as require honesty, industry, temperance, chastity, economy. They are such as promote comfort, thrift, and the confidence of our fellow-men. They teach us to "provide things honest in the sight of all men;" to "labor, working with our hands that which is good;" to be "diligent in business" as well as "fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." So that, "seeking the kingdom of God and his righteousness" is the very best way to get on in the world. The connection between the command and the promise is not arbitrary, but natural. The sequence of things described in the third chapter of the book of Malachi is in the natural order. For the Bible nowhere says that it is a sin to be rich; neither does it say that it is a sin to be poor. The sin is in not putting God first; it lies in loving pleasure, wealth, fame or anything else more than God.

(6) Once more, *the distribution of this provision did not exhaust it*. In all that vast crowd there was not one unfed, and there was more left than was furnished by the lad at first. There was more than enough. The people were satisfied and there was enough over for another feast. They were royally, munificently fed. That is God's way. "Exceeding abundantly" is God's measure. It is we who are small and narrow and niggardly: it is not God. In giving, above all things, God's ways are not our ways, neither are his thoughts our thoughts. We may well imagine the glad astonishment of that hungry multitude as, gazing wonderously, they saw the bread grow as it was touched, first by Jesus; then by the distributors. The little crumb, broken off, was instantly a loaf. Wonderingly would they partake of it. It grew, they knew not how. It was unexhausted by the numbers who were fed. And so it is with all God's mercies. The streams of salvation never run dry. They have poured their floods of healing and joy over this lost world for

thousands of years and are unexhausted by time. They have cleansed the foulest lepers ; they have rescued the degraded prodigal in the far country ; they have cast out devils ; they have lifted up those most deeply lost in sin and are unexhausted by the character as well as by the numbers saved. And in Jesus Christ all fulness dwells, now as then. In him is "enough for each, enough for all, enough forever more." The giving out of his fulness does not diminish it. His resources are infinite and eternal. And I certify to every one who hears me that no one will be lost for want of grace or power on the Savior's part.

And what is true of Christ's giving, is true of ours also. The giving forth of the bread of life does not exhaust it. The more we labor and pray and give, the richer we become. This is true of the individual, true of the Church and true of the Christian nation. "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth ; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty."

Friends of God ; see, then, our Mission : "Give ye them to eat." We cannot get away from this. "Necessity is laid upon us" We are debtors to both Jew and Greek. It is the King's command : "Feed these starving multitudes." It is the Royal mandate : "Give ye them to eat." It is the question from the throne : "What are you doing for Christ?" Thousands around you are starving and dying "Give ye them to eat." I know what you are thinking :—"Lord it is little I can do or offer." "Bring them to me" says Christ, "I will make them enough." Only let him bless the act or offering and it will be enough. When will we learn that "Our sufficiency is of God." Bring all and lay it at His feet and he will multiply it in the bringing and in the taking away. Did you notice that, in the miracle we have been studying, part of the provision was a *natural* product—the fishes, and part of it was *artificial*—the bread. So, we have gifts that are natural and gifts that are acquired. Let both be devoted to His service ; for all we have and all we can get will be but a small return for all that that Savior has done for us.

The secret of all our leanness is, I am persuaded, the very slight sense of *personal responsibility* felt by the mass of professing Christians. There is a vast amount of popery among Protestants. They try to do their religion by proxy. They like the plan of putting it all on the shoulders of minister or Session. Priestism is dear to the average man. God's truth is that a portion of the honor and responsibility of religion in this world devolves on every professing Christian, just as in an army, a portion of the honor of his country's flag is committed to every soldier in the ranks. In almost every congregation in the land, that sense of personal responsibility to make direct efforts for the common cause is felt by the few ; by the mass it is utterly disregarded or forgotten. And yet, the advancement of God's kingdom in

this world depends, under God, on individual effort; just as the victory of Nelson at Trafalgar depended, more than on anything else, on the magic power of the watchword of the day,—“England expects *every man* to do his duty.” “To every man his work,” said Jesus in the parable: “to every man his work,” says the same Jesus to the Church.

My impenitent friend, I tell you what you know to be true, what all that is good in your nature assents to, what no scenes of revelry can drown and what now calls up a response from the depths of conscience, disguise it as you may. You are an unhappy man. Your heart is hungry and weary. Blessed be God: *Jesus Christ can fill thee*. Dost thou believe it? Try it. “They did all eat and were *filled*,” says the Record before me. Hear me, thou poor prodigal, feeding on the husks in the far country; *Jesus Christ can fill thee*. Wandering sinner, hearken to God’s voice of love and mercy: *Jesus Christ can fill thee*. Come back, unhappy wanderer, come back—back from the broken cisterns, back to the fountain of living waters. “I am the bread of life,” he says; “eat of me and thou shalt never hunger; drink of me and thou shalt never thirst.”

“Ho! all ye hungry, starving souls,  
That feed upon the wind,  
And vainly strive with earthly toys  
To fill an empty mind.”

“Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labor for that which satisfieth not? Hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness.”

The Lord Jehovah hath made a feast. His oxen and his fatlings are killed. It is spread for thee: “Come, for all things are now ready.” I charge thee not to despise that feast that come upon thee which is written: “Because I have called, and ye refused: I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded: but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity: I will mock when your fear cometh: when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you. Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer: they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me.”

## Symposium.

### THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH.

REV. JOHN SCRIMGER, M. A.

OWING to the withdrawal of one of the gentlemen expected to contribute an article to this Symposium on the Revision of the Westminster Confession, I have been asked on somewhat short notice to give a statement of my views on the matter. I must do so very briefly, even at the risk of being misunderstood, and I prefer to do so without reference to the two articles which have preceded.

I confess I find it somewhat difficult to excite in my own mind anything more than a languid interest in the question, and am disposed to regard it as of very subordinate importance. Perhaps the following paragraphs will explain why; the fact will at any rate, I trust, enable me to write calmly and dispassionately.

I. To begin with, I have personally no particular grievance against the Confession, as it stands. I have always felt that the formula of subscription adopted by our Church was a little rigid, and had there been any apparent disposition on the part of the Church to use it as a weapon for coercing into the strictest conformity those who might have difficulty with various minor clauses contained in the Confession, I would have been disposed to support an agitation for some modification of this formula. But the Confession itself expresses my attitude towards the great points of theological belief, as well as any document drawn up by a committee two hundred years ago could be supposed to do, and I should be content to let it remain as it is until some other reason arises for changing it.

It is true that if I were to write out for myself a full statement of my own creed it would not take the form exactly of the Westminster symbol. But neither is it at all likely that the revised symbol would correspond to it any more closely. It seems useless to agitate for what must always remain unattainable.

It is true also that there is an emphasis laid upon the doctrine of the divine sovereignty as the logical key to the whole system, which would be out of place in the ordinary ministrations of the pulpit while the fulness of the gospel offer is somewhat lightly touched. I once tried the experiment of preaching through the subjects of its chapters in succession, and found that the result was not quite satisfactory as regards proportion. But then the Confession of Faith is not a sermon, and was never intended to be used for that purpose. Nor is there any rule requiring that the same proportion should be observed in the teaching of the Gospel as obtains in the official dogmatic statement of it. One who is quite in harmony with the system of doctrine which it contains may still have all the liberty he needs in that respect, and put the emphasis where the circumstances of his particular field of labour seem most to demand it.

It is true, likewise, that some of its statements are liable to misapprehension, and have frequently been made the occasion of slanderous charges by those who were anxious to find ground of accusation against the system. In their anxiety to be severely consistent with their own principles, the framers of the Confession have used some unfortunate phrases which are ambiguous.

But it may well be doubted whether any creed can be constructed that will escape that danger from those who are prejudiced against it.

It is alleged as a reason for revision, that the Confession by its stern predestinarianism now repels the young from the membership of the Church, and many of the best minds from its ministry. This may be so; but I must say that I have never been able to find evidence that it is true to any appreciable extent. As for the young, I fear that very few of them ever read it or have more than the vaguest idea of what it contains. And besides, it is perfectly well known that the acceptance of its teaching is not required as a condition of membership, all that is demanded being a credible profession of belief in the gospel. For every one that is repelled from the Church by the sternness of its doctrine, a hundred are driven away by the coldness of its people, and an agitation to revise that would be more to the purpose. It is possible that some may have been frightened by injudicious preaching of a kind of predestinarianism that falsely claimed the sanction of the Confession. But this is the fault of the preacher, not of his Church's creed. As for the ministry, it will scarcely be denied that the Presbyterian clergy are, at least, the equal of any other in ability, and if so many of the best are lost to us, one would like to know what becomes of them. So far as my observation goes, it is a rare thing to find a student withdraw from his course owing to such difficulties with the Church's creed as would be removed by any probable revision. The Presbyterian ministry has drawn more into its ranks from other Churches than it has ever lost to others. Nor have those it has attracted been always weaklings either.

I do not remember to have seen it used anywhere as an argument in favour of revision that the revised Confession would develop a higher and sturdier type of Christianity than that which has been trained under the auspices of the old symbol of 1643. Nor are we likely to hear much of that kind of argument. Judged by its fruits in the old world and in the new, the creed of English-speaking Presbyterianism for the past two hundred years has much to be proud of, and has had little cause to blush for its children except when they wantonly departed from it.

II. There are some obvious evils connected with revision, of which account ought to be taken, though there is no need to exaggerate them.

There is the danger that the process of revision will divert the attention and interest of our church from the real work which it has to do at the present crisis. God has laid upon us serious responsibilities in the evangelization of our own land from ocean to ocean, not to speak of foreign fields, and the work has to be done now. We cannot afford to dissipate our energies on the discussion of theological forms. Such discussion is apt to prove very engrossing, and we might be better employed. Even if the Confession is not ideally perfect, it would be poor strategy to decide on theoretical reconstruction of our position when face to face with enterprises likely to tax our energies to the utmost. Unless some very great advantage is to be gained thereby, it is but risking defeat at a critical hour for the sake of a whim. It may be said this would be only temporary. Perhaps it would; but no one can guarantee that. "The beginning of (this) strife is as when one letteth out water. It is better to leave off the contention before it be meddled with."

It should also be counted no small disadvantage that every church which engages in a revision is doing something to remove one of the strong bonds of union between the various branches of English speaking Presbyterianism. Happily it is not the only bond and perhaps not the strongest

one; but it is one which has had an important influence in the past and may be needed again in the future. This is doubtless one of the reasons which has made most of the churches chary of touching the venerable symbol, preferring to attach explanatory statements rather than mutilate its chapters. It may be only a sentiment, but the sentiment of close brotherhood is one to be respected and cherished. It is easier to hold together now than it will be to re-unite the scattered family at a later time.

III. While I do not desire revision and see little to be gained by it, I am on the other hand not alarmed at the prospect of any changes that are likely to be introduced into the confession as the result of it, should it be pressed. I am satisfied that in so far as they will reflect the mind of our church to-day, they will be substantially along the old lines and will reproduce all the important features of the old system. There is no indication of any widespread desire for radical changes, and nothing to show that the church has materially shifted its position since 1875 when by the terms of the union then formed, the various sections of it in the most solemn way re-affirmed their acceptance of the confession as the subordinate standard of faith. The result of any agitation would in all probability be similar to that in the Presbyterian church of the United States where by an overwhelming majority it was decided that the revision should maintain the same system of doctrine as before. The actual revision would consist mainly in the recasting of paragraphs that have been found to be ambiguous and open to sinister construction. It would take away no doctrine that is essential to the general system, it would certainly not add any new dogma to the creed. It would modernize some of the phraseology. It would adjust some of the statements so as to be more in harmony with modern science and modern political conditions. But it would still be the Westminster Confession of faith and would not unfairly be known by that name. There would be some difference of opinion as to whether the new was better than the old; but we should all be able to accept the position of the new as heartily as we do the old. No one would be likely to find himself excluded or his conscience hurt by the change.

IV. There is one objection to the present Confession which I feel has some force, but it is an objection which no revision made by us alone is at all likely to remove, viz., that, being calvinistic, it necessarily makes the church which holds it in some sense sectional. We believe, as the Westminster divines believed, that the system which it sets forth is not only Calvinistic, or Augustinian, but also Pauline and Scriptural. In that fact alone lies the justification for its insertion and retention in the Confession. But it cannot be denied that, rightly or wrongly, a very large and respectable portion of the Evangelical church disputes that interpretation of the Scriptural passages, and puts a somewhat different construction upon them. It is not too much to say that, since the Confession was drawn up Arminianism has largely changed its character, vindicated for itself a place in the Evangelical church, and has made good its right to be regarded as a legitimate development of Christian thought, quite consistent with the most fervent piety and the most earnest aggressive Evangelism. It has not replaced Calvinism, but by its fruits it has established its right to exist beside it and to be recognized. For a church, therefore, to insist upon either type of doctrine to the exclusion of the other in its creed, is to condemn itself to be sectional, to confine itself to a field narrower than that which it ought to recognize and does recognize as the true Church of Christ. We would have no hesitation in affirming that the Methodist churches can never become truly Catholic until

they frankly admit standing room for Calvinism. It is equally true that the Presbyterian churches will never be truly Catholic until they frankly admit standing room for Arminianism in their creed as well as in their membership.

For this sectionalism of the Confession the Westminster divines are little deserving of blame. To them Arminianism was comparatively a new phase of doctrine, and seemed only an aberrant or heretical type of thought, akin to Pelagianism, and little better than Socinianism, at once inconsistent with Scripture and fatal to spiritual life. They were not, as is often supposed, specially narrow-minded or bigoted men, who wished to exclude from the church all but their own particular school of thought. It is worth while to remember that they represented various types, and that the very purpose for which the Confession was drawn up was to furnish a basis of union for the Protestantism of the three kingdoms. The time proved unfavourable for such a project, but that was their misfortune more than their fault. The Confession itself is one of the most Catholic documents since the Reformation. Socinianism, on the one hand, and Sacramentarianism, on the other, it rightly excludes as systems destructive of spiritual life. But it recognizes as belonging to the visible Church "all those throughout the world that profess the true religion and their children." Christian fellowship is to be extended as opportunity offers to all those "who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus." It recognizes the legitimacy, if not the divine authority, of every form of Church government. It admits of every mode of administering the Sacraments except such as involve the real presence. It covers every theory of inspiration that maintains the divine authority of Scripture. It accepts almost every system of eschatology which holds the certainty of the second advent, the immortality of man and the finality of the judgment. It is perhaps not altogether consistent with itself on the subject of religious liberty, but some of its statements have never been surpassed in the largeness of their toleration and respect for freedom of conscience. It is scarcely conceivable that men who were capable of such broad views, Calvinists as they were, would have hesitated about admitting the legitimacy of Arminianism, if it had had behind it the history of the past century of zealous evangelical activity instead of a generation of wretched controversy during which it had toyed with Socinianism and become smirched with treason. Doctrines are known by their fruits as well as by logic.

It may be objected that if we believe predestination to be scriptural and true we have no right to treat it as an open question. But the answer to this is easy. It is not necessary that all truth should be formulated in the church's creed. Some things are essential; but unless we are prepared to claim, against history, that this is vital to the church's life, we are nowise bound to pronounce upon it as an article of faith. If liberty were allowed there would still be as many Calvinists from conviction as there are now, perhaps more; only they would not be confined to one camp, arrayed in senseless hostility against their brethren. When I try to interpret to myself the growing demand for revision, I see in it, not so much dissatisfaction with accepted doctrines, as the desire for Christian union, making earnest godly men willing to sink differences as largely as possible in order that they may band together on the basis of essentials for overcoming the world's ignorance and sin. In so far as it means that it has my sympathy. But for reaching that end I have small hopes from a one-sided revision of a symbol around which so much controversy has gathered.

*Presbyterian College.*



## Contributed Articles.

---

### THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.\*

THE Apostles unanimously testified to the great fact, on the very spot of its alleged occurrence, and to those whose prejudices and passions ran so much the other way that they would have done anything to be able to disprove it. Their testimony was all the stronger as being that of eye-witnesses, and running counter to their previous beliefs and personal interests. They went everywhere "preaching Jesus and the Resurrection." "Now is Christ risen from the dead," was the keynote to their preaching. Their persistent and persuasive announcement of it, won over multitudes, the sincerity of whose faith in it was tested by the willing forfeiture of their worldly goods, and by the patient endurance of severest sufferings.

It cannot, for a moment, be supposed that a lie would be surreptitiously foisted on the Primitive Church and universally received by its members, who actually observed one day every week to commemorate it, though the Divine command and previous usage had sanctioned a different day.

Nor can fraud or fiction account for the marvellous change wrought in the hearts and habits of those who received with cordial faith the glad tidings that now is Christ risen from the dead.

The *Swoon* theory has had its supporters, such as the intensely naturalistic Pantus, and even, in part, the generally high-toned Schleiermacher. It seems an insult to our common sense, and a gross indignity to the illustrious God-man sufferer, to even hint a suspicion as to His having merely swooned upon the Cross, and after coming to, His having escaped from the tomb, and then showed Himself alive to His trusty followers.

1. The history of the Crucifixion is against it. Special precautions were taken by the authorities, as if in anticipation of such an idea, to prevent its possibility, and to render beyond all question the reality of His Death. The inspection revealed him as "dead already," so that the common usage of

---

\* This article contains the main portions of a lecture delivered in the Morrice Hall, on Sabbath afternoon, 15th March, 1885, in connection with the second series of lectures, delivered in connection with the Presbyterian College, Montreal, on "Questions of the Day."

breaking the legs to expedite dissolution, was dispensed with in His case ; but, to make assurance doubly sure, "a soldier with a spear pierced his side," a mortal thrust which, had there been any lingering spark of life, would have at once extinguished it.

2. The *facts* of the *Burial* are against it. How could there have been any resuscitation in such a place, or chance of one with so marred a vision and mutilated a frame emerging from a tomb closed up by such a stone ?

3. The *character of foes* and *friends* is against it. Would the former have been so easy and neglectful as to have allowed it, and would the latter have acted the part they did in the circumstances, or have received such an influence and impetus from so barefaced a deception ?

4. Above all, the character of Jesus is against it. That character was like His coat, "seamless and stainless, woven from the top throughout," and has extorted glowing panegyrics from bitterest enemies of our faith. Would he have ever countenanced such a transparent fraud, or sanctioned the prevalence of a belief that soon became general and world-wide, based on falsehood ? Would he not have emerged from His retreat to disabuse men's minds of the idea ? Celsus, the ablest of the early antagonists of Christianity, sixteen and a-half centuries ago, frankly admits the universality and uniformity of the belief in the fact of the resurrection, though ridiculing the Christians for holding it so firmly on the evidence, as he expresses it, of an "excited woman." On the other hand, Origen, in his masterly reply to Celsus, having respect to the poor morality that was the outgrowth of the new faith, so supported and extended on the ground of this belief, pertinently asked, "Who would reasonably say that the better life which Christianity has produced, diminishing as it does daily, the number of a man's offences could possibly proceed from deceit?"—*Ag. Celsus*, 11., 50.

Nor will the *Spectre* theory do. The disciples were the victims of nervous excitement, say its propounders, supposed that to be His body, which was only His ghost. "The faith in Jesus as the Messiah, which by His violent death had received an apparently fatal shock, was subjectively restored by the instrumentality of the mind, the power of imagination."

We are quite aware of the extravagancies and eccentricities in which a vivid imagination may indulge, but this is no case in point. No heated brains are here ; the very reverse. These disciples are cool and collected enough to question the reality of Christ's different appearances. Hallucina-

tion implies the seeing, or supposing to see, under the influence of undue excitement what really is—not there. But here the truth is that they will not believe what is there—thinking it something else. So incredulous are they that they refuse to take in the evidence of their senses, and Christ has to insist upon it, “It is I myself,” and order them to “handle Him and see.” Not until they availed themselves of this demonstrative evidence, did their spirits, which were unduly depressed rather than elated, take in the true situation. Elation on their part might have given some shadow of countenance to this strange notion, but it was precisely the other way. The extreme depression into which they had sunk, made, not the seeming real, but the real seeming.

Closely connected with this is the *Mythical* theory. When we adduce the Gospels in proof of Christ's resurrection, we are met by those who assert them to be but a collection of legendary stones gathered a hundred years or so after the supposed death of Christ, and published in the second century. How comes it then that profane historians like Tacitus, with no object to gain, prejudiced rather against the Nazarene, writing little over a generation from the time of His alleged death and resurrection, speak of the remarkable progress of the sect He founded, and the persecutions of its adherents, even in the world's metropolis: while Pliny, writing to Trajan, towards the close of the first century, from distant Bithnria, attests its spread to the regions beyond.

A myth is the growth of a lengthened term of years. It springs up in dark places and times. It finds field and food where there is lack of corroborative contemporaneous history.

We could never attach a mythical character to the Crimean, Franco-Prussian and American civil wars, or to any of the prominent public events of the past half century. They come within the range of memory. They occurred in the blaze of day. History supplies its witness in their favour. The New Testament has stood the test of these conditions.

The famous story of William Tell has been noticed as an illustration how myths are evolved. The apple shooting incident is a familiar legend found among the traditions of many peoples, but it has no connection with Swiss Emancipation. Such features as these have been noted: 1. That it occurs in no contemporary narratives of the events. 2. That the first foreshadowing of the legend, but *without the story* of Tell, do not appear till a century

later. 3. That the first account which contains the legend, written 150 years after the event, knows nothing of the name of the chief actor. 4. That his name occurs first in a ballad founded on the legend. 5. That it appears as vivacious history for the first time 200 years and more after the events with which it is connected. 6. Within a century after (in 1607) reliable judges contemplated these doubts as to whether such a person as William Tell ever existed. How unspeakably different the evidence here! By the highest authority a certain play is credited to Sophocles, on the testimony of Cicero, given 400 years after.

Here we can reach back to within a few years of the personages and events in an age of most advanced culture known as the Augustan, and, in addition to the Roman authorities named, we find eminent Jews like Josephus, who would have disputed or disproved if they could, adducing confirmatory testimony. Let those of the Apostolic Fathers be summoned, whose reliability is undoubted, and we discover a singular consensus in favour of the Gospels. Clement of Rome (commonly regarded as that Clement whom Paul mentions in his Epistle to the Philippians, iv., 17), writing to the Corinthian Church in A.D. 97, when John was exiled to Patmos, quotes the first three Evangelists, giving the words he reproduces as those of Jesus Himself. In the Epistle of Barnabas, which is known to have been written close to Clement's, probably, too, during John's lifetime, are quotations from the same three, and references to the fourth Evangelist. Ignatius, a disciple of John's and overseer of the Antioch Church, gives quotations in his epistles from the four Evangelists. Polycarp of Smyrna, also closely related to the beloved Disciple, quotes from one of his epistles as well as from Matthew, Mark and Luke. Irenaens, Polycarp's pupil, cites every book of the New Testament, while Tertullian, writing within 150 years of the last book's publication, furnishes a brief synopsis of nigh every one of them. Papias, a pupil of the Apostles or of their immediate successors, made a harmony of the four Gospels. These Gospels must, therefore, have existed during the first century, and not been foisted on a public the reverse of credulous during the second. Had such a pious fraud been attempted in the *sixth* century, when Mahomet palmed his cunningly devised faith on an ignorant and superstitious age, or during the yet darker after-centuries when the knights errant of Mary did so "with their enchantments," we might not have wondered so much; but to attempt such a thing at the time alleged, was

transparently impossible. It must have roused, too, a resistance of which some mention would have been made, and would have laid an effectual arrest on the progress of that Word which even then so mightily grew and prevailed that nothing could resist its advance.

It is worthy of notice that Renan breaks with Baur and Strauss on the later authorship of Mark and Luke, freely granting that the Gospel of Mark was really written by the associate of Peter, and that of Luke by Paul's fellow-traveller, who also wrote the Acts. Among more recent German critics there is a growing disposition to concede the first Gospel to be really the work of an apostle and eye-witness. Semi-Rationalists, like Ewald and Black, incline to this view as opposed to the Tübingen school, holding Matthew's Gospel to be an ordinately good historical record of the first century. Even Strauss himself counts Matthew trustworthy enough to found an estimate of the Saviour's life upon. Renan admits Luke to have been with Paul at Jerusalem and Casarea, during his two year's imprisonment, in meeting all the time with those "which from the beginning were eye-witnesses." To him, writing within a quarter of a century or so of the resurrection, all the facts and features would be fresh, especially as he, a man of education and refinement, tells us he made it his special business to "write in order," having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first.

The genuineness of the first three Gospels, at all events, is thus settled, and as for the fourth, Westcott and Mozeley in England and Luthardt in Germany, have seized the ground and spiked the guns of the so-called higher criticism. Drias, the Hulsian lecturer for '84, in his doctrinal system of St. John, has convincingly shown that "the only possible explanation of the form in which the doctrinal matter contained in the fourth Gospel comes down to us, is, that the writer is accurately reporting to us, as from his own lips, the teaching of Jesus Christ."

In Dr. Sanday's "Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel," every chapter of that Gospel is carefully and critically analysed, and internal evidence of the Johannic authorship clearly demonstrated. Even M. Reville admits that "every assault on the genuineness of St. John's Gospel, up to his own, has been successfully repulsed;" and Professor Ewald, whom no one can accuse of partiality to the orthodox side after his unsparing treatment of the Old Testament, declares that "no man who does not knowingly choose error and reject truth can dare to say that the fourth Gospel is not the work of St. John."

Nor do we forget how the author of "Supernatural Religion," that occasioned on its first appearance such "vain confidence of boasting" in the infidel camp, had to attempt re-moulding and re-mounting his ingenious pieces of intellectual artillery which Bishop Lightfoot's unanswerable articles in the "Contemporary Review" had shivered to pieces. And yet this most loudly vaunted of any modern infidel work, which, though ingenious as the reverse of ingenuous, had the hardihood to assert with her usual blatant blinking of all rebutting testimony, (S. R. p. 519.) The whole of the evidence for the resurrection reduces itself to an undefined belief on the part of a few persons, in a notoriously superstitious age, that after Jesus had died and been buried "they had seen Him alive."

It has been incontrovertibly shown by superabundant evidence, that "the belief of the original witnesses was so clear that it completely revolutionized their national expectation, so energetic that it changed their whole character, so vivid that it was from the very first expressed in rites which symbolize with most remarkable power—"the fundamental thought of life through death." But even supposing it could be shown, which it never has been, nor can be, that Matthew, Mark and Luke were not written till between 70 or 80 years after the date usually ascribed to them, and that the Gospel of John is a forgery, dating from A.D., 171, we have left to us from Apostolic Epistles which, "the enemies themselves being judges," go back to eight-and-twenty years from Christ's Death, making frequent allusions to the resurrection of Christ, all the more remarkable that they are undesigned. These four, known as the greater Epistles of Paul, were addressed to the Churches of Rome and Galatia, and two to the Churches at Corinth. The genuineness of these Pauline letters dating from within a generation of Christ's Resurrection, is attested by some of the subtlest of antagonists of Christianity. That these were really written by Paul during his third Missionary Journey, Renan considers "*incontestables et incontestées*" (indisputable and undisputed.) That distinguished Frenchman further adds that "the most severe critic, such as Christian Bauer, accept them without objection." Let me remind you at this point of the value and importance of epistolary correspondence as a department of evidence. The History of Rome between 100 and 150 years, B.C., has a flood of light cast on it by the letters of Cicero, written a century before Paul's. This abounds with references to momentous events, in which that great orator and statesman took part. In

these frequent allusions—all the more reliable because unstudied, thrown out with easy naturalness and without the semblance of design,—we get an insight into the springs of the events and the agencies that brought them about, the real inwardness of them, better than in the statelier histories which are written often under strong bias, and get coloured and distorted by prejudice and partisanship.

In these four Letters of Paul, we are brought “en rapport” with the most active agent of the Infant Church, at a time when his mind was clear and collected. When Paul was aged, he was not what could be called an old man, for he was under three score and ten when the axe of the executioner released that heroic soul from its frail body. His eye was not dim, and took in the over score of years of his missionary life in the interest of that faith which once he destroyed, and as many years besides as would bring him back to the time of Christ’s ministry ; so that everything would come within the range of his recollection, and there could be no room for the growth of fictions superceding the genuine events in the life of the founder of Christianity. These can grow and accumulate only when the memory of events has lost its freshness, and the generation that saw them has passed away. Ten years at furthest (some think only five) elapsed between the crucifixion of Christ and the conversion of Paul. A keen intellect like his must have known fully the beliefs of the Church : must have scrutinized closely the tenets of the new society. When, from being exceeding mad against it, he becomes its ablest advocate, there must have been adequate ground for the change. He was the very opposite of the sort of man to be either a deceiver or deceived. He was not the stuff that imposters or enthusiasts are made of. You know his position and prospects, what he forfeited by adhering to the new faith, and what he had to face. You can recall the memorable list of the “perils” through which he passed. Did he endure such privations and persecutions for the maintenance of a strong delusion ? When one of his calibre and character said so positively, “Have not I seen,” “At last, He was seen of me also,” could he have believed a lie ? Look into these letters of his, written so close to the era of the Resurrection ; in the 1st chapter of Romans, Paul declares Jesus’ resurrection the proof of His Divinity. In chapter 2nd, that “God shall judge the secrets of men by *Jesus Christ*,” assigning to the resurrected Christ the Judgment Throne. The 4th chapter, verse 24-5, announces His Righteousness as imputed to Jew

and Gentile alike, on this condition "if we believe on Him that *raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead*, who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification." "We shall be *saved by His Life*" is the testimony of Romans v., 17. In the 6th chapter, 3-11, an elaborate argument is entered into, which involves, as the others do, the universal and unhesitating recognition of Christ's resurrection as a fundamental fact, "as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so, we also." If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also *live with Him*, knowing that Christ is *raised from the dead*. In Romans vii. 4, Christians are described by a marital figure, as divorced from the law, "that they should be married to another, *even to Him who is raised from the dead*." The resurrections of the Saviour and the Saints are brought into juxtaposition in Romans viii., 10, 11, "If the Spirit of Him that *raised up Jesus*;" in v. 17, he declares that "we suffer, etc., *glorified together*." Towards the close of this chapter comes that triumphant burst, "Who shall," "yea, rather, who is *risen again*." In Romans x., 6-9, describing the "Righteousness which is of faith," he shows that it is not necessary to descend into the deep "to *bring up Christ again from the dead*," and then gives the terms of salvation thus: "That if thou believe in thine heart that God hath *raised Him from the dead*, thou shalt be saved." In Romans xiv., 7-9, he tells us that "Christ both *died and rose* that He might be the Lord both of the dead and living." In 1 Corinthians, Christians are described as "waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ, (i., 7, 8.) They are told to "judge nothing before the time *till the Lord come*, (ii., 5.) They are spoken of as gathering together for worship in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ. Discipline is ordained in the Church on backsliding members "that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus, (v. 4, 5.) "*Till He come*" is the limit assigned in the observance of the Lord's Supper, (1 Corinthians xi., 36.) What meaning can we attach to the "power and coming of our Lord Jesus," if He is here and not risen? What sense in the Sacrament? If Christ be not risen, this sacred Feast, which has been observed through entire Christendom, becomes a delusion and a snare, instead of, through its constant and universal observance, carrying us up by the highest form of historical testimony to the very date of the death it commemorates. In chapter ix., the resurrection of Christ comes in as the seal of His apostoli-



icity, "Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord!" The references in 1 Cor., reach a grand climax in the 15th chapter, 3-20. No one can impartially read these seventeen verses without having fostered in time the conviction that the Church in its New Testament form was reared on a recognition of the fact that Christ is not here but is risen. However split up into parties the Church at Corinth was, one saying, "I am Paul, etc.," they all held by this great historical fact, which, had it not been true, their mutual antipathies and antagonisms would have undoubtedly led many of them to question. However much they might differ on other matters, they were thoroughly at one on this. Even *De Witte*, with all his rationalistic leanings, says in his commentary, "The testimony of the age decides as to the certainty of the fact, nor forget that it can be proved almost to an absolute demonstration that this first Letter to Corinth was written less than thirty years from the time of Christ's Crucifixion." Does any one doubt it? Then, in doing so, you differ entirely from the most eminent infidels in Europe, who frankly concede that this and the other three Letters were written by Paul, and about the time generally claimed. Remember, too, Paul's statement that this thing was not done in a corner, and that the greater part of the 500 witnesses of the Resurrection were alive at the time he wrote, who could and would have refuted it, were it false.

Paul's second Letter to Corinth is not less explicit. He opens it by imploring in their behalf "grace and peace" from the "Lord Jesus Christ," equally with "God the Father." He seeks and bestows forgiveness, not in his own name but "in *the person of Christ*," (2-8.) He *bare about* continually in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the *Life of Jesus* might be manifest in his mortal body; knowing this, that He that raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." There is a direct statement, and an inference as well. In his esteem, Christ's resurrection did underlie all Christian thought, was the basis of all true self-sacrifice, and the stimulus to all holy activity: for we thus judge, says he, that if one died for all, then were all dead, etc., and should not henceforth live unto themselves, but "unto Him that died for them and rose again," (2 Cor. v., 13, 15.)

The first two chapters of the Epistle to the *Galatians* bring out with singular amplitude of recital and illustration the fact that the Resurrection of Christ was the sole ground of the reconstructed Church. He makes it the

basis of his claim to Apostolical authority, which a portion of the Galatians had disputed. But the Resurrection to which he clung so tenaciously, they held by not less firmly. He owed it to his knowing Christ "in the power of His Resurrection," and, "being risen with Christ," (expressions in Philippians and Colossians which reflect additional light on this great fact) that, from being a bitter persecutor he became the foremost preacher of the new faith. When three years after his great change, he went up to Jerusalem and sojourned and conferred fifteen days with Peter and James, he got from them nothing to alter but everything to confirm his view. So with a subsequent visit, fourteen years after, to the headquarters of the Christian faith, when he told to its recognized leaders the Gospel he preached, whose substance was "Jesus and the Resurrection," they "added nothing to him." With those "pillars of the Church, James, Cephas and John," their "beloved brother Paul" agreed. Their testimony, we learn from Luke's history in the Acts, was uniform. They never deviated from it. There was no collusion or collision. "This Jesus hath God raised up whereof we all are witnesses." "We are witnesses of all things which He did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem, whom they slew and hanged on a tree. Him God raised up the third day and showed Him openly, not unto all the people but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us *who did eat and drink* with Him after He rose from the dead," (Acts ii. 3, x. 32, iii. 15, iv. 20.)

These quotations we have given from the four larger Epistles of Paul, show what his own belief was on this matter, and how thoroughly it harmonized with the beliefs of his brethren. They reveal also what the members of these respective Churches believed, all the more strongly that the evidences though often direct and positive, are oftener incidental and inferential, which last, in any epistolary correspondence, as being off-hand and unintentional, have more weight than the other. The faith of these Churches in this great outstanding fact he stays not to substantiate, but taking for granted that they had attained to like precious faith with others, and were partakers of what was by this time, what Jude called, "common Salvation," he proceeds to build upon it. The keen sectarianism that had crept into the Corinthian Church, and the erroneous views on vital points that had upsprung within the Galatian, make it certain that could they have invalidated in the least his averments with reference to the Resurrection of Christ, they would have done it. But though party feeling ran very high at Corinth, to the disparagement of

Paul—and the “foolish Galatians” had gone so far astray as to have come under the influence of what the apostle terms “another Gospel,”—he never hints their having denied the Resurrection, a position which, as evidence of their devotion to their new teachers, they would have taken up, doubtless, if they could. We gather thence also, for they are inseparably linked, what were the views on the subject of the Churches at Jerusalem and Antioch, the one the capital of Jewish, the other of Gentile Christianity.

With the same confidence does Paul speak of the Roman faith on this great fact. With the founding of the Church at this the world's metropolis, unlike Corinth and Galatia, he had had nothing to do. It could never be said that he had exercised an overweening influence in securing their adhesion. Yet “they of Italy, and chiefly they that were of Cæsar's household,” ranked as foremost, first-class Christians, and the faith of the Romans was “spoken of throughout the whole world.” The thought of the Epistle's opening permeates every part of it, namely, that Jesus was declared to be “the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of Holiness by the Resurrection from the dead,” (Luke 4)

Thus, these Letters, written in the confidence of Christian friendship by the most famous advocate of the Christian faith, and less than thirty years from the Crucifixion of its founder, proceed on the assumption of the reality of His Resurrection, which for over two centuries thereafter, was never called in question. They thus confirm the statements in the Gospels and Acts, the whole forming a triple cord which no force can break. “Such Scriptures cannot be broken” has been attested by many who have tried this tug-of-war.

Much has been made of some discrepancies in the Evangelical narratives, but these are of the most trivial kind and are capable of satisfactory explanation. Suffice it too, to meet all such objections in the terms of the most eminent organ of modern scepticism: “It is useless,” says the *Westminster Review*, “to carp at small minor details. All histories contain variations or, if you like to call them, contradictions on minor points. This has been the case with every history that has been written from Herodotus to Mr. Froude”

M. Renan declares that “Miracles never happen but in times and countries where they are believed, and before persons willing to believe them.” Is not this precisely the reverse of the truth? Can he have forgotten how many of Christ's miracles were performed in presence of his enemies, and

that they were "filled with madness" because of them? How many witnesses of Lazarus' resurrection were exceeding mad because of it? Need I recall further the graphic scene of the cure of the blind man which fills almost the entire 9th. John. And so, in connection with His own resurrection, and which, if John was not its author, must have been written by some unknown Shakespeare. Hence the decoys used and deception practised by His foes to do away with the impression of it, while His timid friends were so slow of heart to take it in. It is simply false to assert that the witnesses were credulous, and that no investigation was made. Were there any weak points in the narratives of the New Testament, would not a keen Jew like Josephus have noted it? Would not the Talmud, that singular collection of the traditions of Jewish faith and usages, collected and compiled about the middle of the 2nd century, have directed attention to it? Would the public records of the Roman Empire have made allusion to the more prominent events referred to in the Gospels? Would Justin Martyr and Tertullian have appealed to the "Acts of Pilate," which were included among the Roman archives, to attest the substantial correctness of the Gospel narratives? Would not Porphyry and Celsus, and Julian the apostate, have been only too glad of the chance to expose the fraud? Their entire silence as to any error having been committed should satisfy the most sceptical of the correctness of the sacred record respecting the resurrection, and consequently of the truth of all the secondary and subordinate details.

In the face of such incontrovertible considerations, it involves a credulity far greater than to receive this and all the other miracles of Scripture, persistently to reject them, and to charge with inposition or fanaticism those who palmed them on the public at an after era, without any reclamation on the part of those living at the time.

This greatest of the Christian miracles--the Resurrection of Christ--fully stands the test of the four conditions of the credibility of a miracle laid down by Leslie, the great apologist of the last century, in his "Short and Easy Method with the Deist." These conditions are: First--that the facts should be of such a nature that men's senses can clearly and fully judge of them. Next, that they should have been performed publicly. Third, that public monuments should have been set up and outward actions performed in memory of the acts thus publicly wrought, and, Fourth--that the monuments should have been set up and these actions and observances instituted

at the very time when these events took place and have continued without interruption afterwards.

Weighed in these balances the so-called miracles of Mahomet and Mary, not to speak of the Montarist of earlier or the Mormenite of more recent times, are "found wanting." But the proofs of Christ's resurrection were, as we have seen, patent to the senses and publicly exhibited and there are institutions that have existed since its occurrence and continue to this day, which are designed to commemorate it. These have been kept up publicly, periodically and continuously, from the beginning of the Christian era until now. We have undoubted evidence of their establishment contemporaneously with the great event they are intended to commemorate, which critically has come forth unscathed from the ordeal of a scrutiny, to which no other historical event has ever been subjected. The existence of the Christian Church is proof of the Resurrection.

It rests on this fact. Remove this keystone and the "ruin of this house would be great" as it would be inevitable. The early ministers of the church were commissioned especially to be "Witnesses of the Resurrection." Had this been false, the whole system would have fallen to the ground. As Paul told the King and the Governor, "this thing was not done in a corner." It could have been easily disproved and were it possible, there were opponents enough having heart and mind to do it—the infant system would have been strangled in the birth—had a fraud been detected and exposed. But instead of this it grew with amazing rapidity into gigantic proportions unlike the system of the false prophet, with no adventitious attractions, with no weapons of the warrior, and right in the face of the prejudices and prepossessions, the inclinations and interests of men. We know Luke's witness in the first Church history, and Pliny's letter to the Emperor. Tacitus the great Roman Historian—a Pagan—and contemporary of the Apostles, writing sixty years after the resurrection and six years after the writing of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, speaks of the "vast multitude" of Christians all through the Empire.

*Justin Martyr* writing some twenty years after the date of Pliny's letter declares, and it was no "vain confidence of boasting," that there was "no nation nor even uncivilized tribe dwelling in tents in which prayer was not offered through a crucified Jesus to the Father and Creator of all." Half a century later, *Tertullian* exclaims, "We are but of yesterday, yet we have

filled your cities, islands, towns and boroughs, the camp, the senate and the farm. We have left you nothing but the temples of your gods." It is no evanescent excitement like some of the "sins" of the past and the present. It has gone from strength to strength. Their views as the drops of dew from the womb of the morning was the dew of its growth, and in old age, when other systems fade, now that it has gathered on its brow the snows of centuries it fruit, shall forth shall bring.

We have memorials of the resurrection of Christ, in that day which the Lord hath made and the feast which we celebrate in his honor "till he come."

The Bythinian Governor writes to the Emperor A.D. 97 of the Christians meeting for worship "on a stated day" (*stata die*) and binding themselves by a "sacramentum" to do no evil.

If our contention be not true, then when we meet in His temple and at His table, the Sabbath and the Sacrament memorializes not victory but defeat, not an infallible truth, but an infamous lie. We can't conceive of Americans the world over, at home and abroad, keeping the 4th July if there was no War of Independence, or the 22nd February, if there was no such man as Washington.

We can't conceive of colored people observing the 1st of August if West India Emancipation was never achieved. So with other well known anniversaries. Their continued observance proves the occurrence of the events commemorated. Much less can we conceive of men of every nation, for here there is no limit to any color or country, to any rank or race, commemorating periodically the Lord's Death, and once every week, in the face of previous custom, the Lord's resurrection, if it be not true that Jesus died and rose again according to the Scriptures. We never doubt that the events memorialized happened, in the other cases, why should we in this? especially when the evidence that the Lord is risen indeed, is so much clearer and stronger.

Much of the Scripticism of the present and the past has its source in ignorance, though this they be willingly ignorant of. Many of the foremost Infidels know neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm and are open to the Master's rebuke "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." Not a few by candid investigation have been won over. We are told of Thomas Lord Lyttleton that "in early life he had been led to entertain

doubts of the truth of Revelation, but a serious inquiry into the evidences of the Christian Religion produced in his mind a firm conviction of its divine authority in which he persisted to the end of his life." His "Dissertation on the Conversion of St. Paul," published in 1747, was the fruit of this charge, a work unanswered as it is unanswerable.

*Gilbert West*, one of the acutest sceptics of the last century, sitting down to write against Christianity, was constrained by the sheer force of truth to write one of the ablest treatises ever published in its favor. Taking into account then the personal attestation of the fact by the Apostles, the circumstances under which St. Paul was led to proclaim it, its relation to Christ's whole work, the transformation which it affected in the opinions and conduct of the first disciples, to its continuous efficiency in the life, to the cloud of witnesses who sealed their testimony in its behalf with their blood, to the existing memorials of its reality and power, and to the wonders wrought under the inspiration of this great verity of our faith in the Church and the world, it can surely not be hard for us to subscribe to the matured verdict of so competent a judge as Westcott, that, "taking all the evidence together *there is no single historical incident* better, or more formidably supported, than the resurrection of Christ."

We would like, had our space not been fully exhausted, to have dwelt a little on some of those truths or doctrines with which the Resurrection of Christ is associated, and which it serves to establish. We must content ourselves with indicating without attempting to illustrate :

1. That on it we might base an argument for the Divine original of the Holy Scriptures.
2. That by His resurrection, the real character of Christ, His Divinity equally with His Humanity, is attested.
3. That it is inseparably linked also with His double work of atonement made and advocacy making, revealing the sufficiency and the satisfactoriness of both.
4. We might further show how that the resurrection of Christ precedes and proclaims the penal Resurrection, "that now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept." Christ the first-fruits, afterwards, they that are Christ's at His coming
5. It might also be made apparent, as we hinted at the beginning, how the Church rests, and, indeed, the whole system of Christianity is reared on

the great fact, whose reality it has been our special object in this article to establish. Is it truly so, as we have tried to show, that Christ rose again according to the Scriptures. "He is not here but is risen," then in the establishment of His greatest of the miracles of Scripture, is included the truth of all the rest. Were it possible for any infidel Samsen to grasp this main pillar of the temple of our faith and make it totter to its fall, the whole would come down with a crash, involving its friends and foes alike in irretrievable ruin. But though often touched it has never trembled. We can say of it, as did its architect and builder of the great light-house that stood sentinel at the gate of the Atlantic (the Eddystone), after the most terrible storm that had ever swept that coast, as looking through the mist and spray the morning after, he discovered its stately form towering over the surging deep, "I thank God—it stands!" *Laus Deo!*

This light-house of our faith, the pillar and ground of the truth, rests on the living Rock. That rock is Christ. Against it the winds of controversy, the waves of error, have beaten in vain. Systems founded on the sand have fallen. Their rock is not our Rock, the enemies themselves being judges. He, whose glorious rising again we have been considering, is *the Rock*. His work is perfect. Therefore, come what may, we need not tremble for the Ark of our Refuge, for this imperishable monument, nor shall we fear even though the earth rises from the Rock of our Salvation.

R. F. BURNS.

*Halifax*



## THE POSSIBLE AND THE IMPOSSIBLE FOR THEOLOGICAL COLLEGES.

MR. CLERICUS had just completed his theological course. There was a vacancy in the Smithtown congregation and Mr. Clericus was asked to give them a day. He consented and the date was fixed. Great expectations reigned in Presbyterian circles in Smithtown. The local papers announced that Mr. Clericus had won a string of medals in his University, that he had carried off many prizes in the Divinity Hall, that he was one of the rising lights of the denomination, and several other things highly complimentary to Mr. Clericus. It was also whispered about—confidentially of course—that several letters had been received from learned professors and other prominent people, saying that Mr. Clericus was the right man for Smithtown, or something to that effect. In due time the young preacher appeared in the pulpit and disappointed nearly everybody. No one could say exactly what the weak points were, but the one thing everybody admitted was that the preacher had made no impression. He did not move the people. His reading of the hymns and Scriptures, his prayers, his sermon, seemed to be almost faultless, and yet there was a general feeling that no strong, effective work had been done. The really good, hopeful people said the young man would no doubt have more power when he got more experience. The grumblers wondered why the session did not get better supply. Some good old ladies, who had been accustomed to strong spiritual diet in Scotland, said he was a nice young man, but rather feckless. There was also some criticism of a highly metallic kind. A number of people who supported the college in which the young man had studied, muttered something which if condensed and put into an interrogative form would amount to this:

IS THAT ALL THE COLLEGE CAN DO?

Call the foregoing a fancy sketch if you will. The leading features of the case may be seen almost any day by anybody who takes an interest in such matters. Assuming that the facts are as stated, was the college responsible for that young man's failure to make an impression? Possibly his

college training was largely responsible; probably it was just a little responsible; perhaps it was no more responsible for the failure than for the squeeze at Barings banking house the other day.

Phillips Brooks holds that there are just two elements in real preaching—Truth and Personality. Assuming this theory to be correct we have at once a test by which we can make a diagnosis of a pulpit failure and say, with an approximation to correctness, whether the college or the man is responsible. If the preacher failed because he had no truth worth presenting, or because he dealt in half truths, or because he did not know how to shape and present truth for pulpit purposes, certainly his college was, at least, partly to blame. Assuming that the Personality was a reasonably good one, the Exegetical professor should have shown him how to dig suitable truth out of the mine, the Systematic professor should have shown him the proper relations of truth and, beyond all doubt, the business of the professor of Homiletics and Sacred Rhetoric was to have shown him how to use truth for preaching purposes. The Personality is the cannon, or rifle, or pistol, as the case may be, and the professors should certainly tell the Personality what kind of ammunition to use, how to load, how to aim and how to fire. That, however, is about all they can do or should be expected to do. On the truth side of the problem they can do much, but what can they do for the Personality? Precious little. If the Personality has no brains no college in the world can put brains into his head. If the Personality is constitutionally lazy—*inertia* is the word applied to ministers, but a lazy student must be called lazy until he finishes his course—no college can make him industrious. If the personality is lacking in proper motive power the college can do little for him. A Personality that has no natural aptitude for addressing men—that has no power of expression—no capacity for putting truth into bullets and hitting people with them—can never be made a successful preacher. The college may help him, of course; but making a man a little less useless than he was, does not always mean making him useful.

In an admirable lecture delivered about a quarter of a century ago in Andover, and published in his "Building Eras," Bushnell throws a flood of strong, clear light on the possible and impossible for theological seminaries. There are, says that masterly writer and pulpit prince, four canonical talents which are commonly supposed to make a good preacher, namely, "a talent of high scholarship; a metaphysical and theologic thinking talent; a style or

a talent for expression, and a talent of manner and voice for speaking." But, says Bushnell, a man may have all these and be no preacher. "He may be a scholar and yet no preacher; he may be a tough thinker and great metaphysician and yet no preacher; gifted in style, or thought to be, and yet no preacher; an accomplished and fine speaker and yet no preacher. Whence it follows that he may be all four and yet no preacher."

Now we think it will be admitted on all hands that the college can do something in the way of improving and developing these four canonical talents. It goes unsaid that the college is the place to obtain proficiency in the first two. Style, or the talent for expression, is partly a natural talent, but it may be greatly improved by a good professor. The speaking talent, Bushnell holds, is "mostly a natural talent" which may be "modulated and chastened by criticism." If mostly a natural talent, it follows that the college can never make a good speaker out of a student who has no natural aptitude for speaking. Spurgeon says that when the Lord intends a man for a preacher he always gives him a good mouth for public speaking. If he has a poor mouth, or a cracked voice, unstrung nerves or a weak pair of lungs, it is very clear that the college can never improve the physique by any amount of lecturing.

Besides these four canonical talents, Bushnell contends there are six or seven others highly necessary, if not absolutely indispensable in successful preaching, and when we have stated these it will, we think, be quite clear that there are a few things no college on earth can do for a student. The first Bushnell calls the *talent for growth*. Some men, he contends, grow up to a certain limit, but never grow an inch farther. You wait for them, but they never come. They have not the "faculty of improvableness." They lack the "talent of improvability." Have we not all seen just such men. They preached as well at the beginning or middle of their college course as at the end of it. They could preach as well, or perhaps better, the day they were licensed than they could ten years afterwards. Now we submit that if a student has no capacity for growth, or, to use Bushnell terms, no "faculty of improvableness"—no "talent of improvability"—the college can never make much of him. Probably this talent of improvability makes the main part of the difference between ultimate success and failure. A great political leader of this country has among his followers a class that he describes as "improving men." Most of them have shown themselves worthy of their classification.

Bushnell's second talent he calls "*individualizing power*" in delivery. The preacher who has this power looks his hearers straight in the eyes and makes them think that he is addressing them individually. The preacher who has no individualizing power sees nobody in particular. For all practical purposes his eyes might as well be shut. In some cases they are. A preacher of this kind, Bushnell observes, is like a "gunner firing into Charleston five miles off." Now if a young man is so constructed that he cannot look people squarely in the face when he addresses them, no college can help him much. If he must look at his manuscript, or if he is too timid or too nervous to look at his hearers, we doubt very much if the professors can give him this individualizing power.

Bushnell's third talent is, perhaps, more important than any of the others mentioned. It is "*a great soul.*" He assumes that a man may have the four canonical talents mentioned and all the others necessary or indispensable, and yet have a very small soul, or no soul at all. If his soul is small, or if he has no soul at all, no matter what his other qualifications may be, he never can be a great preacher. If his soul is small, "his motives may be visibly selfish, his judgments may be weak, his impulse small, his action fussy and dry, his resentments petty, his jealousies contemptible, his prejudices shallow and pitiful, and the whole cast of his nature mean." Is it necessary to say that if a student has no soul the college can never put a soul into him. Nor need it be added that if his soul is naturally small the best professors in the world can never make it much larger. A small-souled man, or a man absolutely soulless, may be made a scholar, but no power short of omnipotence can make a soulless or small-souled man a good preacher.

Along with a great soul Bushnell thinks a good preacher must have *a great conscience*, the "*talent of a firmly accentuated moral nature.*" "A man may plainly enough be a great scholar, metaphysician, rhetorician, speaker in the artistic way, and yet have only a weak, scarcely pronounced conscience." Certainly the college is not responsible for the consciences of students, though just as certainly the Presbyteries that send them to college are.

But this paper has already grown beyond the limits intended, and we leave Bushnell's remaining "talents" for some future day. Enough has been said to make it reasonably clear that colleges are often expected to do impossible things. If a young preacher fails in a pulpit effort, somebody is

almost certain to growl something about the "young men the colleges are turning out." It would be difficult to show that young men have not just as good a right to preach poor sermons as old men have. If a candidate for license makes a poor appearance before a Presbytery some father or brother may always be depended on to say something uncomplimentary about the college he studied in. Quite likely two-thirds of the members who asked questions could not answer them correctly themselves. Perhaps many of the questions were so vague and general that any one of twenty answers would have been as correct as any that could be given. Probably some of the queries were intended to display the profound erudition or smartness of the questioner rather than test the attainments of the candidate for license. Colleges can do a great deal for young men and are doing a great deal, but it is just as unfair to blame them for not making good preachers of all students as it would be to blame pastors for not making good Christians of all their hearers. As Professor Young used to say at the close of his lectures—more anon.

KNOXONIAN.

---

The blood is oft purer when let ;  
A failure oft strengthens the will ;  
True love is more firm when beset ;  
And the godly take good out of ill.

—GUILLAUME DE CHATEAUGUAY.

## THE OLDEST CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN THE WORLD.

**I**N the city of Rome, not very far from the great Basilica of S. Maria Maggiore, on the Via Urbana which follows the line of the valley between the Viminal and Esquiline hills, near where it crosses the important thoroughfare of the Quattro Fontane, stands the church of S. Pudentiana. It is of no great size and is not specially beautiful, but it well repays a visit from the tourist, for it is traditionally the oldest church in Rome and has a fair claim to be regarded as the oldest Christian temple now standing on the face of the earth.

The grade of the street in front of it has been raised at various times, perhaps thirty feet above the original level of the valley, and we have to descend a flight of steps for about ten feet in order to reach the court in which the church stands. The façade of the building is somewhat showy with bright pictures in mosaic, but is of doubtful taste and quite modern, having been erected by Cardinal Buonaparte. The doorway in the centre, however, is over 800 years old, and carries us back to the time of Gregory VII, who partially reconstructed the building. The interior is arranged in the older basilica style, that is, with a nave and two side aisles, but without a transept, and, as usual, is flanked with a row of chapels on each side, some of them ornamented with handsome paintings and sculptures. Cardinal Wiseman took his title from this church, and his hat hangs suspended from the ceiling. The most striking feature of the interior, however, is a splendid picture in glass mosaic adorning the vault of the rounded apse at the far end of the nave behind the high altar. This mosaic is supposed by some to be the oldest specimen of such work in the city, and is put by them in the fourth century; but the evidence points rather to the end of the eighth century, in the time of Adrian I. who was Pope from 772 to 795. He is said by Anastasius, a contemporary writer, to have restored the church after it had fallen into ruins, and to have built this apse. However that may be, it is certainly one of the finest to be seen anywhere in Rome. It represents Christ seated in the centre of the foreground, holding an open book in his hand on which is written, "Dominus Conservator Ecclesiæ Pudentianæ."

## THE OLDEST CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN THE WORLD. 199

On either side of Him are a number of figures, including the apostles Peter and Paul, with Pudentiana and Praxedis, two daughters of one Pudens, placing wreaths upon the heads of the apostles. The head of Christ is the only one of the group which is surrounded by a halo. In the background stand several palatial buildings within an enclosure, supposed to represent the house of Pudens and a church, while above in the clouds are a jewelled cross and the four living creatures of the Apocalypse, as symbols of the Evangelists. As is frequently the case with such early mosaics, the picture is intended to tell us something of the origin of the church and to preserve the memory of its founder.

The earliest tradition regarding it is set forth in a narrative purporting to have been written by one Pastor, a Presbyter of the second century. The extract is too long to be given here in full, but it states substantially that Pudens was a wealthy Christian who founded an oratory in his own house for the assembling of the brethren; that a baptistery was added to this after his death by his two daughters, Pudentiana and Praxedis, in the time of Bishop Pius, who with his own hand drew the plan of the font, and in it baptized many converts; that Novatus, their brother, had erected a public bath adjoining this baptistery; that on his death this fell into the hands of Praxedis, his only surviving sister, who offered the use of the large hall which it contained for a church, and that this also was consecrated by Pius in memory of Pudentiana. The older oratory still continued to exist, and was used as a place of concealment during the persecutions under Marcus Aurelius, indicating that it was for some reason in a specially retired situation. This emperor is said to have put to death twenty-three persons found there at one time, including a Presbyter named Simetrius. Their bodies were collected by Praxedis for burial, and a sponge is still shown under one of the altars as being the one with which she gathered up the blood of these martyrs.

Assuming the authenticity of this narrative of Pastor, the church must have been used from about the middle of the second century. The date of the episcopate of Pius is not exactly known, being variously given between 140 and 167, but it falls somewhere within that period. Aurelius was emperor from 161 to 180. His persecution of the Christians in Rome was intermittent, but it began not long after the commencement of his reign. These dates alone would entitle the church to stand at the head of the list

in point of age, with one possible exception, that, in the recently discovered house of Clement beyond the Colosseum. But, according to the account given, the original oratory of Pudens would be a good many years earlier. Just how much earlier, it is not very easy to say. The Pudens of this tradition is by many identified with the person of that name mentioned by Paul in his second epistle to Timothy as sending him greetings along with Eubulus, Linus and Claudia (2 Tim. 4, 21). And the later Roman tradition accepting this identification has embellished the story by declaring that this house of Pudens was one of those frequented by the apostles Peter and Paul, and one in which they frequently held service. A marble slab is shown in the church as one at which Peter celebrated mass. Attempts have further been made by several scholars and archaeologists to show that this Pudens was an officer who had served in Britain and that Paul's Claudia was a British princess named Gladys, daughter of the famous Caractacus, whom Pudens had married, while Linus, afterwards bishop of Rome, was her brother. These identifications are all a little precarious, though not without considerable evidence, which may be found discussed at length in McClintock and Strong's Cyclopædia. If we accept them, it would carry the origin of this church back to the time of the Apostle Paul, before the year 68. But even if we reject them, it might well bring the date of the oratory within the first century, provided the statements of Pastor can be substantiated.

The value of Pastor's narrative has been much questioned, and it is certainly not altogether free from suspicion of having been interpolated at a date much later than the second century. It cannot be denied, however, that it finds very remarkable confirmation in the building before us.

As has already been indicated, the apse of the choir and the mosaic in its vaulting are probably to be referred to the end of the eighth century, but portions of the building are manifestly much older than that. As we pass into the left aisle we discover that it runs considerably further back than the choir, and that the extension is floored with a marble mosaic pavement different from the rest and of very ancient style. On going outside the church we find also a straight wall standing some distance behind the apse of the choir, in line with the end of the aisle. The apse has evidently been built within the original building, shortening the nave considerably, perhaps in order to leave room for a sacristy. This original end wall is pronounced



by competent judges to belong to the close of the first century. It contains a number of window openings which have been filled up with brickwork of the second century. The fact that it is straight and not rounded, shows that the building was probably not erected for the purpose of a church, but for some other use, and at once suggests the baths of Novatus, which are stated by Pastor to have been converted into a church in the second century. Other remains of ancient walls adjoining the church are pointed out by the sacristan as portions of the house of Pudens. A still more interesting part of the building, however, still remains to be noted.

Below the present church is an extensive crypt, which is entirely unused and was long unknown to exist. It had been filled up with earth at some one of the many reconstructions of the church and so was inaccessible, until about 1870, when through the exertions of Mr. Parker, an English archæologist, enough was cleared out to make an examination of the place possible. Owing to the raising of the street and the filling up of the valley, this crypt is now quite underground and must have been so from a very early period. The windows which once gave light to the crypt are now closed up; but evidence of its former occupation are still quite apparent. The candles supplied by the sacristan give only a faint glimmer of light in the Egyptian darkness that prevails, but as he leads us about we perceive that the crypt consists of three long chambers corresponding somewhat to the nave and aisles above. The separating walls are pierced by arches that have apparently been strengthened as if to support a greater weight than they were originally intended to bear. In these walls are also seen traces of *hot air flues* for the baths above, a decided confirmation of Pastor's narrative. But here again a little examination shows that this portion of the structure is older than the baths, and cannot have been originally used as a mere furnace room. These hot air flues have evidently been cut into the brickwork *subsequent to the time of erection*, and the vaulting of the rooms still show traces of stucco ornamentation and frescoing. This, therefore, might well have belonged to the house of Pudens, and may have been the very part of it used as an oratory in the first century. It would serve admirably as a place of concealment in time of persecution. Out of one of the aisles a passage leads into a small square vaulted chamber, only partly cleared out, but in a good state of preservation. The pavement is a mosaic in black and white marble. The walls and ceiling still retain the reddish

brown bands by which they were divided into panels. This answers entirely to the baptistery said to have been added to the oratory by the daughters of Pudens, and no other equally probable explanation of its origin can be given. All this strongly corroborates the accuracy of Pastor's statement and confirms the tradition that here we have really the oldest Christian place of worship in Rome. If so, it is the oldest in the world.

I am not superstitious, but as we stood there in that old underground sanctuary, long-forgotten and now little regarded, even by relic-loving Rome, where the persecuted members of the early church had concealed themselves from the rage of their enemies only to be dragged forth by their relentless pursuers to a violent death, where the brethren had assembled eighteen hundred years ago to break bread and exhort one another to good works, where, perhaps, Paul himself had ministered to the flock, I felt that I was on holy ground and my heart bowed reverently as if somehow I had been brought nearer to the presence of Christ. I felt as if I had almost looked into the faces of some who might have seen the Saviour Himself, and as if I had shaken hands with the Apostles across the centuries. I had, as it were, touched one of the earlier links in the long chain of history that lays fast hold on the immovable verities of the faith, and somehow the whole chain seemed stronger for the touch.

For a point of such genuine interest, the place seems shamefully neglected. One would fain see the oratory cleared out and restored to a condition worthy of its honourable position in the record of the church, were it not for the certainty that it would soon be desecrated by a calculating priesthood using it to bolster up some false pretention of their own and bind with stronger fetters of superstition the minds of ignorant devotees. It were almost better to have it as it is. Only those will care to visit it who are most likely to value it aright.

JOHN SCRINGER.

*Presbyterian College.*

## The Mission Crisis.

---

### THE PRESENT OUTLOOK IN FRANCE.

FRANCE is just now the cynosure of all eyes. Nations are marvellously attracted toward her in these days. The last year, 1889, was the centennial year of the French Revolution. On the 5th of May, of that year, was reached the full completion of the hundredth year since the "States-General" assembled, and the Revolution was inaugurated—the Revolution, that for ten years was busy, through carnage, through many forms of severe trial and disorder, in laying the foundations of the present French nationality. That was a remarkable year of our Lord, that year 1789; and any one who has been familiar with that most significant series of events, which we group together under the name of the "French Revolution," will believe that it is no exaggeration to say that no more stupendous series of events, in the magnitude of the interests involved, the magnitude of the permanent results secured, and the magnitude of the sufferings and sacrifices undergone—no more stupendous series of events, in all that goes to make occurrences memorable, has been known in modern history than those which occurred between the assembling of the States-General and the first consulship of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Who could have believed that in the space of one hundred years our eyes would be looking upon a scene so vastly different in all its aspects, interests, struggles, achievements, promises. The writer confesses that he feels a peculiar interest in the French nation. It has been hinted to him that his own ancestry is Huguenot; and he is sure that he is a Huguenot in religious faith, and more than half a Frenchman is temperament.

A great deal has been said about the fickleness and excitability of the French people. Some like to quote that famous saying of Daniel O'Connell's, "The Irishman's blood is quicksilver," and transfer it to the Frenchman. But quicksilver has been put to many very important uses, and it is especially noticeable that it has a remarkable affinity for the precious metals. All people that are faithless, *i. e.*, without a true religious faith, are fickle. If

you want to insure steadiness, you must give a ship a star to steer by, and a rudder to steer with. It may be doubted whether to-day there are any more faithful, persistent, and steady-going people than the French, when you lodge in a Frenchman's heart a pure evangelical faith. It is not certainly for those to depreciate the French, who remember the Hueguenots. Where shall we find a more faithful and steadfast people than the Hueguenot martyrs of France?

As to this "quicksilver"—this mercurial temperament—we confess that we have a strong liking for *fire*. When fire is subdued it gets to be fervor, and if there is anything we hate it is apathy, indifference, *stagnation*. Electricity may do damage now and then, but what should we do without it when we want motive power, and message-power, and illuminating power. There is something fascinating about enthusiasm. We are not sure but that the old derivation of that word may be the true one—*en-theism*—God working in us. And the Frenchman is enthusiastic; there is nothing stolid about him and nothing stupid, and we have known some Americans who were both stolid and stupid. The natures, or characteristic qualities of men, differ according to the circumstances of their development. If you would give "studying qualities" to the character, you must give character that upon which it can stay itself.

In India, a few years ago, a human being was found in a wolf's den. He had been carried away a suckling baby, and, instead of devouring him, the beast chose to nourish him. From this den was that strange creature taken, foaming and frothing at the mouth, tearing at the chains with which it was found necessary to bind him; but, while they were the chains of bondage, they were the signal and the symbol of liberty. You may take a human being, born of the gentlest mother, and rear that human being into a wolf, if you suckle him at a wolf's breast, and rear him into a wolf's den! We must never attempt to measure character without considering also environment. It is unfair to judge of a nationality without remembering the influences that have moulded a nationality. There is no people on the face of the earth that, if you give them the pure Gospel, will receive it more readily, will incorporate it more rapidly, will exemplify it more gloriously, than the French.

We have already said that we deprecate stagnation. Intellectual stagnation is bad, but moral and spiritual stagnation is criminal. We remember, in boyhood's days, hearing the petition go up, over and over again, that God

would "open the doors to the nations." It was never anticipated then that France, the oldest daughter, and the right arm of the papacy, would, in the year 1871, welcome an Englishman to come and teach the pure and simple Gospel of the Huguenots, even with governmental sanction and protection. In those early days Christians were praying for the doors of access to be opened. Now our missionary boards are crying, "Retrench," which is virtually saying to God, "*Close these open doors!*" We refuse to enter the doors that we prayed might be opened. Take, for example, the Presbyterian Church to which we may refer to with the less hesitation, as we belong to that body; it has great difficulty in raising less than one-third of a cent a day per member, through twelve months, to send the Gospel into foreign countries. The question should be not, how little I can spare for God, but how much I can sacrifice for God; not, how little can I give and satisfy my conscience, but, how little can I keep and satisfy my actual reasonable necessities?

France furnishes illustration of what we have said about open doors and unused opportunities. There has not been, perhaps, in all the eighteen hundred years of Christian history any one missionary enterprise that has been more signally commended of God, blessed of God, crowned with success, and invested with holy and divine promise, than the mission of Robert W. McAll and his helpers in France; and yet he says: "If he had 500 laborers and \$500,000 I could place every laborer and invest every dollar within six months." There is nothing more beautiful and more sublime than a certain solitariness in labors for Christ—a certain sublime aloneness with God. We see this man going across the channel, with his beloved wife, to take up, as one laborer in the midst of a great field, the work of French evangelization. Marvellous man and woman, those two! When we think of McAll we think of George Schmidt, when as pioneer, he was the only missionary in the Dark Continent; we think of Robert Morrison, when as pioneer, he was the only missionary in China; we think of Judson, when as pioneer, he stood alone in Burmah. To furnish Dr. McAll plenty of helpers and plenty of money is one of the sublimest privileges ever accorded to the Christian Church in these days of world-wide missions; and so it is of all missionary enterprises. If we realized our opportunity we should shout "Advance!" all along the lines and never dare to sound the signal for retreat.

If we want to invest capital, what shall we do with it? Put it where it

will yield the largest investment consistent with safety. Will you tell us any investment in American railways, in American manufactures, that compares, either for safety or certainty of large profit, with an investment in such a work as that of missions? To give to these eager multitudes a simple open Bible, to give to these mercurial Frenchmen something to turn this fire into fervor, something to transform this temperamental heat into energy and holy enthusiasm; to make it sure that in Papal lands Jesus Christ may be held up as a crucified, risen, all sufficient Saviour; that the authority of the Word of God may be exalted over tradition, over Pope and College of Cardinals, and hosts of designing priests; and to make sure that, to those who know not the simple Gospel, may be revealed the secret of salvation and sanctification in Christ. Is not that an enterprise worth all our zeal? What are we doing when, with such doors open, we even hesitate? What are we doing that our gifts are not multiplied a hundred, a thousand fold? Who of us has ever come down to the actual experience of bitter self-denial, while in every way limiting our own expenditure, we sought to increase what shall be absolutely at the disposal of the Lord? We are honestly afraid that the financial basis of evangelization is rotten; the two great Protestant nations, America and England, uniting with all evangelical christendom, give less than twelve million dollars annually to the regeneration of a lost world.

There is but little consecration. A most godly man said to the writer on one occasion: "*You never will be fit to go to Heaven until for the sake of dying souls you are willing to stay out of it*" There is a heavenly-mindedness that is just as selfish in its way as the mind that is fixed on earthly gains or intellectual treasures. We ought to lose sight even of our spiritual advancement, in comparison with the uplifting and salvation of a thousand million of the human race that have never even heard of Christ. If, by prevailing prayer, we could pray about twenty years back into a life that is already past its meridian, the writer would gladly go and help Dr. McAll. No field in Papal Europe is parallel to France in attractiveness and promise.

But there is a wider question that concerns a wider field, and that question absorbs and engrosses our thoughts more and more. The Church of Christ has the world open before the Missionary Band, and yet the number of laborers is inadequate to enter and take possession. There is the problem compressed in one sentence. It is the problem of the ages. To its solution the whole church of Christ should turn prayerful attention. Something is

wrong. God would not *open* such doors, great and effectual, if He did not mean *occupation*. He would not lay a duty upon us without giving us ability to do it. The blood of a thousand million souls must crimson the skirts of the church of this generation unless that guilt is avoided by fidelity to our duty. We may avoid it by preaching the gospel to every creature. All our excuses, apologies, insinuations only *evade* it, they cannot *avoid* this guilt. There are men and women, treasures of wealth, resources of all sorts, abundant for the work, if there were only the disposition and determination to do it. And let us try to imagine the boundless satisfaction and joy that would thrill and expand our bosoms if at the end of this century we could look abroad over the whole earth and see not one district of territory, or fraction of a world's population, entirely destitute of the Gospel? What a beginning, or at least fortaste of millennial blessedness, when at least once, to every creature, the gospel of salvation has been faithfully and lovingly proclaimed!

ARTHUR T. PIERSON,

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

## HONAN.

### II.

*Religions*—Little is definitely known regarding the religious beliefs of the earliest settlers in Honan. Traces of a belief in a Supreme Being, and of worship being given to Him, were to be found among the people many centuries before the birth of Christ. An intelligent student of Chinese history informs me that "About 700 B. C. the Honanese worshipped God, they worshipped also the spirits of the mountains and rivers, sacrificed horses and practised Divination as a regular part of their religion then." They may still be considered very "religious," in the sense in which the Athenians of Paul's day were. Temples abound throughout the Province. Gods many and Lords many are to be found in these. To what extent the Honanese really reverence them, and their settled conviction regarding their nature and power, it is difficult to speak with certainty; that they render them homage is unquestionable. Confucianism, Buddhism and Tivism, can all claim a large number of followers. The great majority of the people belong to one or other of those systems, and not a few belong to all of them. That there is truth in all of the systems mentioned few would care to deny. The Christian missionary desires them to be tested as his own is—by their results. They have had a fair trial in Honan. Their most ardent advocate would not grow jubilant over the results. They do not reveal the true God to men, they have no Divinely appointed Redeemer, and no inspired revelation. They know of no satisfaction for sin, and have no sure hope to sustain the soul. They fail to satisfy the deepest yearnings of the human heart, and weighed in the balances have been found wanting.

Mohammedanism has about 200,000 adherents in Honan. They profess to believe in one true God, and claim that they and the Christians hold the same faith. A convert from Mohammedanism to Christianity is exceedingly rare in China.

*Romanists.*—Roman Catholics have been actively engaged in Honan during the past forty years. At present they have eight European missionaries at work, three in the north and five in the south. Numerically they claim to have 6,400 members, 51 churches or chapels, 28 schools, 220



pupils, 1 seminary and 57 students. A study of the methods of Romanists in carrying forward evangelistic work among the heathen is instructive in the way of teaching men what to avoid, and also as to how far formality can be carried in a professedly Christian church.

*Protestant Christianity.*—To the members of the China Inland Mission belongs the honour of being the first standard bearers of Protestantism in Honan. They began in northern Honan in 1875. In October of that year their missionary narrowly escaped being assassinated in Kai-feng-fu. A plot was laid by the gentry to have him killed on the day he left the City. In 1876 a house was offered to this mission in the south. It was rented and a helper left in charge. A few months afterwards disquieting rumours went abroad, a riot followed, and the missionaries left the following day. In 1877 through the friendly intervention of a native helper it was agreed that if the missionary returned he should have his house. On returning he found his house occupied, although eight months of the period for which it was rented were unexpired. He waited for some weeks during which he was treated with contempt. On carrying his case to the Yamen official he was politely informed that being unable to get his house he had better take his departure. On several occasions during the past fifteen years treatment similar to this has been accorded the members of this mission. As early as 1879 they proposed commencing work north of the Yellow river, taking Tseh Chow in south Shansi as their base. Soon afterwards they were expelled from that City. Itinerating and colportage work has been done by them in north Honan since that time at intervals. Their work has mainly been in the southern part of the Province where they had their first convert in 1885, and their first church founded, consisting of 9 members, in 1887. At present they have three churches and about forty who have confessed Christ. They have been driven out at different points from time to time, *invariably after houses had been rented.* To use the expressive words of one of their number who has had his fair share of the treatment meted out to Christians by the officials in Honan; "During the last fifteen years of plodding work I believe every city and large town as well as hundreds of villages have been visited; the Gospel has been preached; thousands of portions of the Word of God sold; much trial has been borne by those expelled from dwellings, and hard journeys accomplished by ladies and gentlemen. We rejoice in the Lord that more than forty souls have confessed Christ."

The Agents of the Bible Societies have circulated large numbers of portions of the Word of God in the province from time to time.

*Canadian Presbyterian Mission.*—The inception of the Canadian mission to Honan took place in 1886. In that year the missionary enthusiasm of the students and alumni of Queen's College Kingston, and Knox College Toronto, took practical form in the direction of sending out a missionary from each of these colleges at an early date. Much of the enthusiasm in these institutions was owing to the ardent advocacy of missionary work by two of the students. When it was definitely decided to send out two college missionaries, what was more natural than that Queen's should select James Frazer Smith, and Knox, Jonathan Goforth, as their representatives. The latter had been proving his fitness for work in the cities and villages of China, by exerting himself vigorously in city mission work in Toronto, where his labours were crowned with the Divine blessing. The former was qualifying himself for the work by taking a full course of instruction in Theology and Medicine, that thus he might minister to diseased bodies and sin sick souls. A special course of instruction was also pursued by him in the medical schools and hospitals of New York. While Dr. Smith was thus engaged in the spring of 1888, Mr. and Mrs. Goforth set sail for China, landing at Shanghai in March. Dr. Hunter Corbett, American Presbyterian Missionary, having visited Toronto in 1887, recommended the Canadians to take up work in northern Honan. On his way to Chefoo, Mr. Goforth met Mr. Paton, agent of the National Bible Society of Scotland, who had travelled in Honan, and knew the province well. He recommended certain cities as a suitable base for operations in north Honan, if a foothold could be obtained there. In August 1888, Dr. and Mrs. Smith arrived in Chefoo, and immediately afterwards, the Dr. and Mr. Goforth, in company with Revs. A. H. Smith, and F. M. Chapin, Missionaries of the American Board, started on a lengthened tour of inspection through Honan. On this trip, they travelled in all about 1,200 miles, visited 17 cities, passed the Provincial Capital, saw the Yellow river breach, had many strange experiences, and gained a vast amount of information regarding their proposed field of labour, its people and their customs. The inquiries made confirmed their opinion as to the wisdom of fixing on some of the cities recommended by Mr. Paton for headquarters. Hsui Hsien and Chang-te-fu were then decided on. The mission force was increased in their absence by the arrival of

Dr. William McClure of Montreal, whose expenses for three years J. T. Morton, Esq., of London, England, had generously volunteered to be responsible for. A further reinforcement was given in December by the arrival of Rev. Donald MacGillivray, M.A., who was sent out by St. James Square Church, Toronto. All the missionaries were busily engaged for a time in acquiring a working knowledge of the Chinese language. In September, 1889, Mr. Goforth and Dr. McClure started on a tour into Honan. The first was a tour of inspection mainly, only 500 patients being then treated. On the second tour the Gospel was preached, patients were treated, the temper of the people was tested, and an attempt made to gain a foothold for the mission. The missionaries were very favourably received, many opportunities of doing good were presented, and a pretty thorough survey of North Honan was again made. The section of Honan north of the Yellow river, in which the missionaries proposed locating, is about 180 miles in length and from 50 to 70 in breadth. About 1,700 cases were treated by the doctor on this tour. An official in Chang-te-fu promised to use his influence to secure a compound there by the time the doctor returned. A man in Wei-hui-fu offered to sell his compound for a hospital. This city was then fixed on instead of Hsui Hsien as a base for operations, as it was believed to be more central, and the opinion was expressed that with another medical man the mission might occupy Chang-te-fu, Hsui Hsien and Wei-hui-fu. It was then thought that it would be comparatively easy work to gain a settlement in Honan, as officials and people had received the missionaries with marked favour. In December, 1889, the mission staff was increased by the arrival of a fresh contingent of eight workers from Canada, three males and five females. These were Rev. J. H. MacVicar, B.A., and wife, whose support was undertaken by Crescent Street Church, Montreal; Rev. John MacDougall, B.A., and wife, who were sent out by Erskine Church, in the same city; and the writer, with his wife, their support being undertaken by David Yuile, Esq., an elder in Erskine Church, Montreal. The unmarried ladies were Misses J. Graham and M. MacIntosh from Toronto, who had graduated as trained nurses from the Training School for nurses in that city. They were sent out under the auspices of the Women's Foreign Mission Society and at the charge of that society.

The Presbytery of Honan was constituted on the evening of the day the missionaries arrived in Lin Ching—5th December. At that meeting the

decision of the missionaries on the field to occupy the three cities above referred to was formally ratified. The following among other reasons have influenced in favor of the cities named :

1. They are on the highway from Peking, the capital of China, to the south. Good roads are not numerous in China, and thus there are decided advantages in being stationed close to a great thoroughfare for the doing of missionary work.

2. They are in the centre of a densely populated region. Large numbers of persons from all quarters could easily be reached there. This is greatly to be desired.

3. They furnish easy communication by river with the west. Two of the cities named are on the Wei river, and the third at no great distance from it.

4. They are sufficiently remote from any other mission station. Collision with others would thus be avoided. The field is wide. China needs light-giving centres all through the empire. It is difficult to justify the existence of two missions in one city at present.

5. They are near the route along which China's great railway is expected to run some day. China is not to remain stationary while all the world is advancing. Her resources will be developed, her rigid conservatism turned out and modern improvements introduced.

A third tour into Honan was undertaken in February last, two of the missionaries visiting the northern portion of the field selected, and two the south. Although two doctors undertook the treatment of those who were diseased, the treatment given to Christ's ambassadors was by no means encouraging. They were coolly received in both sections of the field. Such large numbers as formerly did not come out for medical relief, and somewhat ominous threats were not wanting occasionally. Dr. McClure and Mr. MacGillivray, who laboured in Chang-te-fu, discovered that official influence was at work against them. Through the gentry flaming placards were posted on the walls of the city. They were couched in such language as was fitted to fire the rabble and make the foreigner uncomfortable. A day was named for their expulsion. Official protection was claimed and the district magistrate replied by appearing in person and practically ordering them to depart. News of this spread rapidly, and the brethren left two days afterwards.

The brethren then itinerated in neighboring district and sold large quantities of literature. In the south the reception was more favourable than in Chang te-fu, but in neither place was it of such a nature as greatly to encourage the missionaries or justify them in thinking that a foothold would be speedily or easily attained. Nothing has been heard since of a nature fitted to re-assure our hearts; all the indications are that a determined stand will be made at every point by the gentry against the renting of houses or the giving of any encouragement to the missionaries to settle. The same gentlemen who visited Honan in spring are making a tour there at present. The situation in brief now is as follows: There are four men with sufficient knowledge of the Chinese language to enable them to preach to the people in their own tongue, three later arrivals are endeavoring to acquire such a knowledge of the language at present, and so are the lady workers. We are all situated about 100 miles from our intended sphere of labour. Where then is the difficulty? We have the influence of a haughty, prejudiced, powerful literary class against us. Joined to these there is quite a number of wealthy men, who are opposed to any change. Those classes practically control the officials. Then we have multitudes of people who dare not think or act for themselves, and can be swayed or terrified by their superiors. Then there are cast-iron systems and customs which bind the people and throttle liberty of thought and action, and hoary superstitions which have materialized and degraded a race that must have had many noble traits. Last of all there is the carnal heart which is enmity against God and His truth, and the combined influence of the devil and the legions of darkness who use all the ingenuity of which they are masters to frustrate the efforts of God's ambassadors. Were this the only outlook, the future would be dark indeed. Thank God it is not. We have the Divine command to go and preach, the Divine presence to accompany us, Divine wisdom to guide us, and Divine promises to sustain us. The truth shall prevail. We look calmly and hopefully forward to the future. North Honan shall be opened, the Church of God will be established there, Christ shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied in the salvation of multitudes of the Honanese. The seed is being sown; an abundant harvest of souls shall yet be reaped. Let the united prayers of God's children in our beloved church ascend to God for this, and the day of victory may be nearer than the most sanguine now dreams.

## IN ECCLEFECHAN CHURCHYARD.

(A COMMONPLACE REVERIE.)

These lines are an attempt to embody, to a certain extent, a young man's early conception of Carlyle ; and to reproduce, however inadequately, a little of that atmosphere of old-Hebrew-prophet *remoteness* and reverence, almost amounting to awe, in which this modern Light-Bringer seemed to dwell, while living, to thousands of his countrymen : an atmosphere which the publication of the *Life and Letters*, etc., has done something, perhaps, to dispel. The desire to be laid with his kinsfolk in the peasant home and ways of his youth, has always appeared to the writer as a deeply pathetic incident in the closing career of Carlyle.

To-day I bowed my head upon the grave  
 Of him who smote with pen of vatic fire  
 The shams and insincerities of life. Whose clarion-call  
 Broke with a strangeness on our modern ears,  
 Like His of old within the wilderness. I stoop'd,  
 Yea, almost worshipped, breathless at the feet  
 Of this Grand Warrior laid unto his rest,  
 Amidst the silence of the Scottish hills.

Then from me fled the present and I saw  
 The peasant boy upon the village street,  
 Unconscious yet of all the growing power,—  
 The slumbering Thor within his youthful brain.  
 And shadowy glimpses of that further time,  
 That clasps forever this green Borderland,  
 A soothing calm upon my spirit threw,  
 Like the grey beauty of a summer eve.  
 But passing onward—oncc again I knew  
 The stripling lad amidst the college fanes,  
 And in his eager eyes a deathless light,—  
 The shaft'd fire that slept 'neath shaggy brows,  
 When flushing into manhood's 'glorious prime,  
 Despite the jeers of those who take the shame,  
 And urge along the centuries the cry,  
 'Can any good come out of Nazareth ?'  
 He smote the face of Wrong and thence became  
 A giant labourer in the world's behoof.

Dwelling apart, he spake unto his kind,  
 As one commissioned from the living God,  
 Stayed by no minor music, having heard  
 The deep Sphere-Harmonies that rule the stars,  
 And Earth's 'still voices' of Infinitude  
 And thus he seemed, more closely as the years  
 Deepen'd their shadows o'er his strong, pure life,  
 To hold aloof and reck but little of  
 The hourly needs—the daily hopes and fears  
 That stir the troubled hearts of common men.

Until the end!

'Until the end!' I said.

For kneeling here unto his grave, I saw  
 The few, fond mourners leaving all behind  
 Of 'storied urn or animated bust',  
*Bringing the old man home*: and thus in death  
 Making his greatness greater evermore.

—JOHN ARBORY.

(JOHN MACFARLANE.)

*Montreal.*

---

## THE LIFE FORGE.

Blow the bellows—faster, faster,  
 In the busy forge of life;  
 Heap the coals on—higher, higher,  
 Sevenfold heat for sevenfold strife!

In this forge must ore be melted,  
 Out of which, with curious plan,  
 And incessant toil, to fashion  
 And build up the perfect man.

## PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE JOURNAL.

Here must thought be shaped to action,  
 Passion moulded into will,  
 And upon Time's battered anvil  
 Every blow be dealt with skill.

Oft the metal must be heated  
 In temptation's burning glow ;  
 Oft be cool'd in baths of sorrow  
 Fill'd from founts of deepest woe.

Ere, with temper firm, yet pliant,  
 Heart to feel and head to plan,  
 Stamp'd with God's approving impress,  
 We can say, " Behold a man ! "

Blow the bellows—faster, faster,  
 In the busy forge of life ;  
 Heap the coals on—higher, higher,  
 Sevenfold heat for sevenfold strife !

In this age of thought and action,  
 Men are needed, true and tried ;  
 Men with intellect far-reaching—  
 Men with souls to God allied :

Men with loyal hearts and loving ;  
 Men with willing hands and strong ;  
 Feeling for the woes of others,  
 Fighting bravely 'gainst the wrong.

When from out the smoke and clamor  
 Of life's forge there spring to birth  
 Such men, loyal, brave, and loving,  
 There is hope in store for earth.

And each passing day more clearly  
 Proves that there is worth in man ;  
 That amid earth's jar and tumult,  
 God is working out his plan—

Raising up our fallen nature  
 Purified from every stain,  
 And by earthly toil and trial,  
 Fitting it with him to reign.

JENNIE E. HAIGHT.



## Partie Française.

---

### DE LA LANGUE FRANÇAISE DANS LA SOCIÉTÉ MODERNE.

Le voyageur qui gravit une montagne ardue n'observe tout d'abord que les objets dont l'aspect curieux ou nouveau sollicite ses regards. Et le plaisir qu'il éprouve ne lui paraît pas compenser toujours la fatigue qu'il ressent. Mais quand il a, au cours de sa marche pénible, atteint un sommet élevé, il se retourne, et, appuyé sur son bâton, il contemple d'un œil ravi le paysage qui se déroule à ses pieds.

Il en est ainsi de l'étude des langues. Les leçons de l'enfance et de la première jeunesse ne montrent guère que les détails de la route qu'il faut parcourir ; mais, à mesure qu'on avance, l'horizon s'agrandit. L'ordre éclate dans l'apparent chaos des règles et des exceptions, désespoir des commençants. Les découvertes que l'on fait éveillent dans l'âme une admiration profonde.

Je ne prétends pas, pour justifier cette assertion, considérer avec vous la langue française dans son ensemble. Ses origines, sa constitution, son histoire, les chefs-d'œuvre dans lesquels elle s'est fixée, c'est là un domaine trop vaste et pour mes forces et pour le temps dont vous disposez. J'ai formé un dessein plus modeste : je voudrais montrer quel est son rôle dans la société moderne. Permettez-moi, à cet effet, de prendre la question d'un peu haut.

#### I.

##### LANGUES INTERNATIONALES DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ ET AU MOYEN ÂGE ; LE GRÉC ET LE LATIN.

Il n'y a pas de langue universelle. Le savant géographe Balbi, mort en 1848, a compté 860 langues, divisées en près de 5,000 dialectes. " Leur multiplicité, dit un philologue, aussi bien dans certaines parties de l'Asie qu'en Amérique ou en Afrique, est vraiment prodigieuse. On en trouve jusqu'à 250 chez des peuplades américaines de même famille et de même

nom. Dans l'Indo-Chine, il n'est pas rare d'entendre sous les murs d'une même ville une douzaine de dialectes si différents les uns des autres qu'ils sont incompréhensibles pour les voisins de ceux qui les emploient. Suivant Pline, il y avait dans l'ancienne Colchide plus de 300 tribus parlant des dialectes distincts, et les Romains avaient besoin de 130 interprètes pour commercer et traiter avec elles."

On a tenté d'obvier à cet inconvénient. Le philosophe Leibniz conçut le projet d'une langue philosophique qui mit en société toutes les nations. M. d'Eitchtal a repris de nos jours la même idée en proposant de faire reposer cette langue nouvelle sur le grec ancien, si riche, si sonore, si flexible. D'autres encore ont marché dans cette voie sans arriver au but. Sans doute, les sentiments très vagues et les notions très précises peuvent s'exprimer par des signes communs que l'on remènerait facilement à une prononciation uniforme. C'est ainsi que les peuples civilisés écrivent la musique de la même manière, et se servent des mêmes chiffres, des mêmes formules algébriques, des mêmes notations chimiques. Mais il paraît impossible de rendre par les mêmes signes pour tous les peuples les notions philosophiques, les idées morales, les sentiments religieux. Et pourquoi? A cause de la diversité des conceptions sur ces grands objets de la pensée humaine, et de l'impossibilité où l'on se trouve d'en faire une analyse définitive qui convienne à toutes les croyances ou opinions, à tous les âges et à toutes les époques. Ceux qui se flattent de réduire la philosophie, l'histoire, la morale et la religion en sciences exactes, comme la géométrie, l'algèbre, la physique, la chimie, peuvent seuls espérer cette transformation par le génie humain de toutes les langues du globe en une langue unique; pour nous, ce n'est là qu'un rêve dont il est permis de s'enchanter, mais qui ne se réalisera pas.

Quoi qu'il en soit, en l'absence d'une langue universelle, il faut une langue internationale pour les peuples qui ont de fréquents rapports politiques et commerciaux, intellectuels et religieux,—une langue qui empêche le plus possible les diplomates de se servir de la parole pour déguiser leur pensée,—une langue qui, connue de tous les gens instruits des divers pays du monde civilisé, facilite l'échange des pensées et le règlement des affaires.

Aussi, dès que les nations se sont mises en contact amical et ont formé des relations suivies, il y a eu une langue internationale. C'est le grec qui, le premier, a joué ce rôle, justifié par la brillante civilisation du siècle de Périclès, et imposé aux Orientaux par les armes d'Alexandre-le-Grand. Le latin

l'a remplacé : partout répandu avec la domination altière de Rome, et consacré par les chefs-d'œuvre du siècle d'Auguste il resta pendant le moyen âge la langue de l'Église, des cours, du palais, des écoles, l'organe des diplomates et des savants, alors que s'élaboraient les idiomes modernes dans les chants populaires et dans la prose informe des écrivains nationaux. Même au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, pour être compris de toute l'Europe, il fallait écrire en latin.

## II.

## LANGUE INTERNATIONALE DANS LES TEMPS MODERNES : LE FRANÇAIS.

Langue morte ou mourante, incapable de se renouveler pour répondre aux besoins des sociétés nouvelles, le latin ne pouvait conserver longtemps les hautes fonctions qu'il avait remplies avec honneur. Il succomba à son tour, et le français pris sa place. Au moyen âge déjà, les grandes épopées de la France étaient devenues européennes. Au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle, la langue française se fait accepter comme la langue littéraire de toutes les cours et de toutes les sociétés policées. "Alors dit Voltaire, " tous les étrangers qui ont de l'esprit se piquent de savoir le français." Au traité de Nimègue, en 1678, il devient la langue de la diplomatie. Il l'est encore. "Rome elle-même observe cette coutume dans la publication du jubilé, que deux prêtres lisent la bulle, l'un en latin, l'autre en français, sur deux chaires différentes dans l'église de Saint-Pierre du Vatican " (Litté). Leibniz, philosophe allemand, écrit dans notre langue ses deux principaux ouvrages, la *Theodicee* et les *Nouveaux essais sur l'entendement humain*. Avant lui Charles-Quint, au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, déclare le français langue d'Etat, et s'en sert pour haranguer les Etats des Pays-Bas le jour qu'il fit son abdication. Après lui Frédéric-le-Grand, roi de Prusse, l'emploie de préférence à l'allemand. Gibbon, historien anglais, faisait en français les extraits de ses lectures. Goethe, sur la fin de sa vie, exprimait ses regrets de n'avoir pas écrit en français ses ouvrages. C'est aussi notre langue qu'employait Schelling pour se rendre compte de ses propres pensées. Le XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle avait fait de la langue française un puissant instrument de propagande philosophique ; la Révolution et l'Empire ont achevé de la répandre. Les autres idiomes se sont développés et perfectionnés, mais ils ne sont pas d'un usage européen ; on les apprend davantage, mais le français reste la langue des traités internationaux et des instruments diplomatiques, la langue de la plupart des cours de l'Europe, la langue au moyen de laquelle communiquent entre eux les savants du monde entier, la

langue des étrangers de distinction qui affluent à Paris, la ville internationale par excellence.

“ En dehors des frontières, dit M. Elisée Reclus dans sa monumentale *Géographie universelle*, le français est également la langue nationale d'une moitié de la Belgique, de la Suisse du sud-ouest, même des hautes vallées des Alpes italiennes, et par delà les mers, la partie occidentale de l'île d'Haiti, le Bas-Canada, le nord du Nouveau-Brunswick et de nombreux districts du Haut-Canada et de l'Amérique anglaise sont compris dans son domaine. Il se parle aussi dans tous les pays civilisés, partout où les hommes s'occupent des œuvres de l'art et des travaux de la pensée . . . Dans tous les pays de population dite latine, c'est-à-dire en Roumanie, en Italie, en Espagne, en Portugal et dans toute l'Amérique espagnole et lusitanienne, le français est, après le langage du pays, et même dans quelques contrées avant l'idiome local, la langue classique par excellence, et les ouvrages des grands écrivains français y sont à la place d'honneur dans toutes les bibliothèques. En outre, l'Afrique du nord, qui par ses colons est encore l'Europe, offre au français un vaste champ d'expansion, et les hommes du désert s'essayaient par milliers à le parler : déjà les Beni-Mzab, les grands courtiers du commerce dans les contrées de l'Afrique septentrionale, le connaissent presque tous (tome II, p. 914).

“ C'est par millions, lisons-nous encore à la page 53, que les étrangers parlent ou comprennent le français, non-seulement dans le pays dit latins . . . mais aussi en Angleterre, en Allemagne, en Hollande, dans la Scandinavie, en Russie, en Orient et dans tout le Nouveau Monde.

“ A l'action directe exercée par la langue dans le mouvement des idées s'ajoute l'influence indirecte due aux modifications intimes qui se sont opérées dans les idiomes étrangers. Sans tenir compte des mots que le français leur a donné ou transmis, toutes les langues européennes ont reçu du parler de Pascal, de Lafontaine et de Voltaire une allure plus ferme, des contours plus précis, un modèle d'expression plus clair : leur structure même s'est rapprochée de celle du français.

### III.

#### POURQUOI LE FRANÇAIS SE PARLE-T-IL DANS TOUS LES PAYS CIVILISÉS ?

Voilà le rôle que joue le français dans la société moderne. Ce fait constaté, il faut l'expliquer. Pourquoi donc notre idiome est-il devenu la langue internationale des peuples civilisés ?

Doit-il cet honneur à l'importance politique, au prestige militaire de la France ? Je ne le crois pas. Louis XIV, et plus récemment Napoléon Ier, qui voulait faire du français une langue universelle, en ont favorisé l'extension. Mais leurs conquêtes n'auraient pas suffi à l'imposer aux peuples de l'Europe. L'Allemagne pendant le moyen âge, l'Espagne au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle avec Charles-Quint, l'Angleterre au siècle dernier ont été tour à tour plus puissantes que la France, et jamais leur langue n'a disputé l'empire à la nôtre. Il en est de même depuis Waterloo et Sedan.

Est-ce à la beauté, à la variété, à la richesse de notre littérature que la langue française doit son influence ? On se rapproche de la vérité en l'affirmant. La littérature française est la plus ancienne de l'Europe. Elle prend naissance vers le XI<sup>e</sup> siècle avec les chants des troubadours et des trouvères, lorsque la langue parvient à se dégager des formes latines qui l'enveloppaient. Elle étend son domaine avec les chroniqueurs des deux siècles suivants : Villehardouin, Joinville, Froissart, Commines. Elle fait pressentir ses hautes destinées avec les écrivains de la Renaissance et de la Réforme : Clément Marot, Ronsard, Régnier, Amyot, Rabelais, Montaigne, Calvin. Malherbe l'ennoblit en épurant trop la langue. Puis resplendit une pléiade d'hommes de génie qui la revêtent d'un éclat incomparable en exprimant des vérités générales dans un langage parfait. Que de noms illustres dans toutes les sphères de la pensée ! Parmi les philosophes et les moralistes Descartes, Nicole, Malebranche, Fénelon, La Rochefoucauld, La Bruyère ; parmi les orateurs et les polémistes Pascal, Arnauld, Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Jacques Saurin, Massillon ; dans le genre épistolaire Balzac, Mme de Sévigné, Mme de Maintenon ; dans la poésie dramatique Corneille, Racine, Molière ; dans la satire Boileau ; dans la fable La Fontaine. Que d'écrivains dont les connaisseurs ne se lassent pas d'admirer l'art exquis et le goût délicat !—Plus rapprochés de nous brillent en divers genres des auteurs non moins célèbres : Voltaire, J. J. Rousseau, Montesquieu, Buffon, André Chénier.— Plus près encore, dans notre siècle, marchent à leur suite Châteaubriand, Mme de Staël, Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Victor Cousin, Guizot, Villemain, Thiers, Michelet, Cuvier, Ampère, Sainte-Beuve, Alexandre Vinet.... Il faut renoncer à les nommer tous. Ces grands hommes ont plus fait pour l'extension de notre langue que les armes des plus renommés capitaines. Je souscris volontiers à ces paroles de Voltaire : "C'est à Cinna, à Phèdre, au Misanthrope que la langue française a dû sa vogue, et non pas aux conquêtes de Louis XIV."

Faut-il nous contenter de cette explication ? Je ne saurais l'admettre. D'autres littératures, l'italienne, l'espagnole, l'allemande, l'anglaise s'enorgueillissent à juste titre d'un grand nombre de chefs-d'œuvre ; elles peuvent offrir à l'admiration du monde des esprits d'élite au-dessus desquels s'élèvent à une hauteur qui n'a pas été dépassée Dante et Cervantès, Shakspeare et Goethe.

C'est dans les mérites de notre langue elle-même que nous devons chercher la principale cause de son ascendant. Il me paraît superflu de dire qu'elle n'est pas sans défaut, pas plus qu'elle n'est sans difficulté. Toute œuvre humaine est entachée d'imperfections. Un maître dans l'art d'écrire l'a dit : "Le génie de notre langue est la clarté et l'ordre. Le français n'ayant point de déclinaison et étant toujours asservi aux articles, ne peut adopter les inversions grecques et latines ; il oblige les mots à s'arranger dans l'ordre naturel des idées. On ne peut dire que d'une seule manière : *Plancus a pris soin des affaires de César* : voilà le seul arrangement que l'on puisse donner à ces paroles. Exprimez cette phrase en latin, *Res Cesaris Plancus diligenter curavit* : on peut arranger ces mots de 120 manières différentes, sans faire tort au sens et sans gêner la langue. Les verbes auxiliaires, qui allongent et énervent les phrases dans les langues modernes, rendent encore la langue française peu propre pour le style lapidaire. Ses verbes auxiliaires, ses pronoms, ses articles, son manque de participes déclinaibles, et enfin sa marche uniforme, nuisent au grand enthousiasme de la poésie : elle a moins de ressources en ce genre que l'italien et l'anglais ; mais cette gêne et cet esclavage même la rendent plus propre à la tragédie et à la comédie qu'aucune langue de l'Europe. L'ordre naturel dans lequel on est obligé d'exprimer ses pensées et de construire ses phrases, répandent dans cette langue une facilité et une douceur qui plaît à tous les peuples ; et le génie des écrivains se mêlant au génie de la langue a produit plus de livres agréablement écrits qu'on n'en voit chez aucun autre peuple." (Voltaire).

J'ajouterai que la langue française, essentiellement analytique, exprime tous les éléments de la pensée par des termes distincts. Elle n'accorde que peu à l'esprit d'individualité qui pourrait l'obscurcir. Nul en France n'est grand écrivain s'il ne se soumet à ses lois. "Ce qui n'est pas clair, disait Rivarol, n'est pas français."

D'où lui vient cette clarté ? Tout d'abord, de l'esprit français lui-même, passionné de logique, malgré ses inconséquences et ses défaillances ; puis,

des grands hommes qui l'ont fixée : ces hommes étaient des dialecticiens, comme Calvin ; des philosophes, comme Descartes ; des géomètres, comme Pascal ; enfin de l'Académie française, fondée en 1635 pour contenir l'esprit d'individualité excessive et en prévenir les excès par le maintien de règles sévères.

La clarté ne constitue pas son seul mérite. Transparente comme le cristal, elle n'est pourtant pas froide comme lui. Si les langues synthétiques avec leurs terminaisons variables et leurs inversions se prêtent mieux que la nôtre à l'expression des sentiments poétiques et à ce vague des pensées qui ressemble à la profondeur, elle se plie néanmoins aux exigences des grands artistes qui savent la maîtriser. Elle se revêt de force et d'éclat avec Corneille, Saint-Simon et Victor Hugo ; de majesté avec Bossuet et Guizot ; de douceur avec Fénelon et Rollin ; d'harmonie avec Racine et Lamartine ; de bonhomie et de malice avec Lafontaine ; de naturel avec Mme de Sévigné ; de simplicité avec Thiers ; elle déploie une étonnante souplesse avec Sainte-Beuve et se pare des plus fines nuances avec Renan. On l'a fait remarquer, étudier la constitution de la langue française, c'est faire un excellent cours de logique ; étudier les chefs-d'œuvre de notre littérature, c'est faire un excellent cours de rhétorique.

Dirai-je, de plus, qu'elle est riche ? Plusieurs refuseront de le croire. Ils se souviennent que Malherbe était surnommé le tyran des mots : que les écrivains du grand siècle ont trop dédaigné la langue du peuple et laissé tomber en désuétude une infinité de termes énergiques ou gracieux, de tournures élégantes et naïves ; que Voltaire appelait notre langue "cette gueuse qui fait la fière." Tout est relatif assurément. Elle pourrait être plus riche, Et cependant il lui reste plus de cent mille mots (Gram Larousse, p. 28), comprenant environ deux mille familles de mots ayant chacune pour chef un mot distinct que l'on appelle radical,—tandis que la langue anglaise, qui passe pour être aussi riche que ceux qui la parlent, ne compte guère plus de quatre-vingt mille mots, y compris les termes qui servent à désigner les sciences et les arts, (suivant le Dr. Angus), et que les dictionnaires de Richardson et de Webster, suivant MaxMüller, ne donnent que 43,566 mots. Le nouveau dictionnaire de Webster contient, paraît-il, plus de 118,000 mots, y compris les noms propres, les termes de géographie, etc., (prospectus). Oui, la langue française offre assez de ressources à ceux qui les connaissent. Jetez un coup d'œil sur le dictionnaire de Littré. Voici

quatre volumes in-folio, contenant 4,708 pages à trois colonnes chacune, plus un supplément de 459 pages. Quel est le lexique qui présente un aspect aussi formidable? Webster et Worcester paraissent bien humbles devant Littré. La langue française est assez riche pour suffire aux besoins des plus grands esprits. Savez-vous combien de mots emploient les hommes dans le commerce de la vie? Quatre mille environ. Victor Hugo, dont le vocabulaire est si varié, se contente de dix à quinze mille. Ainsi fait Shakspeare, et pourtant les gros mots n'y manquent pas, non plus que dans Molière. On trouve environ huit mille mots dans les poésies de Milton. Vous voyez qu'avec les cent mille mots de notre langue, il nous est facile d'exprimer toutes les idées que nous avons et quelques autres encore. En outre, le français fait économie de termes pour rendre les nuances les plus délicates de la pensée; *tenir*, par exemple, a 72 significations, *tête* en a 64, *venir* 44, *mot* 26, *corps* 24 *langue* 21, *œil* 44.

(*A continuer.*)

D. COUSSIRAT.

*Presbyterian College.*



## Editorial Department.

---

### THE NEW YEAR.

AS we go to print with the third number of the present volume of the JOURNAL, the evening shades of the old year are hovering around us and its sun disappearing in the western horizon. Fitting season for retrospection! But who can scrutinize his life during the past year with unalloyed pleasure? We shrink from the ordeal. Who can say, from this ordeal I shall come forth honorably? At the commencement of the year our hearts were filled with noble resolves, high aspirations and lofty purposes. We consecrated ourselves anew to the Master and pledged our time, talents and deeds to His service. But what has been our success? Are we able to rejoice in the accomplishment of our noble purposes? Have we redeemed all our pledges of faithfulness and loyalty? Alas! for the frailty of man, we cannot answer these questions as we would.

“Weak and irresolute is man,  
The purpose of to-day,  
Woven with pains into his plan  
To-morrow rends away.”

But while we sing our penitential song let us not forget our hymn of praise to the Creator for His goodness. Are we not able to say that during the past year He “has made the outgoings of the morning and of the evening to rejoice?” As a pitying mother “He hath not dealt with us after our sins.” We have been surrounded continually by the radiance of His love of which even our deepest sorrows were but precious tokens.

“The darkness in the pathway of man’s life  
Is but the shadow of God’s Providence  
By the great sun of wisdom cast thereon,  
*And what is dark below is light in Heaven.*”

Thank God, too, we have kept our “direction,” and notwithstanding the failures and imperfections of the past it is still our desire, forgetting the things that are behind and reaching forward to those things that are before, to press toward the work of Jesus.

Let us then, as we step on the threshold of a new year, renew our united resolves, and strive to realize to a greater degree than ever before the “consecrating spirit of its commencement.” And while we are diligent in building the structure for our own character and eternal destiny, we should not forget our responsibility to others. Let us seek in our sphere of influence, however small it may be, to make our lives greater blessings than they were in the past

“You will not pass this way again ;  
Take some weary one by the hand,  
And lead them into the narrow way  
That reaches the better land.”

“ Look up through tears, for on beyond  
 Is the gleaming golden shore ;  
 We can bravely bear a little while,  
 For we pass this way no more ”

With these thoughts, suggested by the solemnities of a dying year, the JOURNAL begs to tender its readers sincere New Year's greetings. “ May it abound in Divine sunshine and be rich in gracious fruit. Let us not be sparing in our sowing to the spirit and we shall reap a bountiful harvest.”

---

## THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR.

**A**LTHOUGH scarcely a decade has passed since the first of these societies was established by Dr. Francis E. Clarke, of Portland, Maine, there are in existence to-day twelve thousand societies, with a membership of about two hundred and fifty thousand persons. This phenomenal growth is a pretty strong evidence that the society is supplying a deeply felt want. The Church has had recourse to many schemes for holding the young people and building them up in christian character. Many of these schemes have been abandoned as ineffective, and some of them as positively injurious. Earnest pastors have felt that while no class was more in need of attention and help than the young men and young women of the congregation, the methods usually followed in working among them were not always attended with satisfactory results. Consequently when a new method was presented, which was based on thoroughly scriptural principles and which promised fair to meet the want, the Church was ready to give it a reasonable trial. The Society of Christian Endeavor has stood the test for ten years, and the result is that every day it is increasing in favor. It has shown a remarkable capability of adapting itself to the methods of work followed by the various sections of the Church, and to-day it has branches in twenty-two different denominations.

One of its distinguishing features is its loyalty to the Church. Any society that attempts to do Christian work in a congregation, independent of the control of the officers of the Church, must be watched with a suspicious eye. In the Christian Endeavor Society one of the cardinal principles is loyalty to the pastor and session, or deacon's court ; and any society which acts in opposition to the will of these office-bearers, does that which is decidedly contrary to the genius of the organization. The design of this society is the upholding of the Church, and it aims at becoming as truly an auxiliary of the Church as the Sabbath School is. The society has certainly had a wonderful quickening influence on the young people of the Church. Its members are very frequently heard to testify, “ I have never felt so much like doing Christian work before.” The spirit which runs through its prayer meetings and consecration meetings impresses a person with the thought that the young people are in dead earnest, and that their hearts are being touched by the Spirit of God.

The recent convention in this city, which passed off so enthusiastically and profitably, disclosed the fact that in Montreal there are now twenty-four Societies of Christian Endeavor, -- exactly three times the number existing a

year ago. The number of societies elsewhere in Quebec is likewise constantly increasing. Ontario is reporting rapid progress in this connection, and there is a prospect of having the international convention of 1892 within the borders of Canada.

It is possible that this system of work may "have its day and cease to be," like other systems before it, but that will not cancel all the good it will have done before that time comes. If all of these societies were to dissolve now, they would not "leave not a rack behind." The good they have already done would remain as a monument to their usefulness. But we do not anticipate an immediate dissolution of this organization, but rather that it will become a permanent institution, and form the connecting link between the Sabbath School and the Church.

### THE LIBRARY.

WE are glad to notice that Mr. Peter Redpath, of Chislehurst, Eng., who has already done so much towards enriching the library, has presented to it another valuable collection of forty-two volumes, embracing the works of a number of the standard English divines,—Jeremy Taylor, Barrow, South, Hooker and Fuller. It includes also Blackadder's unique edition of the English Bible, Anderson's Annals of the Bible, Stroud's Death on the Cross and Steinmetz's History of the Jesuits. Mr. Redpath always does these things handsomely; these volumes are all richly bound, and stamped with the college arms.

---

Three of our professors have now given expression to their views concerning the Revision of the Confession. In the succeeding three numbers we are to be favored with articles on this subject by writers whose words are likewise entitled to consideration; Drs. J. Watson, J. Laing and R. F. Burns. This will complete the Symposium. In addition to this, we have in store for our readers a plethora of other very readable articles.

---

The business managers have requested us to ask those of our subscribers who have not already remitted their subscriptions to be kind enough to do so as soon as possible. Our printer's bill comes in monthly, and if subscriptions are not paid in advance, wherewith have we to meet it?

# College Note Book.

## STUDENT LIFE.

FOR some reason or other, the items of local news of the past month are "few and (if the printer spaces them out) far between." Examination week has cast before it its Plutonian shadow. True, our men still live and act, but it is in the darkness, and "their deeds are evil." Well may we exclaim: "The days of chivalry are gone, those of sophisters, economists and calculators have succeeded, and the glory of the college is extinguished—forever?" Oh! no. As behind the cloud which casts upon the earth the gloomiest shade, in secret splendor shines the noonday sun, so, if our eyes have not been dimmed, beyond these days of gloom we may descry the brightest season of the varying year. Euphrosyne will come, her sister Graces leading on her gladsome train, at sight of whom dark Erebus, dismayed, will betake himself to Orcus, and in his sovereign stead Aurora reign supreme. As men inspired by the morning, we shall return; and the new year shall record the brilliant deeds that shall spring from the renewal of our ancient glory and the revival of our former fame.

Dear reader, you've got to come down, so you may as well fall on something soft. Mr. T. S. St. Aubin will spend his vacation at Orangeville, Ont. We are not authorized to give his reason for so doing.

The third year in Theology have elected Mr. Vessot valedictorian.

The P. E. Island men and a few others will remain in the College during Christmas. May they spend a holiday as agreeable as it is usually made for those who stay!

His fellow students hear with sympathetic regret of Mr. McLean's bereavement in the death of his esteemed father.

Mr. D. A. Campbell, after spending a month or two in the city, has returned among us. Doubtless, he has often been haunted by the smell of codfish, and has yearned to be back among "the flesh pots of Egypt."

Some weeks ago a student announced at the dinner table that a package of books, entitled "How to Study the Bible," had been given him by the college bookseller for distribution among his fellows. He intimated that any student who desired one should call at his room after dinner. On going up, which he did directly the meal was over, he found his room crowded. Before the expectant throng he slowly brought from his pocket a little bundle of tracts bearing the title stated. The applicants silently retired with averted faces. At tea the same gentleman moved a vote of thanks to the bookseller, which one of the disappointed ones seconded, adding the suggestion that it be conveyed by the mover. The latter suggested in return that it would be much more effective if set to music and sung to Mr. Drysdale by theseconder,

who retorted that he would have no objections to singing it if the mover would play the accompaniment on the banjo. He, in his turn, expressed a fear that he could not get his banjo up to the necessary tension "You have been paying enough *attention* to it." *Omnes*. Oh! (repeated twenty-five times and followed by three lines of exclamation points).

---

VOICES FROM THE HALLS.

Like the fellow in "Excelsior!", we must "try the *pass*."

A pony! a pony! My kingdom for a pony!

And so she'll be playing ta tampoureene on ta Sawpath. Nainsel wass amaced.

Come for a walk and develop your constitution *Theo*. No necessity. I spend five hours daily in getting up my "*System*"

The west wing is going to have an oyster supper in support of the General Hospital. You can't see it? Well, you've never sat next a west wing man at table. Better have the ambulance ready.

---

In last issue we failed to keep our promise with regard to Ragged Gown for want of space. Inspired by the approaching holiday season, he this time furnishes us with what he calls

THE STUDENT'S CHRISTMAS CAROL.

Oh! the happy time is coming, we can scent it on the air,  
 In its fragrant breath thuriferous with sweets,  
 Redolent with Christmas puddings, spicy beverages rare,  
 And the aromatic dressing of rich meats.

Oh! the time when with the musty Mathematics we'll be done,  
 When our Classics will be laid upon the rack,  
 When each student will surrender to festivity and fun  
 ('Cept the fellow who has *subs* when he gets back).

When the Senior awes his sisters with the self-sufficient air,  
 Which contemplates the receipt of his degree;  
 When the Junior idly lounges in the lazy, cushioned chair,  
 And regrets that he has eaten quite so free.

When the Sophomore so stoutly carols out the college songs,  
 And among the ladies thinks he takes the *bun*,  
 Shouts about as if the wisdom of the world to him belongs,  
 And assails you with the Sophomoric pun.

When the Freshman speaks so fondly of the days when he was young,  
 Uses college slang and wears his best attire,  
 Tries to *dicere* his *pater* in the ancient Latin tongue,  
 And for Santa hangs his stocking by the fire.

WM. M. MACKERACHER.

## REPORTERS' FOLIO.

## PHILOSOPHICAL AND LITERARY SOCIETY.

A MEETING of this society was held on Friday evening, Nov., 21st. A very interesting programme was presented. Mr. Frew, the essayist for the evening, was received with prolonged applause. A song was then rendered by the Glee Club.

The debate, "Resolved, that capital punishment should be abolished," was ably led on the affirmative by W. D. Reid, B.A., followed by Mr. McKeracher. On the negative were Messrs Dobson and St. Aubin.

Mr. Reid, in supporting the resolution, built up a strong case in its favor, only to be dashed to the ground, however, by the leader of the negative, Mr. St. Aubin. The latter was especially happy in his analogies, and where words failed to express the thought within, the declivity of his left eye-lid "told what a flame of fire was at his heart." Mr. McKeracher then spoke on the affirmative, tracing the adverse sentiment to capital punishment as seen among philosophers and poets. His arguments showed a careful preparation of the subject under discussion.

Mr. Dobson was several times applauded. His telling arguments, given as they were in his usual forcible manner, gained the sympathy of the audience. The decision was given in favor of the negative.

Before adjourning, Mr. Sproule, from Queen's University, was introduced, who extended friendly greetings on behalf of the students at Kingston. Mr. Sproule had come as a delegate to the McGill University dinner, and after discharging his duty in this respect, desired to satisfy his inclination to know something of our institution and its societies. It is needless to say that the greetings were heartily reciprocated on the part of those present. The meeting then adjourned.

Another meeting was held on Dec 5th, the president in the chair. Mr. D. MacVicar, B.A., read a very interesting essay on "The Epicureans." Mr. Reid, the popular tenor, favored the audience with the rendition of "The Vale of Chamouni."

The debate at this meeting proved a failure. This, however, was no fault of the debaters, who had spent considerable time in preparation and who merited better treatment at the hands of their fellows.

The subject, "Resolved, that emulation should be encouraged in education," was to have been discussed on the affirmative by Messrs. H. C. Sutherland, B.A., and A. McGregor, B.A.; the negative to have been supported by Messrs. D. J. Fraser, B.A., and W. T. D. Moss, B.A. Examinations being near, the Art students were unavoidably absent, and owing to the meagre attendance of Divinity students, it was deemed wise to cancel the debate. A motion was, therefore, carried to the effect that the meeting adjourn. It is to be deplored that students should make engagements on an evening which should be kept free for College societies. It seems to be the general feeling that as Friday concludes the week's lectures, that evening, if any, should be given up to engagements outside the regular college work. At this time of the year, Art students cannot be expected to attend so regularly, owing to pressure of examinations, but there is no excuse for those taking Divinity classes, as there are no examinations in this work and, there-

fore, nothing of a serious nature to draw the attention away. With one exception, the attendance during the past term has been good. Why not have it as good all session?

---

### MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

We are pleased to record the recent visit to our college of Mr. and Mrs. Watt, who have been laboring for the past twenty years in the Island of Tanna, one of the New Hebrides. Mr. Watt, in addressing the students, gave a vivid description of his work in this foreign land. His words were very encouraging, especially to those who are looking forward to their life's labor among the heathen. A novel feature of the meeting was a hymn by Mrs. Watt, sung in the Tannese language. Such visits as these cannot fail to arouse among students greater sympathy in this important branch of the Church's work.

The meeting of the Missionary Society have been fairly successful during this first term. Some profitable and instructive papers have been read: those of Mr. Sutherland on "The Zenanas of India," and of Mr. Rondeau on "Romanism, its practices and results," are especially worthy of notice. Mr. Charles still gives encouraging reports from St. Jean Baptiste. This school, being the special work of the Society at present, it is interesting to learn that it is progressing favorably, and under the able management of Mr. and Mrs. Charles there is every reason to feel hopeful for its success in the future.

Now that the Society has closed its meetings for the present, it might not be out of place to suggest some changes in the programme for the ensuing term. The Essayist might touch on subjects hitherto unthought of by the Society, such as Confucianism, Buddhism or any other of those forms of belief which our missionaries are daily combatting in foreign lands. We would thus learn something of their difficulties, and would thereby be brought into greater sympathy with their work. It would also be interesting to sketch the history of Presbyterianism, either in the Old Country or in Canada. It might also be well to institute discussions at the close of each paper, thus giving each an opportunity of taking an active part in the meetings. Your reporter begs to suggest some such innovations as these, hoping that they may meet with the wishes of all who are interested in the welfare of the Society.

W. T. D. Moss.

---

### OUR GRADUATES.

Rev. D. L. Dewar, B.A., has been inducted into the charge at Ailsa Craig, Ont., under very auspicious circumstances.

Rev. T. A. Nelson, of Windsor, N. S., has received and accepted a unanimous call from the congregation at Bristol, Que.

Rev. G. T. Bayne, of Ramsay's Corners, Ont., has received a call to Gloucester, Ont. We notice an account of an interesting series of evangelistic meetings which he has been conducting at Merivale, Ont., during the month of October, in which he was assisted by Evangelist Meikle.

Mr. W. A. Cook, one of last year's graduates, has been presented with, and, we believe, has accepted, a call to the united congregations of Crumlin and Dorchester, Ont. All the graduates are now settled or are on the eve of being settled. We wish Mr. Cook much prosperity and success in his work.

Rev. R. Johnston, B.A., of Lindsay, Ont., has been presented with a Persian lamb overcoat by the ladies of his congregation. We are not surprised. He was always popular with the ladies.

It gives us much pleasure to speak of still another graduate of last year, Mr. W. J. Jamieson, who, in devoting his life to the work of the Foreign missions, adds one more to the number of those who have gone from amongst us to make known the message of salvation to those in the darkness of heathenism.

Mr. Jamieson has gone to join the mission band in Central India, which was recently joined by his sister, and where the Rev. G. MacKelvie has been labouring for the past two years.

More recently the Rev. J. C. Martin, B.A., the late pastor of St. Agnes de Dundee, Que., paid us a farewell visit in the dining hall. Mr. Sutherland was appointed by the students to say a few words of valediction, which he did in appropriate terms. Mr. Martin replied, and his address, breathing a warm missionary spirit, was listened to with rapt attention. Dr. MacVicar, was also present, and spoke a few words. Mr. Martin has been appointed as the head of an educational institution at Tarsus, Asia Minor, and, with his wife, intends to travel by way of London, Paris, Rome, Constantinople, &c. A fuller notice of these two gentlemen will appear in our editorial columns next month.

Speaking of missionaries, it is pleasing to note once more the fact that within the past three years, seven of our graduates have gone to proclaim the gospel in heathen lands. It is pleasing also to note that these are not men who are unable to obtain positions of honour and usefulness at home, but that they are invariably men of talent, who would undoubtedly be bright ornaments to the church at home; but they shall shine with even greater brilliancy, because by their noble self-denial, they reflect the spirit of the Master, and because they shall gather many gems for the Saviour's crown, gems "of purest ray serene," all the brighter because sought out from hitherto "dark, unfathomed caves."

Most of our readers know of the sad death of one of the missionaries referred to above, Rev. J. J. Forbes, who fell at his post, just when he had manfully taken his stand at it.

It might not be out of place, however, to mention what may not be known to all, that his widow, who is a native of Montreal, and whose relatives live in the city, is devotedly carrying on the work, and continues firm in her determination to remain in the Field. She is at present on the island of Kusaie, where the death of her husband took place, and where she finds ample work to engross all her time and attention. Interesting letters, giving accounts of her work, and her experiences amongst the South Sea Islanders, are received frequently by her friends at home.



Interesting tidings have reached us concerning Rev. A. McWilliams, B.A., of Heckston, Ont. We are delighted to hear of the great success which has attended his labour since he left us. At the last Communion Service at Heckston 41 united in church membership, almost all on profession of faith, while at his other station at South Mountain, thirty-seven joined the church. During his first year in the ministry, over one hundred members were added to the roll.

Such evidence of the Divine blessing must be a source of great joy and encouragement not only to himself, but to us also who are looking forward to the work.

Quite a number of graduates have visited us during the past month. The first to present an appearance was the Rev. M. L. Leitch, of Elora, Ont. The Rev. J. Allard, of Fall River, Mass., and Rev. J. A. McFarlane, M.A., also favoured us with a call. Rev. W. Russel, B.A., spent a few days with us. We always feel profited by his presence and his words.

The members of St. Andrew's Church, Sherbrooke, have shown their appreciation of their pastor, Rev. A. Lee, and their regret at his departure from them, by presenting him with a purse of \$100.

At Almonte, Nov. 7th, the wife of Rev. A. S. Grant, B.A., of a son.

“What smiling star with silver light  
In heaven chanced to reign  
And like a diamond deeked the night  
The little curate came.”

We are sorry to learn that owing to ill-health the Rev. D. L. McCrae, N. Y., has decided to resign the charge of the congregation at Jameston, and has applied to the Presbytery for letters of demission.

JOHN A. CLELAND.

## HOMER ON MCGINTY

THERE is no new thing under the sun, as our Personal Reporter, who knows everybody and everybody's business, from Methuselah to McKinley's Bill, has found. In the almost forgotten past he has discovered a great female ancestor of a much abused man of modern times. About this time last year, the whole atmosphere was damp with “McGinty at the bottom of the sea.” He was thought at first to have been an Irishman, but, when traced by various parcels to a residence on St. Catherine St., Montreal, it turned out that he was a French Canadian. Our reporter investigated this matter of nationality, and, in the course of his researches, came upon an ancient and much dog-eared copy of the immortal poems of Homer, the blind old man of Scio's rocky isle. This proved that the Montreal McGinty is an unfortunate victim of denationalization, or else an imposter and no true man. In the sixth book of the Iliad, not the crib that lay alongside of it, but in the stern original, and at the eighth verse, he read, to his amazement, that McGinty was a Threkessi or Thracian, a lady also, and somewhat of a

Tartar at that. What the hidden joke is, that being a Three-kessi she only tuk-two, he fails to understand. Homer must have been failing when he wrote this.

Allowance must be made for the blind old bard's imperfect knowledge of Thracian orthography. As generally read, the verse runs thus:

*"Huion Eussorou Akamant'eun te megan te."*

But in real genuine Thracian, and when a boy, our reporter was acquainted with many Thrashuns, the verse reads:

*"Whee! On! use a row; hack a man t'ye, aunty McGinty."*

This proves that the Aunty was vindictive in disposition, perhaps cannibalistically inclined. It is probable that Andrew Balone, who occurs in the preceding or seventh verse of the book, was the inhuman monster that uttered the awful "Whee!" and the subsequent cry to the onset. Balone, though a Thracian name, is the same as the modern Irish Malone, from which it differs by a change of labials common in comparative philology. He may have been the son of the well-known Widdy Malone, who was afterwards picked up by that unblushing spalpeen, Mr. O'Brien from Clare. The Thracians or Thrashuns would thus appear to have been an ancient Irish sept. How Balone came to be called Andrew is a question for the Celtic Society. It is a good thing to have cleared up this mystery of McGinty's origin, as it was creating softening of the brain in some quarters not far away. Yet, Homer is not so ample and satisfactory as he might have been, had he known the gravity of the interests at stake. We have accordingly set our Personal Reporter on the Aunty's trail, to run her down *a la Witness*.

## STUDENTS' DIRECTORY, 1889-90.

### (A)—STUDENTS IN THEOLOGY.

#### *Post-Graduate Course.*

NAME.	HOME ADDRESS.	ROOM.
1 ROBERTSON, A., B.A.	Edinburgh, Scotland	32

#### *Third Year.*

2 CHARLES, G., B.A., B.Sc.	Grand Ligne, Que.	136 Dufferin St.
3 FRASER, J. K. G., B.A.	Alberton, P. E. I.	26
4 FREW, R.	Glasgow, Scotland	3
5 MORISON, J. A., B.A.	Ormstown, Que.	842 Sherbrooke St.
6 VESSOT, C. H.	Joliette, Que.	136 Dufferin St.

#### *Second Year.*

7 MACCULLOUGH, R.	Inverness, Que.	29
8 MACLEOD, J. W.	Kirkhill, Ont.	10 Drolet St.
9 MACGREGOR, A., B.A.	Aberfeldy, Scotland	30
10 MACVICAR, D., B.A.	Strathroy, Ont.	17
11 MOSS, W. T. D., B.A.	High Bluff, Man.	23
12 RONDEAU, S. P.	Joliette, Que.	31
13 SUTHERLAND, H. C., B.A.	Woodstock, Ont.	27

#### *First Year.*

14 FRASER, D. J., B.A.	Alberton, P. E. I.	26
15 GIROULX, L.	Duclos, Que.	16
16 MACDOUGALL, R., B.A.	Ormstown	32 Cre. cent St.
17 MACKENZIE, E. A.	Lucknow, Ont.	20
18 MACLENNAN, K.	Harris, Scotland	19
19 MAYNARD, M.	St. Brigide, Que.	15
20 MITCHELL, T. A.	Linden, N.S.	11
21 REEVES, A. C.	Ormstown, Que.	721A Sherbrooke St.
22 REID, W. D., B.A.	Maple Hill, Que.	33
23 RUSSELL, A.	Bristol, Que.	28
24 ST. AUBIN, T. S.	St. Philomene, Que.	18

### (B)—UNDERGRADUATES IN ARTS.

#### *Fourth Year.*

25 DOBSON, J. R.	Pictou, N.S.	9
26 GUTHRIE, D.	Guelph, Ont.	45
27 HOLDEN, A. R.	Montreal, Que.	49 Belmont Park.
(7) MACCULLOUGH, R.	Inverness, Que.	29
28 MACLEOD, N. A.	Lochside, N.S.	8
29 PIDGEON, G. C.	New Richmond, Que.	1
(23) RUSSELL, A.	Bristol, Que.	28

#### *Third Year.*

30 ANDERSON, J. D.	Tiverton, Ont.	21
31 COLQUHOUN, P.	Colquhoun, Ont.	13
(17) MACKENZIE, E. A.	Lucknow, Ont.	20
(18) MACLENNAN, K.	Harris, Scotland	19
(21) REEVES, A. C.	Ormstown, Que.	721A Sherbrooke St.
32 RUSSELL, W.	Monreal, Que.	40 Balmoral St.
33 SMYTH, W.	" "	387 St. Antoine St.
34 TAYLOR, J.	Ottawa, Ont.	54

*Second Year.*

35	GORDON, J. S.	Alberton, P.E.I.	49
36	HUTCHISON, D.	Brechin, Ont.	14
37	INTERNOSCIA, J.	Montreal, Que.	55 University St.
38	MACVICAR, A.	Strathroy, Ont.	17
49	MACKERACHER, W. M.	Howick, Que.	2367 St. Catherine St.
40	MAHAFFY, A.	Port Albert, Ont.	22
41	MUIR, P. D.	Fordwich, Ont.	57
42	PATTERSON, W.	Cantley Que.	58
43	SMITH, E. F. M.	Hawkesbury, Ont.	7
44	TOWNSEND, W. M.	Traveller's Rest, P. E. I.	50

*First Year.*

45	ADAMS, J. P.	Broadlands, Que.	52
46	BOYD, R.	Russell, Ont.	38
47	BREMNER, W.	Ottawa East, Ont.	59
48	CLELAND, J. A.	Enni killen, Ireland	41
49	GRAHAM, A.	Glencoe, Ont.	39
50	GILMORE, W. F.	Almonte, Que.	46
51	MACGREGOR, A.	St. Andrews, Que.	61
52	PROCTER, A. P.	Aiberni, B.C.	3
53	STEWART, J. C.	Embros, Ont.	43
54	STEWART, G.	Bristol, Que.	52

## (C)—STUDENTS IN THE LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

*Third Year.*

55	BALLANTYNE, R.	Dunbar, Ont.	9 Richmond Sq.
56	EADIE, R.	Sherbrooke, Que.	15 Overdale Ave.
57	FRASER, A. D.	Dundee, Que.	12
58	MACINNIS, J. P.	Vankleek Hill, Ont.	55
59	MACLAREN, N.	Ch coutimi, Que.	6
60	MAYNARD, J.	St. Brigide, Que.	5
(12)	RONDEAU, S. P.	Joliette, Que.	31
61	SAUVE, ALBERT	Hull, Que.	51
62	SAVIGNAC, J.	Tulleride, Colorado, U.S.	40
63	TENER, R.	Donaghmore, Ireland.	12

*Second Year.*

64	BEAUCHAMP, P.	Grenville, Que.	53
65	MACLEAN, N.	Bolsover, Ont.	62
66	MORISON, W. T.	Ormstown, Que.	842 Sherbrooke St.
67	SINCENNES, J.	Duclos, Que.	56
68	SAUVE, A. E.	Hull, Que.	60
69	BEATTIE, W. E.	Guelph, Ont.	24

*First Year.*

70	ARMSTRONG, S.	Milo, Que.	35
71	LAMERT, J. O.	Montebello, Que.	44
72	MACCUAIG, W.	Bryson, Que.	21 Argyle Ave.
73	MACINTOSH, J.	Mount Pleasant, P.E.I.	44
74	MASSICOTTE, G. A.	Montreal, Que.	223 St. Constant St.

## Talks about Books.

THE book of the day is General Booth's "In Darkest England." I call him General, because he calls himself so, just as I would call a teacher of elocution or music a professor, if he arrogated that title to himself, as I would call Cardinal Taschereau by the dignity the Pope conferred upon him, and as, in correspondence or conversation, I have addressed their lordships, the bishops of Fredericton, Toronto, and Huron. Good words are worth much and cost little. My youngest boy is no captain and he knows it, but it gives him pleasure to be hailed as such. When I remember that the saints shall judge the world, and that every one of them shall be a king and a priest to God, and, knowing that God's promises are yea and amen, see a poor wretch whom the General's army has picked out of the mire and brought to christian manhood, I look about me in the starry heavens and say "Lord, over which of these fair worlds of Thine shall that gutter waif rule as king?" What are professors and doctors, cardinals, generals, and lords spiritual, yea earthly kings and emperors, compared to God's kings and priests; and such, by faith answering to grace, may the vilest become. General Booth, under God, is a king maker; and it makes my heart glad to hear men and lads, who once served the devil greedily, even though they do it with grimace and contortion, and needless noise, sing "I am the son of a King, I am: I am the son of a King." God bless the General, and every one else, who, like Abou-ben-Adhem loves his fellow man. "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

General Booth wants to set before the eyes of those who care for their fellows, not the Parnells nor the Salisburys, the degradation of the submerged class in England, amounting to a tenth part of the whole population; and to propose a scheme for that class's elevation. If you want to know what the class is like, get George Gissing's *Nether World* and read it; then know that there are lower depths still. The General gives a number of brief biographies of the submerged, male and female, that make your flesh creep, and wring from you the confession, "Verily the devil rules this earth of ours." For their sake, he proposes the establishment of three communities or colonies; one in the city, consisting of harbours of refuge for the ingathering of the outcasts; another in the country, a farm colony, to take the poor city, diseased and rickety, plants back to the garden; and a third over the sea, in South Africa or British Columbia, where the second generation at least may regain lost manhood. A thousand creatures of that miserable, selfish, carping class that loves to see itself in the newspapers, and which some newspapers, to their own loss, encourage in their wretched criticism, will have stones ready to pick up and throw at General Booth's scheme; but, if he continues to be the man he has shewn himself hitherto, he will brush these mosquitoes of the press aside with sovereign contempt and go forward in his grand scheme for relieving suffering humanity.

In this connection, the Rev John Mitchell, B D., of Chester, England, sends me Dr. Barnardo's Night and Day for November, calling special attention to two articles, entitled "Roman Catholic Aggression" and "For the Defendant." The first sets forth the action of Roman Catholic organs in attempting, first, to hinder Sir Arthur Blackwood and the Marquis of Lorne

from presiding over the Barnardo meetings, and, afterwards, in vilifying them for so doing. The second deals with law suits, in which, according to the author, Roman Catholic lawyers, under priestly direction, unjustly removed children from the houses. Dr. Barnardo makes out a good case. With General and the late Mrs Booth, Mr. Charles Booth, the author of *Labour and Life of the People in East London*, with Miss Macpherson and Miss Rye, Dr. Barnardo stands forth as a friend of the poor, a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ, a Christian hero of the nineteenth century. It is a pity that he and the Booths, Mr. Stead and Benjamin Waugh, either cannot cease criticizing one another's methods or, when criticized, cannot put up with it. I do not claim to be much of a benefactor or of a public man, but if I were to stop my work and get angry whenever a cur barked at my heels, I should lead a most uncomfortable life and accomplish nothing. Some of Dr. Barnardo's lieutenants are notoriously inefficient. It can hardly be otherwise; for where is the man who can infuse his own spirit into all his helpers? They should, however, remember this, that they owe a debt to the kind friends who, in Canada, take up their waifs as well as to the waifs themselves. A lively correspondence in the *Montreal Witness* proved that, while some of the Home children turned out very well, others were so bad that their employers washed their hands of Home children for ever. To champion bad children through thick and thin, even before courts of law, inviting inevitable defeat, is not the way to commend an otherwise most praiseworthy institution.

I am sure that we all congratulate Mr. Mitchell on his F.R.A.S, which I take to mean Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society. In the *Journal of the Liverpool Astronomical Society* he has an article on A Universal Micrometer. This is an instrument, placed over the lens of a telescope, for measuring small distances on the surface of the heavenly bodies. The one recommended by Mr. Mitchell is that made by Slade of Hull. Other articles in the *Journal* are the address of the President, W. B. Hutchison, Esq., F.R.A.S., notes on Variable Stars by Major Markwick, Solar Observations by E. M. Antoniadi of Constantinople, Coloured Star Section by the Rev. M. Waugh, Lunar Surfacing by seas and lakes of molten lava by Mr. L. E. Peal, and Notes on the Zodiacal Light by Mr. L. J. Johnson. It is very gratifying to find our graduates, now in many parts of the world, not only doing good duty in the pulpit and among their flocks, but holding their own with the thoughtful men and scholars of the day. The use of the singular pronoun would be inappropriate here, so I say *we all* rejoice most heartily in the welfare, the success, the literary and scientific excellence, of every graduate who leaves our halls to be an honour to his Alma Mater.

The *Canadian Methodist Quarterly* for October is on our table, and is a most respectable looking Review. It contains an article by Dr. George Workman on Messianic Prophecy, a second paper by the Rev. W. D. P. Bliss on Christian Socialism, and, I had almost said a sermon, a discourse on Christian Fellowship by the Rev. James E. Ford. The editorial notices of books and reviews are very numerous and of varying merit. One sentence of Dr. Shaw's is barbarous: "Evidently in this other Methodism (the Church of the United Brethren) our Greek, Armenian, Wesleyan Freedomism is losing none of its power." There is no such word as Freedomism in the English language, and, with all respect for Professor Shaw, I don't believe that even the weight of his learning will carry such a repulsive-looking

object into the dictionary. Dr. Workman's essay is learned and thoughtful, its seventy pages presenting an exhaustive treatment of a momentous theme. I am disposed to think, however, that in following his scholarly guides, he has allowed himself to be too much influenced by theological teaching. When he says that there was only one Old Testament passage to guide men to the Christ, and regards Isaiah xi. and liii. as only partly Messianic, he virtually denies that the Scriptures testify of Christ, and involves Isaiah in obscurity. It is this kind of minimizing Christ that frightens timid believers away from a reformed Biblical theology, for they confound the two movements, which are quite distinct in aim and effect. Christian Socialism and Christian Fellowship, a defence of love feasts, are both worthy of perusal. Taking the Quarterly in all, our Methodist brethren are to be congratulated on its appearance. Long may it live.

The Rev. Thomas Fenwick, now of Elder's Mills, Ontario, has issued and sent to the JOURNAL a volume of over 200 pages, in true Presbyterian blue and gold, entitled Archbishop Lynch's Answers, &c., reviewed. This is, as all who are familiar with Mr. Fenwick's extensive reading would expect, a solid substantial treatise, full of thought and replete with wise answers to the late Archbishop's pleas. But it is the most rollicking, funny, laughter provoking religious book that ever issued from the press. There is no irreverence meant. It is the work of a deeply pious and earnest man, but of a man who has not self conceit enough to stand always on his dignity, and who possesses, what is regarded as a necessary concomitant of true genius, a strong sense of humour and perception of the ridiculous. Had the good Archbishop been alive to receive a copy of the book from the kindly author, I am sure he would have enjoyed the occasional bits of brogue. It is most amusing and at the same time instructive to follow Mr. Fenwick's pursuit of the poor Archbishop, correcting his grammar and his theology in a playful, bantering fashion combined with solid learning, until at last his spirits get the better of him and, with a wild hurroo!, he bursts into the brogue. I should like exceedingly to try the effect of this book on a humorous Irish Roman Catholic, and trust that it may have a wide circulation. It is for sale by Messrs. Drysdale & Co., St. James St.

Mr Croil's contribution of Provost Vahl's Northern Mission Chronicle reminds me that my Danish is getting rusty. One can't be a perpetual polyglott without practice. That was a good thing Bismarck said to a gentleman, who proudly presented his son, stating that he could speak several languages; "Hum!" replied the man of blood and iron, "Are you going to make a courier of him?" The Chronicle contains a Review of Missions by Christian Kundsén. It is a good review, but how any Dane can bear to be called Christian, since the second king of that name perpetrated the horrible massacre of Stockholm, I cannot imagine. Herbert Widman writes on the Life and Work of the Swedish missionary Lager. Mr. Kundsén also contributes an article on the Congress of Northern Missionary Societies for 1890. There are also papers on Zenana and other foreign work of interest. The Danes early took an interest in missions, but their zeal seems now to be flourishing anew. From the same donor comes the Journal of the Geographical Society of Jena. It contains useful articles on The Papuas of Geelvink Bay, New Guinea by Missionary Von Hassett, The Customs of the Chosa Caffres by Mission Superintendent Dr. Kropf, and others that will repay perusal.

Knowing that the Talker about Books has not lost his interest in botany, Dr. Thorburn of the Geological Survey at Ottawa has kindly sent him the Catalogue of Canadian Acrogens drawn up by Professor MacCoun, M.A., F.L.S., F.R.S.C., and Mr. W. H. Pearson's List of Canadian Hepaticæ. They are admirable catalogues, the work of men who thoroughly know their science, and Mr. Pearson's has the additional merit of possessing very useful illustrations. I think it was Mr. Squeers who used to call up the first form in botany, make them spell bot-tin-ney, *bottinney*, and then send them out to weed the garden or dig potatoes. That is the kind of practical *bottinney* which occupies most of my spare time in summer, but, very often people with enquiring minds disturb the island *Cincinnatus* with a request for the name of what they are sure is a new orchid. Everything in the flower line that is unknown is an orchid, and the plant presented for inspection sometimes does belong to the orchis family, more frequently it is a *Pyrola*, a *Moneses*, or a *Chimaphila*, and once, this last summer, it was a creeping cranberry. The number of botanists in Canada must now be very large, as compared with thirty years ago when a few of us used to sweep the plains and valleys for miles about Toronto of old, but which are now largely absorbed in the city of to-day.

Messrs. Williamson and Co., of Toronto, have favoured me with a copy, in elegant white and gold, of the Hon. Oliver Mowat's Lecture on Christian Evidences, referred to with respect in last month's Talks about Books. The Editor of the Journal also offered me, in an apologetic sort of way, and with an incredulous smile, a minute tract, which he said was the Rev. Mr. Something's sermon, entitled Lessons from the life of Mr. G. W. Childs. I begged the Editor to keep that tract; not to let me know the name of that minister, lest in my heart I should despise him. I asked if Mr. Childs had died since last month's talk. He answered "No, but ---," and then I fled the corridor. I don't want that man's blood on my hands, but would warn him, as Paul and Silas did the Philippian jailor, "Do thyself no harm!"

It is well to be honest, and confess that the books that follow were not sent to the JOURNAL by their publishers, but were purchased with hard cash for the Library, and ignominiously brought thence to the reviewer's table for a brief space of time, to return again to the shelves from which they were taken. Of course this is humiliating, but it gives the reviewer a great advantage. He can say what he likes about that which the Americans call "a boughten book." The Honorary Librarian, Professor Scrimger, as is evident from last month's JOURNAL, would be a far better hand than the writer to review Franz Delitsch's Commentary on Isaiah, with an introduction by Dr. Driver. Franz Delitsch, Philoioudaiou, is dead; the lover of the Jew, who did more than build him a synagogue, for he translated the New Testament into the Hebrew tongue, and thus made himself a monument forever. A man who could do that, knew Hebrew, and thus bespeaks respect for what he has written on matters Hebraic. It does not follow, because a man is a great scholar, an earnest Christian, a loving soul yearning for the restoration of Israel, and a hard worker for that great end, that every word he writes is to be implicitly received; for the work of the Higher Criticism, as Professor Scrimmer has shown, is one in which imperfect historical knowledge of the ethnical and philological surroundings of Israel in ancient times may give rise to preconceptions affecting the interpretation of the Hebrew records by many and varied hypotheses. But when this preeminently truth



ful man finds that the Prophecy, ascribed to the princely Isaiah, was written, not by him alone, but by a prophetic school of which he was the head, I feel that I should need to know Hebrew literature better, in order to call his statements in question. In Hittite I call no man, master, but, in Hebrew, Professor Coussirat, the Rev. Mr. Croull of St. Sylvester, and Professor Scrimger, could walk all round me. Dr. Driver's introduction is appreciative and kindly, most unlike his ungenerous treatment of Sir William Dawson's Mosaic Cosmogony.

Two volumes by Dr. Emil Schurer of Gressen belong to my department, ; speaking more truthfully, to one of my departments, for in this College we all do double duty, and try and do it to the best of our ability. They both bear the general title "A history of the Jewish people in the time of Jesus Christ." The first volume, belonging to what Dr. Schurer calls the first division, is translated by the Rev. John Macpherson, M.A., and deals with the political condition of Palestine from 175 B.C. to 135 A.D. This is a very full and scientific setting forth of the history of Palestine from the period immediately preceding the revolt of the Maccabees down to that of the suppression of the revolt of Bar Cochba. The first English man to attempt a work of this kind was Dr. Humphrey Prideaux, Dean of Norwich, in 1715, in his *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*; but his work only comes down to the time of our Saviour. The Apocrypha and the writings of Josephus are the chief authorities for the first part. The history from the time of Christ down to Bar Cochba's insurrection is taken from the Church historians and past Christian classical authors. The other book is in the second division, dealing with the internal condition of Palestine in the time of Jesus Christ, and is Vol. III, treating altogether of Jewish literature. It is well translated by Miss Sophia Taylor and the Rev. P. Christie. This interesting, but somewhat scanty literature is set forth briefly by the late Dr. Edersheim, as far back as 1857, in his valuable *History of the Jewish Nation*. We speak of the Jew with bated breath, remembering that He who wears our humanity in the highest seat in Heaven came of the tribe of Judah, but Renan is all astray in taking the Jew or the larger Semite as the type of spirituality. Where, apart from inspiration, on the one hand, and the influence of classical culture, on the other, are Semitic writings evincing spirituality? They are nowhere. The Jew, of whom, concerning the flesh, Christ came, is my brother, but Miracle is nowhere written more plainly than in the fact, that a people in all ages ardently devoted to material prosperity should have been the repositories of the Sacred Oracles. Dr. Schurer's books are worthy to be regarded as standard in the subject they treat.

Yet one more library book is Dr. Edwin Hatch's, "The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church," the Hibbert lecture for 1888, edited by Dr. Fairbairn, of Mansfield College, Oxford. Dr. Hatch is well and favourably known for his studies in early ecclesiastical history. Thoroughly conversant with the Greek Church historians and with patristic literature in general, he, like Neander, takes a subjective view of its history, reading the thoughts of the Christians in the early centuries, and tracing their development. What strikes him is the marvellous change from the Sermon on the Mount to the Nicene Creed, the bound, in three centuries, from a life to a philosophy. This down grade in theology, which Mr Spurgeon and the pugilistic Dr. Watts would fain have us believe was an up grade, (what folly!) Dr. Hatch accounts for by the influence on Christian

thought of Greek philosophy. There is truth in this, for Justin Martyr and Clemens Alexandrinus were philosophers; Origen sat in the Neo-Platonic school under Ammonius Saccas, side by side with Plotinus and Longinus; and the three great Cappadocians studied in the Pagan schools of Athens. The early opponents of Christianity, such as Celsus, found fault with the Bible as a book lacking philosophical system. Such system the Christian teachers thought to impart to their presentation of its truths, and Dr. Hatch thinks that in doing so they spoiled the revelation. He, therefore, longs for the time when the philosophy will be discarded and the life come back again, when the Spirit of God shall breathe upon the fossils and make them stand up and walk, for a "Christianity in which men will be bound together by the bond of service."

In a brief street conversation the other day, Dr. Murray of McGill, refreshed my memory with what Sir Henry Maine, in his books on ancient law, says concerning the influence of Roman law on Christian belief. Law and philosophy have moulded out theology. Men brought to the study of the Bible more than half of what they took out of it. It is not the philosopher or the lawyer who knows Divine truth, but "he that doeth the will of God shall know of the doctrine." Even Old Testament revelations were coloured by the thought and practice of the times. A friend has suggested to me, and I think the suggestion a good one, that the reason why diabolical agency has no mention in the books of Moses is that, if Satan had been revealed as a mighty malevolent being, the degraded Hebrews would have deserted the worship of the God of goodness in order to propitiate the great adversary, and have become like many African tribes, devil worshippers. Some theologians, such as Dr. Watts of Belfast, seem to think that, even now, it is not safe to declare the whole counsel of God. God's truth will take care of itself, but we will not take care of ourselves, if, by our false views of God, we bring an offence into the world and cause its little ones to stumble. Better the millstone and the depths of the sea!

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. Murray". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the main text of the article.