



THE

KNOX COLLEGE

# MONTHLY

AND

PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

---

*Managing Editor,* - J. A. MACDONALD.

*Associate Editors:*

REV. R. P. MACKAY, M.A.

REV. W. G. WALLACE, M.A., B.D.

REV. R. D. FRASER, M.A.

H. E. A. REID, B.A.

JOHN CRAWFORD, B.A.

W. J. CLARK.

J. W. McMILLAN, B.A.

T. H. ROGERS, B.A.

F. F. McPHERSON, B.A.

W. GAULD, B.A.

---

TORONTO:

PUBLISHED FOR THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION AND THE METAPHYSICAL  
AND LITERARY SOCIETY OF KNOX COLLEGE, BY

D. T. McAINSH,

PRESBYTERIAN BOOK ROOM,

COR. TORONTO AND ADELAIDE STREETS.

# KNOX COLLEGE MONTHLY.

VOLUME XII.

## CONTENTS.

*May.*

### GENERAL.

Scholasticism in Modern Theology . . . <i>Rev. W. T. McMullen, D.D.</i>	1
Lightfoot on the Christian Ministry. <i>Rev. Prin. Sheraton, D.D.</i>	5
Franz Delitzsch . . . . . <i>Rev. Prof. McCurdy</i> . . . . .	22
The Church and the Labour Question . . . . . <i>T. Ritchie</i> . . . . .	30.

### MISSIONARY.

On the Holy Hill of China . . . . . <i>Rev. D. MacGillivray, B.D.</i>	43
---	----

### REVIEWS.

THE EDITOR'S BOOK SHELF . . . . .	51
Cave's Inspiration of the O. T.—Dods' Introduction to the N. T.—Somerville's Precious Seed—Hunter's Old Missionary—McNish on Great Hymns.	

HERE AND AWAY . . . . .	58
-------------------------	----

THE ANITOBA COLLEGE LIBRARY,

ACCESSION NO. 2195-

## June.

## GENERAL.

The Birth of a Sister Dominion . . . . .	<i>Rev. Principal Grant, D.D.</i>	61
Lux Mundi . . . . .	<i>Rev. J. Burton, B.D.</i>	70
The Upper Chamber . . . . .	<i>Rev. W. Robertson, M.A.</i>	76
Berea College . . . . .	<i>Rev. W. G. Wallace, B.D.</i>	82
New Articles of Faith . . . . .		86
Dr. Von Döllinger . . . . .	<i>Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D.</i>	93

## MISSIONARY.

Calcutta . . . . .	<i>Margaret Caven Wilson</i>	102
A Year's Work at Neemuch . . . . .	<i>Rev. W. A. Wilson, M.A.</i>	111

## OPEN LETTERS.

Knox College Monthly as it was and is . . . . .	<i>An Old Editor</i>	116
The New Magazine . . . . .	<i>D. M. R.</i>	118

HERE AND AWAY . . . . .		119
-------------------------	--	-----

## July.

## GENERAL.

The Present Desiderata of The- ology . . . . .	<i>Rev. J. Stalker, D.D.</i>	121
Doubtful Teaching . . . . .	<i>A. Shortt, M.A.</i>	137
The Character of Christ . . . . .	<i>Rev. J. Thompson, D.D.</i>	140
Dr. Delitzsch on the Bible and Wine . . . . .		149
The Future . . . . .	<i>Edward Rolland Sill.</i>	152

## MISSIONARY.

Serampore . . . . .	<i>Margaret Caven Wilson.</i>	153
The Reformer . . . . .	<i>E. R. Sill.</i>	159
The Woman for the Foreign Field . . . . .	<i>One Interested</i>	160
Presbyterian Union in India . . . . .	<i>Rev. S. H. Kellogg, D.D.</i>	165

## EDITORIAL.

Literary Piracy . . . . .		170
The New Professor . . . . .		172

## REVIEWS.

THE EDITOR'S BOOK SHELF . . . . .		174
-----------------------------------	--	-----

Gibson's *The Gospel of St. Matthew*—Forbes' *The Servant of the Lord*—Fisher's *The Nature and Method of Revelation*—Delitzsch's *Iris*—*The Expositor*—*The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

iii.

August.

GENERAL.

Russel Wallace on Darwinism. . . . .	<i>Rev. W. A. Hunter, M.A.</i> . . . . .	181
A Commonplace Holiday . . . . .	<i>J. A. M.</i> . . . . .	189
The Church and Justice . . . . .	<i>W. A. Douglas, B.A.</i> . . . . .	196
The True Shepherd. . . . .	<i>F. W. Faber</i> . . . . .	203

MISSIONARY.

Patterns of Filial Piety . . . . .	<i>Rev. D. MacGillivray, B.D.</i> . . . . .	205
Benares. . . . .	<i>Margaret Caven Wilson</i> . . . . .	215
Itinerating in Central India, I . . . . .	<i>Rev. W. A. Wilson, M.A.</i> . . . . .	223

REVIEWS.

THE EDITOR'S BOOK SHELF . . . . .		229
Stanley's in Darkest Africa—Memoir and Sermons of Prof. Elmslie—Godet's Studies on the Epistles—Liberal Living, etc.—Sanitary and Economic Cooking.		

September.

GENERAL.

The Materials of Apologetics. . . . .	<i>Rev. Prof. Beattie, D.D.</i> . . . . .	237
A Reminiscence . . . . .	<i>Rev. D. D. McLeod</i> . . . . .	250
A Voice from Afar . . . . .	<i>John Henry Newman</i> . . . . .	255
American Institute of Sacred Literature . . . . .	<i>Rev. A. M. Phillips, B.D.</i> . . . . .	256

MISSIONARY.

Itinerating in Central India, II . . . . .	<i>Rev. W. A. Wilson, M.A.</i> . . . . .	263
Cawnpore . . . . .	<i>Margaret Caven Wilson</i> . . . . .	268
Shanghai Missionary Conference . . . . .	<i>Rev. D. MacGillivray, B.D.</i> . . . . .	279

REVIEWS.

THE EDITOR'S BOOK SHELF . . . . .		283
Edersheim's Jesus the Messiah—British Weekly Pulpit—Sermons by John McNeill—Dr. Beattie's Christian Apologetics.		

HERE AND AWAY . . . . .		288
-------------------------	--	-----

October.

## GENERAL.

The Evolution in the Manifestation of the Supernatural . . . . .	<i>Rev. Prof. Thomson, B.D.</i> . . . . .	293
The Moderator's Charge to the New Professor . . . . .	<i>Rev. John Laing, D.D.</i> . . . . .	319
The Present Needs of Knox College.	<i>Rev. H. M. Parsons, D.D.</i> . . . . .	323

## MISSIONARY.

Angus Robertson . . . . .	<i>Rev. C. W. Gordon, B.A.</i> . . . . .	329
Itinerating in Central India, III. . . . .	<i>Rev. W. A. Wilson, M.A.</i> . . . . .	334

HERE AND AWAY . . . . .		339
-------------------------	--	-----

## CONTENTS OF VOL. XII.

THE

# Knox College Monthly

AND

## PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. XII.

MAY, 1890.

NO. 1.

---

### "SCHOLASTICISM IN MODERN THEOLOGY."

UNDER the heading above quoted an article by the Rev. Prof. Campbell, of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, appeared in the KNOX COLLEGE MONTHLY of December, which should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. Admitting the excellence of certain passages and passing by minor details open to criticism, I select the following positions taken by Prof. Campbell, and proceed to state the grounds on which I challenge their correctness.

1. In his opening sentence he says :—"It is a matter of some surprise and no small regret to the graduate of a theological college, who has mastered such a modern text-book as that of Hodge, with its three volumes and index, to find that it has failed to furnish him with adequate material for supplying the spiritual wants of his people." The ground on which disparagement is here cast on Hodge's great work is truly surprising. If the graduate in question had received proper training he would experience neither the surprise nor regret described by Prof. Campbell. He would understand that it was not the design of Hodge that his "three volumes and index" should take the place of the Scriptures or serve the same end.

A scientific and systematic course of instruction in agriculture might very greatly improve farming in Canada, and a good textbook on that subject might be very helpful, but who would expect it to feed the Canadian people? They might be a more prosperous and better fed people in consequence of it, but still their food must come from the field. In like manner careful study of a work like that of Hodge may greatly enrich the ministrations of the pulpit by giving the young preacher a more intelligent and comprehensive grasp of the system of revealed truth; but the inexhaustive source from which he must obtain "material for supplying the spiritual wants of his people" must be the Divine Word itself; and that the discovery of this should be "a matter of some surprise and no small regret" to the graduate of a theological college, is an assertion as uncomplimentary to the graduate as it is unjustly disparaging to the masterly work of a truly great man who always sought to exalt the Word of God.

2. On the doctrine of total depravity Prof. Campbell says:—"In the region of practical anthropology, which the graduate has abundant opportunities of studying, the theological *hortus siccus* traverses fact, for it exhibits a total depravity of which there is no living human example," etc. This is a truly astounding assertion by a gentleman holding a professorship in a theological college and supposed to know the sense in which Calvinistic writers like Hodge speak of man by nature as being in a state of "total depravity." It is not thereby meant that man is as bad as he can be, or that there is nothing whatever good in him. Were this the sense in which systematic writers used the words then might Prof. Campbell assert that no living human example of it can be produced. But how does Hodge define total depravity? On page 233 of Vol. II. he says, "By total depravity, is not meant that all men are equally wicked; nor that any man is as thoroughly corrupt as it is possible for a man to be; nor that men are destitute of all moral virtues." Then on page 234 he adds, "There is common to all men a total alienation of the soul from God, so that no unrenewed man either understands or seeks after God;" \* \* "The apostacy from God is total or complete." Is there "no living human example" of this? Does the doctrine of total depravity, as defined by Hodge, traverse fact?

3. Prof. Campbell's disparaging allusion to the Westminster

divines is as unjust as is his attempt to belittle Hodge's Systematic Theology. Referring to the alleged deadness characteristic, in his opinion, of the systematic setting forth of truth, he accounts for it as follows: "The true reason is that our modern theology is scholastic. It is deductive, not inductive. Like the Westminster divines, its authors first frame their system, and then search the Scriptures for proof of their statements." \* \* \* "There is no historical evidence of any attempt to build up theology, as other sciences have been built up *de novo*, by induction of fact."

In dealing with this very serious charge against the method alleged to be followed in modern systematic theology, I must preface my remarks by recording my very cordial agreement with Professor Campbell as to the importance of strictly adhering to the principle of induction in theology as in the other sciences. An incorrect generalization is liable to be the result of a too limited or imperfect induction. But after all this has been fully admitted, the question remains, Is the charge preferred by the Professor well founded? I might answer in the apt and eloquent words of Chalmers, "This antipathy to system in theology proceeds on the mistake of confounding the generalities of our systematic divines with the generalities of our old schoolmen, instead of which they ought to be considered as altogether of the same character with the generalities of modern science." (Institutes, Vol. I, page 39.) As the Prof. has given no proof that our theology is "scholastic," "deductive not inductive," except bare assertion, I quote the judgment of Chalmers in preference to any opinion of my own. Every enlightened man rejoices in the marvellous advance made in the other sciences in recent times; but which one of them has a better record than theology as regards compliance with the canons of induction? Dr. McCosh, ex-President of Princeton College, will, I am sure, be recognized as an authority on such a point; and what does he say as to observance of the principle of induction in the other sciences? His words are, "But a moment's reflection suffices to show that in most cases, I believe in all, we cannot find out all the facts." \* \* \* "Observation cannot reach all the facts and give us absolute certainty." And may I not add that very many of the so-called facts of natural science are resolvable into the personal testimony of an eye-witness; so that here again an element of a precarious



kind has to be dealt with. And besides, after all that Prof. Campbell has said in extolling the method pursued in the other sciences at the expense of modern theology and such writers as Hodge, is it not a fact that a working hypothesis, e.g., evolution, is still the method of the scientist, and that some hypothesis is better than none, as thereby observation is stimulated and the ultimate attainment of truth greatly subserved? Imperfect induction is a charge so vague and general that it may be made against the method and conclusions in any branch of science; but there is less excuse for it and less liability to it in theology than in any of the other sciences, the page of Revelation being so sharply defined and so easily explored as compared with the page of Nature.

Dr. Wm. B. Carpenter, in his inaugural lecture before the British Association, cautioned the admirers of the *spectrum analysis* in weighty words, reminding them that "the induction does not hold good when extended to other worlds." Leaning with too great confidence on a precarious, though in many respects seemingly probable or all but established conclusion, is the tendency against which, in other sciences, men like Carpenter are ever and anon lifting up a warning voice. And I make these references in explanation of my surprise at certain statements by Prof. Campbell to the disparagement of the work done in theological science. I am glad that his reference to and manifest appreciation of the inspired word of Scripture and its divine and infallible authority has in it a ringing clearness that tells of the pure metal, but I wish he had spared the Westminster divines and the great Hodge what I regard as most uncalled for and unjustifiable disparagement. After all that has been done in Biblical criticism, systematic theology, and general study of the Scriptures, does Prof. Campbell seriously believe that our theology requires to be constructed *à novo* from bottom to top?

W. T. McMULLEN.

Woolstock.

## BISHOP LIGHTFOOT ON THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

MY former article on Bishop Lightfoot will be fitly supplemented by a brief discussion of his views in relation to the Christian Ministry. These views were fully elaborated by the great Bishop in the well-known *excursus* in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, the first edition of which appeared in 1868; and, notwithstanding frequent reports to the contrary, he has never departed from the position there assumed. In the preface to the sixth edition he explicitly disavows any change of opinion. The eighth edition, that of 1888, remains unchanged, and his publishers have stated that no alterations have ever been made in the Dissertation in question. The rumor of such a change originated in a bold statement made in the *Church Times*, an extreme Ritualistic paper, in July, 1875. When Dr. Lightfoot's attention was called to it he, not only very emphatically disowned it in a letter, made public since his death, but he also added this important statement:—"The opinions maintained in my Dissertation are, so far as I can see, the same as Hooker's."

This reference is invaluable, both because it adds another weighty testimony of a competent interpreter to the position occupied by our great jurist, and because it furnishes an additional proof, if such were necessary, that Lightfoot's views are no novelty, but in entire accord with those of the most eminent expounder of the polity of the Church of England. Hooker and Lightfoot are kindred minds, alike in their clear, strong, practical judgment, in their grasp of essential principles, and in their appeal to the broad and solid grounds of history and of reason, in which their conceptions of Church order were firmly rooted. And, strange to say, they have alike been subjected to the misjudgment of the school of Anglican traditionalists, who have attempted to draw from them some warrant for their own theories, while in truth nothing could be more radically opposed to their uncritical and unhistorical pretensions. Yet, as Pusey misquoted Hooker, and Keble feebly

groped around his massive exposition, so we find now Anglican sacerdotalists in support of their crude and mechanical conception continually quoting detached sentences of Lightfoot, torn bleeding from their context, while they are blind to the vital principles which dominate and determine the Bishop's theory of the Christian Ministry.

The attitude of so profound a scholar as Dr. Lightfoot towards this question cannot be a matter of indifference; the more so that the subject itself is one of a very pressing and practical character in relation to the ecclesiastical and religious circumstances of our times. We have on the one hand a yearning for Church unity and on the other hand a perverted conception of the nature of that unity; on the one hand we have anxious questionings as to the hindrances and how they can be removed, and on the other hand the reassertion of the most audacious claims on behalf of priestly mediation and Church authority, pretensions which are now what they ever have been, the greatest barriers to union, and the most prolific source of division and isolation. How then does Bishop Lightfoot stand towards these questions? and how do his views correspond with those of the "judicious" Hooker?

At the outset of our enquiry we are brought face to face with a question of the most radical character, as to the nature of the Christian Ministry.—Is it a pastorate or a priesthood? Here we find a line of cleavage between two historical developments, two theologies, in fact, two Christianities. That same issue which St. Paul opened up in his epistle to the Galatians, and which re-asserted itself at the Reformation, has to-day become the crucial question in the controversies which agitate the Church of England. Dr. Pusey stated that "upon the principle of sacerdotalism hangs the future of England's Church." The present Bishop of Lincoln has recently stated that the issue at stake in the ecclesiastical courts now in progress is not merely a form of ritual, but the sacerdotal character of the Christian Ministry.\* It is then scarcely necessary for me to attempt to prove what the most superficial observers of the times cannot fail to discern, nor to dwell upon the consequences involved throughout the whole compass of theology and the whole

\*That there may be no doubt as to what is meant by sacerdotalism, it may be well to quote the definition given by Mr. Gore, that it is "the belief in certain individuals, ordained in a certain way, being the exclusive instrument, in the Divine covenant, of sacramental graces."

domain of Christian life. We can view these in their logical completeness in the Church of Rome. He must be blind who cannot see that between sacerdotalism and the theology of the Reformed Church there is fixed a gulf deep as Hades and broad as the eternal antithesis between truth and error, Christ and anti-Christ.

The question I am now seeking to answer is simply this : Upon which side of this gulf stands Bishop Lightfoot and his great precursor, Hooker ; and what is their testimony to the position of the Reformed Church of England ? There is no room for doubt here. The Christian Church, Bishop Lightfoot tells us, "has no sacerdotal system. It interposes no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man, by whose intervention alone God is reconciled and man forgiven. Each individual member holds personal communion with the Divine Head. To him immediately he is responsible and from him directly he obtains pardon and draws strength." Again he says :—"For communicating instruction and for preserving public order, for conducting religious worship and for dispensing social charities, it became necessary to appoint special officers. But the priestly functions and privileges of the Christian people are never regarded as transferred or even delegated to these officers. They are called stewards of the mysteries of God, servants or ministers of the Church, and the like ; but the sacerdotal title is never once conferred upon them. The only priests under the Gospel designated as such in the New Testament are the saints, the members of the Christian brotherhood. As individuals, all Christians are priests alike \* \* \* The most exalted office in the Church, the highest gift of the Spirit, conveyed no sacerdotal right which was not enjoyed by the humblest member of the Christian community."

Not only so, but Dr. Lightfoot has carefully traced the genesis and development of sacerdotalism as a heresy in the Christian Church, one which indeed originated very early. "Towards the close of the second century we discern," he says, "the first germs appearing above the surface ; yet shortly after the middle of the third, the plant has all but attained its full growth." Into the history of that development we need not now follow him. It is sufficient for me that Bishop Lightfoot distinctly affirms it to be an un-Biblical and anti-Christian growth, originating in heathendom, although finding its professed justification in a perverted con-

ception of the Old Testament sacrificial system. One example may, however, be cited. Referring to Ignatius' vehement advocacy of episcopacy, glowing with Eastern hyperbole and extravagance, he says, "Ignatius never regards the ministry as a sacerdotal office." In his latest great work on Ignatius, after a minute examination of the Ignatian Letters, he reiterates his denial of any sacerdotal element therein. "There is not," he says "throughout those letters the slightest tinge of sacerdotal language, in reference to the Christian Ministry."

A few paragraphs at the close of Lightfoot's Essay are sometimes cited as lending a modified support to some indefinite form of quasi-sacerdotalism; but upon what meagre ground will appear from a careful study of his words. The question suggested by the preceding discussion is glanced at, "Can the Christian Ministry be called a priesthood in any sense? And if so, in what sense?" In answering it, Lightfoot first recurs to the silence of the Apostolic writers, and especially to the attitude of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as explaining that silence. "This epistle," he states, "teaches that all sacrifices had been consummated in the one Sacrifice, all priesthoods absorbed in the one Priest. The offering had been made once for all; and as there were no more victims there could be no more priests." In like manner he proceeds to show that the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews is accordant with the tenor of its argument, that the Christian sacrifices it speaks of are those of praise and thanksgiving and well-doing, and the Christian altar, the Cross of Christ, on which the One Sacrifice was consummated. "If," Dr. Lightfoot urges, "the Christian Ministry were a sacerdotal office, and if the Holy Eucharist were a sacerdotal act \* \* \* then his argument is faulty and his language misleading." So, as the Bishop urges, alike in what is said and what is left unsaid, the same result is attained. "If," the Bishop continues, "the sacerdotal office be understood to imply the offering of sacrifices, then the Epistle to the Hebrews leaves no place for a Christian priesthood." And Hooker tells us that "sacrifice is now no part of the Christian Ministry." As Gregory Martin, a learned Roman Catholic divine of the 16th century, clearly and logically puts it, "These three—priest, sacrifice and altar—are dependents and consequents one of another, so that they cannot be separated." And, as Archbishop Whately testifies

the Church of England consistently and "distinctly repudiates the notions of sacrifice, altar, and sacrificing priest."

Had Dr. Lightfoot rested here in this logical and consistent position no question would have arisen. But he proceeds to add words which have given opportunity to his opponents to try to enlist his advocacy in favor of what he has distinctly rejected and condemned. "If," he says, "the word (priest) be taken in a wider and looser acceptation, it cannot well be withheld from the ministry of the Church of Christ.)\*" Two questions here arise—the expedience of such a usage, and the meaning of the term so applied. Lightfoot himself admits it to be inexpedient, for he goes on to say that "in this case the meaning of the term should be clearly apprehended, and it might have been better if the later Christian vocabulary had conformed to the silence of the Apostolic writers, so that the possibility of confusion would have been avoided." Confusion in terms leads to confusion of thought, and confusion in regard to a matter so vital is disastrous. We have proof of this in the very way in which Lightfoot's own expressions have been abused, either through wilfulness or through the illogical and inexact habits of mind which so often vitiate theological discussion.

When we come to examine the sense in which Lightfoot would concede a secondary and improper use of the term "priest," we find it to be utterly devoid of sacerdotal significance. The minister may be called a priest, he argues, as one who represents God to man and man to God. He twice urges that "representative" does not mean "vicarial," so that in no sense does the minister stand instead of the people; he does not, the Bishop insists, interpose between God and man, so as to form the medium of communication or to be the indispensable condition of mediation. And, again, he explicitly states that his representative position is not and cannot be absolute and indispensable. The Christian congregation can, although it ordinarily does not, dispense with its ministerial representatives. As representing God to man, the minister is charged with the ministry of reconciliation, unfolds the Divine will, declares the condition of forgiveness, and bears God's

\*It is scarcely necessary to state that the question here raised has nothing to do with the use of the word "priest" in the Prayer Book, where, as Lightfoot and Hooker both notice and the merest tyro knows, it is used in its own original etymological signification as the contraction of "presbyter."

message of pardon to the penitent. But, as the Bishop notes, all this is "very closely connected with the magisterial and pastoral duties of the office, and is only priestly in the same sense in which they are priests." There is absolutely nothing sacerdotal here. In fact this application of the term "priest" can only be maintained by confusing the sacerdotal with the prophetic function. Why should so clear-headed a thinker fall into this snare of ambiguity? On the other hand, as representing man to God, the Christian minister offers the prayers of the congregation to God, that is, he is the mouthpiece for their public and united utterance. But there is nothing sacerdotal in this. The same can be said of everyone who in any public or official capacity represents the people. Lightfoot himself perceives this, for he immediately adds: "Some representation is as necessary in the Church as it is in a popular government." And he identifies the representation as to its character in both cases. He intimates that there is nothing more sacerdotal in the one case than in the other. For he adds, "the nature of the representation is not affected by the fact that the form of the ministry has been handed down from Apostolic times and may well be presumed to have a divine sanction." Thus completely does Lightfoot shatter that which he himself calls "a false conception," the sacerdotal theory of the ministry.

This theory is intimately bound up with another upon which, it is safe to say, it is invariably made dependent by its advocates. The sacerdotal powers are asserted to be transmitted by tactual succession from the Apostles through the Bishops. This theory must be carefully distinguished from the statement of the existence of bishops as well as presbyters and deacons from Apostolic days, as the Prayer-Book affirms it. Those who allow only the existence of presbyters and deacons from that date do not thereby affirm a tactual succession of presbyters in the sacerdotal sense. So neither do we by the acceptance of the existence of the three orders from Apostolic times, thereby admit the theory of Apostolic succession. This hypothesis Bishop Lightfoot cuts away root and branch. He tells us that "the opinion hazarded by Theodoret and adopted by many later writers, that the same officers in the Church who were first called apostles came afterwards to be designated bishops, is baseless." "The episcopate," he affirms, "was formed not out of the apostolic order by localisa-

tion, but out of the presbyterial by elevation." And in his later work on "Ignatius" Lightfoot calls attention to the extent to which Ignatius associates the presbyters with the bishops. Both are associated in the government of the Church and for both obedience is demanded. "If the bishop occupies the place of God, or of Jesus Christ, the presbyters are as the Apostles, as the council of God. This last comparison would show how widely the idea of the episcopate differed from the later conception, when it had been formulated in the doctrine of Apostolic succession. The presbyters, not the bishops, are here the representatives of the the Apostles." (Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, I, 383.)

Hooker in like manner carefully distinguishes between apostolical succession and episcopal government. Ordination he holds to be not the impartation of supernatural grace, but simply the conferring of ministerial authority. Accordingly, he says, "Out of men thus endued with the gifts of the Spirit, upon their conversion to the faith the Church had her ministers chosen, unto whom was given ecclesiastical power by ordination." And further, he shows that while the Bishop is ordinarily the officer by whom this power is conferred, yet it is derived not from the Bishops but from the Church itself. The opposite opinion that "the power of jurisdiction ecclesiastical doth not rest derived from Christ immediately into the whole body of the Church, but into the prelacy," he condemns as a Popish error. Thus Hooker opposes the doctrine of Apostolic succession by a two-fold denial: first of what is supposed in it to be transmitted, and secondly, of the mode of transmission, by successive delegation from the Apostles.

But those who hold the sacerdotal theory of the ministry, necessarily maintain that the existence of the Church is dependent upon this tactual succession by which alone the grace of God is ordinarily conveyed to men. Nor do its advocates shrink from such a claim and all that it involves. We find even so comparatively moderate a man as the amiable Dean Goulburn affirming that "there is and can be no real and true Church apart from the one society which the Apostles founded, and which has been propagated only in the line of the Episcopal Succession." Haddon in his standard book on "The Apostolic Succession," in words substantially identical with those of the Council of Trent, tells us that "it means, in few words, without Bishops no Pres-



byters, without Bishops and Presbyters no legitimate certainty of sacraments, without sacraments no certain union with the mystical Body of Christ, viz., with His Church, without this no certain union with Christ, and without that union no salvation." Thus one form of external Church organization is affirmed to be essential to the existence of the Church. Is it any wonder that Archdeacon Hare, in his "Mission of the Comforter," characterizes this as "a monstrous error, which would restrict the powers of Christ's mediatorial sacrifice, and the efficacy of the sacraments within the limits of Episcopal Churches." He, however, "trusts that it is confined in the main to some of our weaker brethren who, in want of logical and plastic power, stake themselves up with positive peremptory assertions."

How remote from such folly do both Lightfoot and Hooker stand. While asserting his jealous adhesion to the Episcopal polity, Lightfoot declares "the facts do not allow us to unchurch other Christian communities differently organized." No one who has the most moderate acquaintance with Hooker can fail to perceive how completely his doctrine of the Church antagonizes the sacerdotal theory. To examine this at length would far exceed the limits of this paper. I may however cite the testimony of the late Bishop Waldegrave, of Carlisle, that Hooker regarded Episcopacy as necessary to the *beneficium* but not to the *essence* of the Church.

So far then it is plain that both Lightfoot and Hooker are the uncompromising opponents of sacerdotalism, that they deny both the sacerdotal theory of the nature of the ministry and the sacerdotal theory of the transmission of the ministry by tactual succession, and that consequently they reject that doctrine of the Church which makes its very existence depend upon a priesthood thus constituted and maintained. They regard Episcopacy not as a channel of grace, but as a mode of government, in their view the best as well as the most ancient.

But we may proceed a step further in our enquiry. Did Lightfoot or Hooker regard Episcopacy as having an absolute *jus divinum* as being the only form of Church government divinely authorized, and hence for ever and under all circumstances binding upon the Church of Christ? They unquestionably claimed for Episcopacy a divine sanction. What was the nature of that

sanction, and what does it involve? Lightfoot explicitly states: "If the preceding investigation be substantially correct, the three-fold ministry can be traced to Apostolic direction; and short of an express statement we can possess no better assurance of a Divine appointment or at least a Divine sanction." Much stronger is Hooker's statement: "Let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if anything in the Church's government, surely the first institution of bishops was from heaven, was even of God, the Holy Ghost was the author of it." (E. P. VII, 5, 10.)

It is very important that we should correctly estimate these words. Do they, as many do, claim for Episcopacy what has been claimed for Presbyterianism and for Congregationalism by many of their advocates? Do they imply an absolute *jus divinum* of positive and unchangeable prescription; or simply the divine sanction of providential provision and of the promised guidance of the Spirit in the direction and ordering of all things relating to the manifestation and upbuilding of the Kingdom of Christ in the world? Let us first examine Lightfoot's position. His dissertation is simply an historical and exegetical enquiry, not a dogmatic exposition. He occupies himself with the facts, only indirectly and subordinately with the inferences. His words must be read in the light of his own historical data. In the New Testament he finds simply a rudimentary Episcopacy in the presidency of James, the Lord's brother, in Jerusalem, and in "the temporary position" occupied by Timothy and Titus as "apostolic delegates" "at critical seasons in important congregations." Lightfoot is careful to distinguish their missions from "the conception of a later age which represents Timothy as Bishop of Ephesus and Titus as Bishop of Crete." In regard to the rudimentary Episcopacy, he is moreover careful to note two things: first, that it is the presidency of a presbyter over fellow-presbyters; and, secondly, that "the New Testament presents no distinct traces of such organization in the Gentile congregations." But the first of these points carries us back to a preceding enquiry—whence came the presbyters?

Of the organization of the diaconate we have an express account, if we identify it, as Lightfoot and the majority, I think, of exegetes do, with the Seven in Acts vi. And even so, the office was not a new creation, but an adaption of an existing Jewish institution. Lightfoot rejects this explanation, but, it seems to

me, upon altogether inadequate grounds. The view of Mosheim is confirmed by recent Talmudical scholars, and maintained, amongst others, by Schurer, Lechler and Lumby.

But of the origination of the presbyteriate, as Lightfoot observes, there is in the Acts no account whatsoever. St. Luke "introduces them without preface." He speaks of them as in existence, but gives no account of their institution, which he takes as a matter of course. The explanation, as Lightfoot points out, is to be found in the flexible institution of the Synagogue. "As soon as the expansion of the Church rendered some organization necessary it would form a 'Synagogue' of its own." "With the Synagogue itself they (the Christians) would naturally, if not necessarily, adopt the normal government of a Synagogue and a body of elders, or presbyters, would be chosen to direct the religious worship, and partly also to watch over the temporal well-being of the society." How did the Synagogue originate? In no revelation or explicit command of God, but in the necessities and spontaneous action of the Jewish exiles to secure for themselves religious organization. And whence came the elders? They were an ancient institution of primitive civilization, growing out of the family itself, and the attempt to enlarge its functions of government to keep pace with the growth of the family into the tribe and the nation. They were introduced into the polity of Israel at the suggestion of Jethro, and entered largely into the civic, national and religious organization of the Jewish people.

Hooker has a deeply interesting reference to this, (E. P. VII, 5, §2.) Following Jerome, (although, as we shall see, he wavers) as Lightfoot does, and identifying the bishop with the presiding presbyter, he claims for episcopacy Divine sanction and in such terms as throw much light upon what he regards as giving such sanction. For he says, "it (episcopacy) had either Divine appointment beforehand, or Divine approbation afterwards, and is in that respect to be acknowledged the ordinance of God, no less than that ancient Jewish regiment, whereof though Jethro were the deviser, yet after that God had allowed it, all men were subject unto it, as to the policy of God, and not of Jethro."

Lightfoot next carries his investigation beyond the limits of the New Testament, examining into the polity of the different churches at the close of the first and the opening of the second

century. I can now merely indicate his conclusions. He discusses Rothe's theory, and while he admits with him the gravity of the crisis in the history of the Church at this epoch and the influence of the emergency in accelerating and consolidating the episcopal government, and also the probability of the sanction of St. John, the one surviving apostle, yet he distinctly rejects Rothe's hypothesis of "a combined effort on the part of the Apostles, resulting in a definite ecclesiastical polity." He shows that the rise of episcopacy was not so sudden or immediate that it can be explained by an authoritative order issuing from an apostolic council. On the contrary, Lightfoot maintains that the result of his investigations places beyond question that "the episcopacy was created out of the presbytery," and "that this creation was not so much an isolated act as a progressive development, not advancing everywhere at a uniform rate, but exhibiting at one and the same time different stages of growth in different churches. They seem to hint also that, so far as this development was affected at all by national temper and characteristics, it was slower where the prevailing influences were more purely Greek \* \* \* and more rapid where an Oriental spirit predominated. \* \* \* Above all, they establish the result clearly, that its maturer forms are seen first in those regions where the latest surviving Apostles (more especially St. John) fixed their abode, and at a time when its prevalence cannot be dissociated from their influence or their sanction."

But Lightfoot further shows that there was not only a development of the office out of the presbyterate which gradually extended throughout the Church, but also a development of the powers held in the office. For he says, "the earliest bishops did not hold the same independent position of supremacy which was and is occupied by their later successors." And so he proceeds "to trace the successive stages by which the power of the office was developed during the second and third centuries." In this development he shows that the names of Ignatius, Irenæus and Cyprian represent three successive advances. He points out that with Ignatius the chief value of episcopacy lies in that it constitutes a visible centre of unity, a security for good discipline, and a safeguard against disunion and dissolution. He condemns, while he extenuates, the hyperbolical extravagance of his language,

observing that if taken literally it would invest the episcopal office with "a crushing despotism," "subversive of the true spirit of Christianity in the negation of individual freedom and the consequent suppression of direct responsibility to God in Christ."

Irenæus regarded the episcopate as the depository of Apostolic tradition, and a guarantee for the transmission of the pure faith. Cyprian laid the foundation of sacerdotalism in his "assumption of the absolute supremacy of the bishop" as "the absolute vicegerent of Christ in things spiritual." In this concentration of authority in the hands of the bishop, as in the gigantic powers wielded by the Popes in the Middle Ages, Lightfoot sees a providential provision by which "only could the Church, humanly speaking, have braved the storms of those ages of anarchy and violence." Doubtless there was a Divine overruling, but it may be fairly questioned whether so large an accession of the worldly spirit, and so extensive a resort to worldly methods, did not hasten her corruption and impair most lamentably her work.

As Lightfoot identifies his own views with those of Hooker, it becomes almost indispensable that we should compare the two and ascertain where the teaching of the one is corroborated and illustrated by the other.

Even as the Church of England never had a more loyal son, so the principles of the Reformation never had a more thoroughgoing and consistent advocate than the great Hooker. Read his sermons on the certainty and perpetuity of faith in the elect and on Justification, in which with masterly hand he exposes what he brands as "the mystery of the man of sin," Rome's doctrine of Justification by infused and inherent grace, through the sacraments, by which he says, "she doth pervert the truth of Christ." As an illustration of his sympathy with the Protestants of Europe, read his eulogy of Calvin, whom he esteems "incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy. \* \* \*

Though thousands were debtors to him, as teaching knowledge of this kind (of Scripture and Theology), yet he to none but only to God." In proof of his breadth and power, read his great argument on the principle of law, and his exposition of the true nature of Church authority as based on reason and social law. The laws of reason are the laws of God. Thus it is that *vox populi* is *vox Dei*,

or as Hooker expresses it, "the general and perpetual voice of man is as the sentence of God Himself." Hooker's opponents could not understand this. They ignored alike reason and history. If they had simply stood out against the imposition of an unwise uniformity, our sympathies had been completely with them. Here they had just ground of complaint, and here (for example, in parts of his fifth book) Hooker is not altogether faithful to his own principles, in minor matters, and betrays the traces of the Tudor influence. But the narrow Puritan insisted that in the Scriptures everything necessary to human conduct and action is laid down, not only principles but rules, so that anything not prescribed therein is sin. He claimed that the exact pattern of Church polity was given in the Scriptures, and asserted a *jus divinum* absolute and unchangeable for what he conceived to be the form of ecclesiastical government set down in the Scriptures. Hooker, on the contrary, maintained that while the Scripture is the sole authority in all matters of principle and of essential faith, yet every national or individual church has the right to make such laws as are needful for its own government and worship, provided its enactments are not contrary to God's Word, and also provided that it does not claim for these *ἀδιάφορα* the authority which belongs only to matters of principle. Hooker never wavers from his assertion of the alone supreme authority of the Scriptures. These are noble words: "Although ten thousand general councils would set down any one and the same definitive sense concerning any point of religion whatever, yet one demonstrative reason alleged, or one manifest testimony cited from the mouth of God Himself to the contrary, could not choose but overweigh them all, inasmuch as for them (the Councils) to have been deceived it is not impossible."

On the other hand, he pleads for liberty in things non-essential. He insists that all may hold the necessity "of polity and regimen" without holding "one form necessary in all." "Matters of faith," he declares, "necessary to salvation and sacraments, are contained in God's Word. But matters of ceremony, order, Church government, are free if nothing against them be alleged from Scripture." He accordingly did not meet the claim of a *jus divinum* for Presbytery or Independency, by the counter claim of a *jus divinum* for Episcopacy. On the contrary, he says, "if we did

seek to maintain what most advanceth our cause, the very best and strongest were to hold even as they, that in Scripture there must needs be some particular form of the polity God hath instituted, and which for that cause belongeth to all Churches and to all times. But we are persuaded of nothing more than this, that no untruth can avail the patron and defender long; and that things most true are likewise most believably spoken." A noble spirit breathes through these words, and if the force of them had always ruled in our English Church History how different had been the spectacle we would have contemplated to-day.

While Hooker denied that the Scriptures prescribed any one form of Church polity, he maintained that the Church of England in retaining Episcopacy, did so in the belief that it was most consonant with Scripture, and with unbroken historical precedent; yet he does not claim that Episcopacy is necessary to the being or integrity of the Church, and he freely allows that the Continental Churches non-episcopally organized, had a right thus to constitute their polity. "Although," he says, "some Reformed Churches, the Scottish especially and the French, have not that which best agreeth with Scripture, the government by bishops, I rather lament the defect than exagitate (reproach), since none without fault may be driven to erect that polity which is best." Again he says, "Where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give place." Yet again, "Some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops. \* \* To this we answer that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop."

Still more distasteful to the school of traditionalists must be Hooker's statement as to the origin and perpetuity of the episcopal office. Up to Hooker's time, and beyond it, the old scholastic theory had prevailed, that the order of bishops and presbyters is one and that they differ *in gradu non in ordine*. This was held by Cranmer, Hooper, Jewel, the Elizabethan editor of the XXXIX. Articles, by Field in his great work on the Church, and by Archbishop Usher and others. This fact has an important bearing on the interpretation of the word "orders" in the preface to the Ordinal. Later the

view came in that bishops and presbyters were distinct orders, but made such by Apostolic appointment. Those who held this view did not unchurch other communions. Later still there prevailed the view held by Laud, the Carolinian divines (for the most part) and the non-jurors, that this distinction of order was by Christ's own appointment. The holders of this view unchurched all non-episcopal communities; and this is the view revived by the Tractarians of the present day. Now Hooker's position lies between the first and second of these opinions. At first he followed the opinion of his great master, Bishop Jewell, who considered the episcopate to have arisen naturally and without any Apostolic sanction out of the presbyterate. Afterwards Hooker seems to have followed the opinion that the development took place under Apostolic sanction. For he says: "Now, although we should leave the general persuasion held from the first beginning, that the Apostles themselves left bishops invested with power above other pastors; although, I say, we would give over this opinion and embrace that other conjecture which so many have thought good to follow, and which myself did sometimes judge a great deal more suitable than I do now; namely, that after the Apostles were deceased, churches did agree among themselves, for preservation of peace and order, to make one presbyter in each city chief over the rest," etc. How little difference this makes in Hooker's essential position may be gathered from this remarkable statement, in which he claims that the episcopate is subject to the Church, as the organ to the body: "The whole body of the Church hath power to alter, with general consent and upon necessary occasions, even the positive laws (that is, laws which are of the nature of enactments and not essential principles) of the apostles, if there be no command to the contrary; and it manifestly appears to her that change of times have clearly taken away the very reasons of God's first institution, as by sundry examples may be most clearly proved. \* \* \* Bishops, albeit they may assert with conformity of truth, that their authority hath thus descended from the apostles themselves, yet the absolute and everlasting continuance of it, they cannot say that any command of the Lord doth enjoin; and therefore must acknowledge that the Church hath power, by universal consent, upon urgent cause, to take it away. \* \* \* Wherefore lest bishops forget themselves, as if none on earth had power to touch their states,



let them continually bear in mind that it is rather the force of custom whereby the Church, having so long found it good to continue under the requirement of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honour them in that respect, than that any such true and heavenly law can be shewed, by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear, that the Lord himself hath appointed presbyters forever to be under the requirement of bishops, in what sort soever they behave themselves. Let this consideration be a bridle unto them; let it teach them not to disdain the advice of their presbyters; but to use their authority with so much the greater humility and moderation, as a sword which the Church hath power to take from them."

It is thus abundantly evident in what sense and to what extent Hooker and Lightfoot claim a divine sanction for episcopacy, and how far removed is such a reasonable and moderate claim, a claim subject to Scripture and to reason, from the extravagance and pretensions of the *jus divinum* theory.

Hooker's position was in full accord with that of the divines and fathers of the Reformed Protestant Church of England at the time of the Reformation and the first hundred years thereafter. And more than that, as every historical critic and student concedes, they are in harmony with her practice, for as an ex-Tractarian concedes, "It is a fact that Presbyterian orders were cheerfully acknowledged by the Crown, the Bishops, the Universities and the Clergy, down to the middle of the seventeenth century."

The greatest hindrance to Church unity, so far as the polity of the Churches is concerned, arises out of these two closely connected theories, the sacerdotal nature of the Christian ministry and the *jus divinum* authority of some one form of Church organization. I have, I think, abundantly shown that Hooker and Lightfoot are uncompromisingly opposed to both of these fundamental errors, and that they stand, in regard to the doctrines of the Church and the Ministry, on true Reformation ground. And to that ground the Church of England must return in practice (as she has never deviated from it in theory, although a large school within her has lamentably departed from it), would she take her true and honoured place as a mediator in the reunification of Protestant Christendom. The *jus divinum* theory

of any form of Church polity has been pulverized by the advance of historical criticism. Even the Sacerdotalists are beginning to realize this. Hitherto they have rested their position upon it, but now, as the efforts of Mr. Gore of the Oxford Pusey House show, they are beginning to cast about for some other basis upon which to place their superstructure, and are seeking to readjust their theories to meet the claims of modern historical science. It is strange that they have not sooner realized this necessity, which the Church of Rome, ever on the alert, has for some time perceived. She has long ago abandoned the untenable *quod ubique, quod semper, quod omnibus*, of an authoritative apostolic tradition, and substituted, on the one hand, a continuous inspiration of the Church for the development of dogma, and on the other hand the infallibility of the Pope for the verification of the dogmas thus formulated. There are by no means obscure indications that the Tractarians are adopting the former of these two elements. Will they not be logically driven to the second? I know of no alternative.

But in the meantime with the advance of the critical knowledge of Church History, and with the progress of Biblical study, through the pressure of the alliance which is surely coming between the forces of sacerdotal absolutism and godless democracy, and above all through the mighty impulse and unifying power of Christian love, we may hope to see an alliance of Protestant Churches in active co-operation, which may eventually lead up to closer organized union.

J. P. SHERATON.

Wycliffe College, Toronto.

## FRANZ DELITZSCH.

A GREAT light in the world of sacred and oriental learning has gone out—a light which has burned with a pure, steady and ever increasing flame for over half a century. Franz Delitzsch, the profound and brilliant scholar, the beloved and commanding teacher, and the pure-minded, high-souled Christian, passed to his rest a few weeks ago, leaving behind him an honoured name, and an influence altogether unique among the Biblical scholars of the time.

The leading events in the life of this eminent man are easily enumerated. He was born in Leipzig, Feb. 23, 1813, in very humble circumstances. His parents were very poor, and he had little gladness in his childhood; thus his early years were not spent in circumstances calculated to prepare him for a life of prominence and influence in any wide sphere of labour. Providence, however, directed his way for him by giving him a good and faithful friend in the person of a Jew, Hirsch Levy, a book-dealer, who lodged in his father's dwelling, and, being attracted by the qualities of young Delitzsch, interested himself in him greatly. He helped him in his earliest studies, encouraged him in his school work, and was, in fact, the main instrument in promoting his early career. Delitzsch himself was not brought up as a Jew, for he was baptized in the St. Nicolai Church, in Leipzig, March 4, 1813, but his early associations with people of that race led him to take the deepest interest in them throughout life, and it was to him a peculiar joy to welcome to Christianity his dear old friend Levy, who was baptized in 1843, two years before his death. The determining influence, however, that led him to give so much of his energy and sympathy to the Jewish people, was his association with two missionaries named Goldberg and Becker, who, in the prosecution of their labours among the Hebrews, used to visit Leipzig during the great fairs.

NOTE.—A sketch of Prof. Delitzsch, mainly made up of a brief autobiography, contributed to a Norwegian journal, *Mission's Blad for Israel*, April 1883, was published in the *Old Testament Student*, March, 1887. An excellent article upon Delitzsch also appeared in the *Expositor* for June, 1886, written by Prof. Salmon, which, however, has the defect of not recognizing the unique mental development of the subject, with its influence upon his teaching and writings.

Hebrew he first learned, not from Levy, but at the gymnasium, and his earliest Rabbinical reading was done with the missionary Becker, during the years of his University course, which lasted from 1831 to 1834. His first intention at the University had been to apply himself to philology and philosophy, for which he had a strong natural liking; and, for a time, he pursued these studies with ardour. In religious matters he was not at first much concerned. In his theology, or rather philosophy, the Person of Christ was kept in the background. The influence of a devout fellow student led him to serious thought, which was intensified and made more practical by association with earnest-minded University men, and circles formed in the city for Christian worship and work. Henceforward sacred study claimed his attention, and he determined to make his life task the interpretation of the Old Testament. For this his philological tastes specially fitted him, and in them he found abundant satisfaction in the great field of Semitic literature, which more or less directly illustrates the Hebrew Scriptures. His chief guide there was the younger Rosenmüller, and afterwards the famous Arabist Fleischer, whom he was to have later as his colleague in Leipzig. His favourite work was done for a while in the sphere of Rabbinical learning. To this he was largely helped by the lexicographer Fürst, who had come to live in Leipzig in 1833. He became at first a favourite pupil of Fürst, and afterwards his associate in the preparation of his famous Concordance and other learned works, and much later his colleague also in the University.

In 1842, after a large amount of literary work in the departments of Jewish literature and philology had already been accomplished, Delitzsch qualified himself as *privat-docent* at his own University of Leipzig. In 1846 he was called as professor to Rostock, in Mecklenburg, and four years later to the more important University of Erlangen in Bavaria. Here he laboured for seventeen years with great energy and success, and here the first editions of his most influential works were published. Among his associates in that institution, whose theological faculty has always maintained the tradition of Lutheran Orthodoxy as well as zeal and learning, were Herzog of the *Real Encyclopædic*, Ebrard and Hofmann. In 1867 his great and growing influence led to his being called back to his old home, to become for twenty-three years one

of the leading spirits of the greatest of modern theological schools. The commanding position which he had gained in Erlangen as a teacher and guide of youth he fully maintained in Leipzig, and there his influence upon the whole continued to rise till the close of his days.

His end came much sooner than his friends had been in the habit of expecting. He had a very strong constitution and great capacity for work. His death was hastened by an attack of paralysis, brought about by a cold contracted from bathing last summer on the coast of Holland. He toiled on however till the last, having even announced his plan of lectures for this summer semester. Only the day before his death he corrected the proofs of his last work, "Die messianischen Weissagungen in geschichtlicher Folge" (the Messianic Prophecies in Historical Order).

Prof. Delitzsch was married in 1845. He had made the acquaintance of his wife, Clara Silber, in the course of the devotional meetings already alluded to. She survives him with the two youngest of their four sons, who comprised their family. The older of the two, Hermann, is in a banking concern in Leipzig. He was at one time engaged in business in Montreal. He is the translator of Smith's Chaldaean Genesis into German. The youngest, Friedrich, has, since 1874, taught with great success in the philosophical faculty in Leipzig, and as professor of Assyriology, has had an influence equal to that wielded by his father in exegetical theology. As he is still young there is much more to be expected from him. The other two sons were taken away before the promise of their youth could be fulfilled. The oldest, Johann, died in 1876, from illness brought on by overwork. He was extraordinary professor in Leipzig, and had already done distinguished work in historical theology. The second, Ernst, succumbed to the effects of the wear and tear of the Franco-German war, in which he served as assistant surgeon.

Some personal reminiscences of the great and good man may not be unwelcome. His appearance was striking. He was very short in stature, but of a wiry and vigorous frame. His grave and gentle face expressed perhaps most strongly acuteness and ideality. More than most German professors, he had the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit. He was very sensitive, but patient and unresentful. His physical senses were in complete

harmony with a mind of high sensibility. He was alive to all forms of beauty, and he had the poet's way of taking them in and using them as spiritual symbols. Flowers especially were his delight. He almost constantly carried one or more with him, and his interest in any of rare beauty or fragrance was remarkably intense, and illustrated perhaps as well as any other of his qualities how well rounded was his nature. It was, in fact, his love for hyacinths that led him to take the fateful journey of last summer to Holland. Though very careful of his hours of study, he was sociable and approachable and saw much of his students and friends, and manifestly desired to know them as well as make their acquaintance. He had great capacity of assimilating divers kinds of knowledge, and a ready command of what he had read, especially in poetical and proverbial literature. His learning in his specialties was prodigious. The most recondite fact seemed to him a casual and matter-of-course acquirement.

Among German theological professors he held unique relations to English speaking students. Probably none, not even excepting Tholuck, was so well known personally to biblical students of Great Britain and America. This is to be accounted for partly from his approachableness and amiability, but more especially from his general attitude towards biblical questions which had a certain kinship with the traditional English spirit and method, and the fact that his published works were widely circulated and studied in these lands. His Wednesday evening seminary for English-speaking men was long a special feature of Leipzig life. In this his habit was to use the English Bible, though the conversations and discussions were mainly held in German, as he never attained colloquial ease of English expression. His prelections there were informal and not elaborate, and were accordingly all the more enjoyed. He was in the habit of taking up subjects of a more or less popular character, and of giving his general views on matters of biblical and theological interest. As a personal mediator between English and German theological education, the place held by him can never be taken by another. To-day many of his old students, scattered over English-speaking lands, give more than the passing tribute of a sigh to the memory of their old teacher and friend, as they reflect that in men as well as in ideas and methods the old order changes, giving place to new.

The writings of Prof. Delitzsch were very numerous, and dealt with a wonderful variety of subjects. They are not easy to classify minutely nor to criticize in the order of publication, since the intellectual history of their author was so exceptional. We may, however, divide them into five general classes, linguistic, literary, dogmatic, exegetical, and devotional, leaving out a few of a less special character, such as one on "Physiology and Music in their relation to Grammar," and one published last year, "Iris, studies in Color and talks about Flowers." Purely linguistic authorship occupied but a small portion of his time, but in all his exegetical books he gives much space to discussions of words. A youthful publication in Latin called "Jesurun," written under the influence of Fürst's theory of biliteral roots, and aiming to prove the affinity of the Aryan languages, particularly Sanskrit, with the Semitic, is chiefly noteworthy as an evidence of the bent of his mind at the age of twenty-five, and of the uselessness of a false method in science, even in the hands of a man of genius. It must also be acknowledged that he never attained to the best philological methods, so that etymological and kindred discussions in his commentaries are to be read with caution.

Of his work in doctrinal theology it is not necessary or possible to speak here at length. The general remark that both his tastes and his education led him to cultivate biblical more than dogmatic theology will suffice to indicate the relative importance of his labours in these spheres respectively. Like most of the leading German theologians he felt called upon to write a compendious "Dogmatik," but like most of its class in that country it has been little studied. His "System der Apologetik" has also attracted comparatively little attention. His mind was in fact not of the constructive or systematizing order. His true business in the world was that which the world is getting more and more to see is the highest vocation of every theologian—the work of an interpreter. Taking his productions in this sphere for all in all it must be agreed that upon the whole he was the greatest German Old Testament exegete which this century has seen except Ewald. As all nature seemed to speak to him with a living voice, so also did the heart of suffering and struggling humanity as subject to and yearning for man's Creator and Redeemer, especially as speaking through the tongues of the Hebrew poets and prophets. Hence it

is that his commentary on Job is upon the whole such a masterpiece. To us this has always seemed his greatest work, as well as the greatest commentary upon Job ever written. One might speak almost as emphatically of his works upon the Psalms, Proverbs and the Epistle to the Hebrews. His commentary on Isaiah and his latest upon Genesis are probably less just and sufficient than one or two upon the same books by other authors that might be named, but to say that they also are indispensable to every earnest and reverent student is to say much less than ought to be said. Moreover they are not only noble exegetical works in themselves, but their successive editions are peculiarly important as indicating the history of the author's own opinions and his mental development as an interpreter of Revelation. Every student of Delitzsch knows that his critical attitude towards the Old Testament writings and even his principles of interpretation became considerably modified during his long professional life; and what is most remarkable, the change was apparently most rapid in his latest years. How significant and decided this change was may be indicated by the fact that most of his commentaries were projected and published as part of a series embracing the whole of the Old Testament in conjunction with the late Prof. Keil of Dorpat—a conjunction which may be somewhat rudely likened to the yoking together of a horse and an ox which one sees so often in German villages. As far as taste, imagination, and all the higher qualities of mind are concerned, there was no equality or kinship between the two scholars, but during the most of their careers this at least was true, that their general critical standpoints were the same as well as their view of the historical order of the several sections of the Old Testament. Now no one thinks of classing them in the same school, except in so far as the very wide grouping may be made which brings them together in holding to the supernatural element throughout the whole series of books.

In two main features did the old differ from the young Delitzsch. In the first place his early absorption in Jewish literature and Jewish modes of thinking, and sympathy with the theosophy of Jacob Böhme, along with his devotion to the philosophy of Fichte, led him to indulge in romantic speculations with regard to the whole mysterious realm of human nature in its relation to the divine, and with regard to the revealed Word as



setting forth the meeting of the human and divine—a system of unprovable and unsubstantial theories which only a Cabbalist or a Neo-Platonist could call a philosophy. Thus it happened that to him not only the ideas but many of the very words of the Bible were burdened with a fulness of meaning for the past and future, which could never be apprehended or enjoyed except by a trained idealist. His exposition of the Song of Solomon (1851) perhaps shows this tendency most fully among his exegetical works. His "Biblical Psychology," (first edition, 1855) with all its acuteness, learning, and suggestiveness, is, however, the main repository of this unreality in a systematic form. But such speculations seemed to have lost much of their charm for him during the last years of his life. Their effect could hardly be traced except in his occasional treatment of individual Hebrew words, while his whole style and method showed a soberness and clearness unknown to and unsuspected by his earliest productions.

The other notable change of mental habit and opinion is found in his modified attitude towards questions of Biblical criticism, which has been already alluded to. With all his native tendency to philosophical and theosophical speculation, he was a strong confessionalist, and with his conservative temperament also during most of his life a firm traditionalist. For example, in questions of the authorship, dates of composition and chronological order of the books or sections of the Old Testament, he followed the lines of Jewish as modified by the later ecclesiastical tradition. The extent of the mental interval between his old and new standpoints is not relatively so great as has sometimes been thought or feared, and whatever English students may think of his judgments, it must be admitted that they have been formed against the current of long prejudices and habits and associations, and only after the most careful, thorough and conscientious examination of all the points involved. Doubtless they were developed under the influence of a more close adherence to the historical method. Of most interest are his change of opinion formed about eight years ago with regard to the authorship of the Second Part of Isaiah, and his contemporaneous concessions to modern criticism in the matter of the origin of several of the largest sections of the Pentateuch. How steadily and sternly he has kept faith with the more essential and cardinal articles of his Biblical creed may be

seen in an article which appeared from his pen last year in the *Expositor*, entitled "The deep gulf between the Old Theology and the New."

Apart from his vocation as a writer and his ordinary functions as a teacher, Prof. Delitzsch did a great practical work for the Jews, with the two-fold aim of mutually conciliating Jews and Christians and of winning the Jews over to Christianity. With this end he founded, in 1864, a journal, *Saat auf Hoffnung*, which he edited up till his death. He also was the chief promoter of the *Institutum Judaicum*, a society for the encouragement of work for and among the Jews, which, chiefly under his inspiration, has founded branches in connection with the principal German Universities, and by means of lectures, publications of various sorts, and active missionary efforts, has accomplished much for the object which lay so near his heart. Perhaps the contribution of greatest permanent value made by him to this, his life mission, is his famous translation into classical Hebrew of the New Testament, under the auspices of the British and Foreign Bible Society, a work which has had a wide circulation among the Jews, and which is not likely ever to be displaced by any rival version. It must not, of course, be supposed that Delitzsch performed this monumental task unaided by any to whom Hebrew was as a mother tongue.

In this imperfect sketch, which has aimed to follow broad lines rather than give minute details, many facts of importance have been omitted and overlooked. A good deal must also be said in any adequate estimate of our lamented friend's best productions of those qualities which have made them so valuable and so influential—the epigrammatic force of expression, the fulness of technical knowledge, the easy command of apposite illustrations from all sources, the exquisite felicity of his vocabulary and of his renderings from the Hebrew, his eagle-like range of thought and fancy, and above all the genial poetic insight combined with moral enthusiasm and religious fervor which endowed him so highly for his noble ministry of bringing the people of these latter days into closer relations with the seers and singers of ancient Israel, so that many through him have come to touch their mind to mind and heart to heart.

J. F. McCURDY.

*University College, Toronto.*

## THE CHURCH AND THE LABOUR QUESTION.

THE attention of the world is being called, as never before, to the supreme importance of the labour question, by combinations of the masses, by combinations of the classes, and by conferences of emperors and kings and rulers of the nations of the earth. To all thoughtful minds this question must present itself as the most momentous one of the age, absorbing all others, as upon its solution on right lines depends the future of modern civilization.

The object of this paper is to indicate that with the Church rests the solution of this problem, and that it is only by the exercise of the power committed to the Church by Christ that the work can be done. Radically and fundamentally its solution rests on a moral basis, and only by the *specific* and *distinct* application of righteous principles to our social adjustments, and the removal of what is unjust, can the desired end be attained. The way is simple enough if faith in God and the constancy of His laws has not altogether departed from the Church.

The intellectual progress made during the last half century in the development of the arts and sciences, and the application of these to the production of wealth (of what men need and desire), with the accompanying minute sub-division of labour, have wholly changed the conditions of our social relations, or, to speak more correctly, have changed the effects resulting from those conditions. Wrong conditions existed before, but the evil effects flowing from these conditions have become intensified to an enormous degree by the very development and progress of the industrial arts. In proportion to the increase in rapidity of production do matters become worse and worse. The more progress is made the greater the evils from unjust conditions are felt. To such an extent is this the case that productive labour is not only coming to get a less proportion of what it produces, and losing more and more the security of a just return, but it is also becoming deprived of the opportunity of producing, by a state of things which leads to the

enforced idleness of millions, by being debarred access to the resources which nature affords. Thus progress is now being hindered, and on present lines must finally be entirely arrested. It is not far to see that the result of all this must be to blight the prospects of future social development toward a higher plane. Personal character or conduct of men as individuals can do little or nothing in staying or even modifying these growing evils, or their final results, as long as the conditions in society out of which they arise remain.

This labour problem is too often looked upon by the multitude, and even by those who ought to be leaders of men, as one merely affecting what are termed the working classes, or the masses of the unemployed, whereas it intimately affects every man, woman and child, high and low, rich and poor, cultured and ignorant. Some good people are prone to attribute the growing unrest among the masses to discontent aroused by demagogues through envy of the wealthy, and a coveting of their possessions. This is a most shallow judgment, unworthy of any man capable of reflection. All whose efforts are in any way concerned with the production of wealth, are intimately interested in the labour question, be they mechanics, tradesmen, teachers, farmers, artists, preachers, clerks, sailors, builders, or whatever be their occupation, manual or mental, relating to production, all are affected in a like manner by false conditions in our social system. The maladjustments in our social arrangements touch all in the same way, though it may be in different degrees varying with circumstances and accidents of surroundings. All are rendered more or less insecure in the possession of what they ought justly to own,—of a fair return of the products of their labour. It is a calumny upon our common humanity to assert that the millions in every land who are now moving for a change in our social conditions, are animated by envy and covetousness. It is not anywhere urged, except by some ignorant fanatics, to take from the rich to give to the poor, or to level up or level down by dividing accumulated wealth among the people. Apart from the injustice of such a thing, every sensible man knows that this would do no good, but on the contrary, infinite harm, even if it were possible to do it by and with the free consent of the wealthy. What, however, is justly demanded of Society—of the State—is that each and all be

allowed liberty to produce, by being relieved of unjust restrictions and hindrances imposed by certain laws, and be free to exchange what is produced with whom and where he pleases, and that all be made secure in the possession of that portion which is rightfully his own in production.

Neither of these ends can possibly be secured by special legislation intended to benefit particular callings, for while this may be affording temporary relief in one direction, it will be imposing extra burdens in another. Nor can trade unions or other labour associations, by combining in strikes or otherwise for higher wages, ever succeed in securing for themselves a just proportion of the products of their labour. A rise in wages in one department of labour is always more or less at the expense of every other department of labour, and should every department of labour get an equal rise, say double or even a hundredfold, all labour would then be in precisely the same position it was in before any rise was secured. The efforts made to secure a just return to labour by a rise in wages is at best a mere treadmill. One seems to be moving forward but never advances. The only real rise in wages (wages, salary, stipend, fee, etc.) is a rise relative to the value of productions, and to benefit labour generally there must be a rise all round relative to the value of the sum of all that is produced. Now what do we actually find? We find the very reverse of this relative rise in wages is what is happening all over the world, for while wages may and do rise nominally yet a less *proportion* of what labour produces returns to those who are the intelligent instruments in production, so that the more progress and rapidity there is in making wealth (what men need and desire), the poorer the actual makers of the wealth of the world become. It is not within the scope of this article to state the whole argument or to fully explain how this comes about, suffice it is to say, that it can be proved conclusively *à priori*, that from the given conditions in society such must be the result, or, which would be more satisfactory to most minds, proved from a wide induction of facts that such has occurred. Phenomena seemingly contradictory to this conclusion will present themselves to many, but these can readily be explained in harmony with it. The subject is one which requires study and wide observation. Perfect candour is also necessary, for we must count on the natural prejudice and bias of

our minds occasioned by our environments and the universal practice of mankind. The purpose of this article, however, is not to furnish a manual on political economy, but to arrest attention so as to fix it on the magnitude of the issues, and more especially to note this, that the solution of this great social problem rests wholly upon a moral basis.

There are certain facts which reveal the truth of the above conclusions apart from any elaborate process of reasoning. It is a fact, manifest and undeniable, that the wealth of the world produced by labour, that is by human effort, mental and manual, is centering more and more into the hands of a comparatively few persons and in a few places, as large cities. Take for example the United States alone, there Prof. Sherman and others show by a collection of facts, that while forty-five years ago there was but one person in the United States possessing five millions of wealth, to-day there are twenty persons owning from fifty to one hundred and fifty millions each, one hundred and fifty persons possessing from ten to fifty millions each, and so on. In short, it has come now to this, that upwards of three-fifths of the whole wealth of the United States is in the possession of thirty-one thousand persons, while at the same time the increase of the wealth of the country has been in a greater ratio than the increase of the population. That three-fifths of the productions of sixty million people should pass into the hands of thirty-one thousand persons surely presents food for thought. Certainly this ought to furnish subject for serious consideration and active enquiry on the part of every man of ordinary intelligence possessing a human soul. Of course much poverty exists, and that of a most distressing character, of which intemperance, ignorance and improvidence are the *direct* cause, but the existence of these vices themselves is very largely due to unjust conditions for which Society itself as such is responsible, far more than most people have the remotest conception.

Similar results are to be seen even here in Canada, young as she is, as well as in every country in Europe. In face of these facts—for they are facts, not theories—will the pulpit and the religious press persist in asserting that that poverty which is crushing millions on millions into wretchedness, misery, despair, and death, throughout the world—will they persist in asserting that the primary or fundamental cause of this poverty is intem-

perance, improvidence and ignorance, especially when they might know upon an analysis that these evil traits of character would be found as general among the few immensely wealthy as among the many millions of the poor.

Now here is another fact, not an opinion, be it remembered, but a *fact*, which may help to shed light on the cause of such a monstrous anomaly in the distribution of wealth—just one fact among others intimately related which might be given. In Toronto you have considerable areas in the city which are worth one hundred thousand dollars an acre ; that is, as things stand, the owner of a single acre of this land controls one hundred thousand dollars worth of the products of the labour of the people of this province and of some beyond,—controls and owns this wealth simply and solely by reason of his ownership of the acre of ground. The personal ownership of the acre of land is right enough, and Society—the State—is bound to respect this right of property and maintain his ownership inviolate, of the land and of all the value he himself has brought on or attached to it ; but it is a totally different thing that, by means of the control of this acre, he should be permitted to take the products of the labour of others without any recompense whatever. Free control and possession of land, and all the values which the owner himself has attached to it, is a perfectly and wholly distinct thing from the control and possession of values he has had nothing whatever to do in producing, except as one of millions. To permit this control, which very thing is done to-day throughout the civilized world, *is to render insecure the personal possession of all property which men ought rightfully to own.*

This is not the only cause of the unjust distribution of wealth but it is a primary and fundamental cause to which other secondary causes are necessarily related. It is a cause of other causes. Other causes loom up it may be more prominently to view, but this is at the basis, and until this is removed it is utterly impossible to remove the others. It is as to Society as if a man were standing on his head, and a physician called in to treat him in this position for some functional disorder. He could not do it. Set the man in a natural position, and then there may be some hope of treating his disorder successfully. The greater the progress made in production, so much the more individuals

holding land (being permitted to control land values other than what they themselves have given to the land or had rightfully transferred to them), are enabled to appropriate to themselves the product of the labour of others unjustly, so that your holder of an acre in Toronto is able to command not only one hundred thousand dollars worth of the product of the labour of the whole people of this Province, but later on, double that amount, and in a few years if labour puts forth more energies four hundred thousand dollars worth, and so on indefinitely, until progress is arrested by a return to labour of products insufficient for bare maintenance. This is operating throughout this land and in every land.

Instead of taking these values, which are created by the whole body of the people throughout the country, by a yearly tax thereon for the purposes of government, etc., of which but a small percentage per annum would be needed for all purposes, both state and municipal, we intensify the evil by placing the burden of taxes for state and municipal revenue almost wholly on certain classes of productive labour, and to cap the climax we impose immoral restrictions on and impediments to labour by laws hindering free exchange, and further, in *doing these things*, and *by reason thereof*, we divert an immense and unjustly large proportion of labour's products into the hands of accumulated capital. Capital possesses a power which is natural and right, but by our economic arrangements we bestow upon it a *further* immense power which does not naturally or justly belong to it. Society in permitting one wrong is led to commit other grievous wrongs and injustice on the great body of the people. The full iniquity of the system we are tolerating is only to be discerned in its far-reaching effects, extending out in all directions into every avenue of life, which to the multitude are occult, and only to be fully apprehended by close investigation and thoughtful enquiry.

The main object of this paper is to emphasize the fact that this great social problem is fundamentally a moral one, and that its solution rests wholly on the recognition of principles of right and justice, and the specific enforcement of these on the attention of the people by the Church, the divinely appointed moral guide. Thus the removal of the evil becomes distinctly and definitely the work of the Church. That a monstrous wrong does exist in our social arrangements cannot be denied, the fact itself is patent and



manifest, and its blighting effects on Society seen on every hand to be far reaching and profound. Shall we tolerate the wrong, because universally practiced and hoary with time, when we are being brought face to face, as we are to-day, with the intolerable evils wrought thereby? The Church is trifling with the solemn responsibilities placed upon it by Christ in remaining silent as to these public wrongs—as to immoral principles in the constitution of Society and the unjust conditions into which men are thereby forced. No plea of social or political expediency can ever justify the Christian Church in standing aloof and remaining silent when the law of God is being disregarded and broken by men either in their corporate or individual capacity.

The lines taken in dealing with this subject by ministers of the gospel and other religious people, when they do give it any consideration, are such as totally to ignore the real issue, and is substantially in effect saying to the hungry and naked, be ye warmed and filled, and yet not moving a little finger to relieve the distress. An example of this may be seen in the MONTHLY for April, in an article entitled "The Church and the Poor." There the writer speaks of ignorance and personal wrong-doing as the cause of poverty and distress, as doubtless they often are, and he rightly counsels that individuals be urged to adopt habits of temperance, frugality and thrift, and seek to be better fitted by education for their various callings; he also presses upon the rich the duty of cultivating benevolent sentiments and exercising kindness and consideration toward the poor. Now these common-places are all very right in their way, but a man, be he very rich or very poor, may have every Christian grace with the intelligence and vigour of cultured manhood—a model man—and yet be utterly powerless to deliver himself from the baneful effects of unrighteous and unjust conditions imposed by the constitution of Society, of which he himself forms an integral part. He is here as part of Society, and he cannot free himself from consequences of wrong incorporated in Society as such. The millionaire and the pauper are within the radius of the same raging elements, and by the conflict and force of these elements one is hurled upon a bank of ease with more than heart can desire, the other is drawn down to the perdition of deepest poverty. The same evil forces in Society are producing, on the one hand, princes of wealth, and, on

the other, children of want, and this altogether apart from the intention or personal character of either class. As members of Society, rich and poor alike, we are in necessary contact with what is in antagonism to the law of nature—the Divine law, we cannot escape, we must suffer the consequences whatever be our personal character, religious belief or aims. The stone falling will crush saint and sinner alike, and they being thus pressed together by an over-mastering force outside themselves, the saint crushes the sinner and the sinner the saint. There is no freeing ourselves from the operation of Nature's laws. If the arrangements and conditions which Society agrees to proceed upon are in antagonism to natural law—to the Divine will—then not any one of us, as an individual, can by any means deliver himself from the damning effects of this antagonism of our social arrangements. The pain and sorrow is of course mitigated by the consciousness of oneself opposing the wrong and doing what he can to remedy it, but this does not prevent the effects from constantly operating upon him and every one else while the cause remains.

The writer of the article referred to mentions one cause of poverty, namely "enforced idleness," and curiously enough says it is "probably of least importance" and that "it is one with which politicians have to deal." The reverend writer does not seem to comprehend what *enforced idleness* means. One needs patience when confronted with such flippancy. When we reflect that enforced idleness means that millions of our fellow creatures are excluded by unjust conditions from opportunity to produce what they need, and are debarred by arbitrary laws in Society from access to the resources of Nature which the Great Father in His goodness has provided in profuse abundance for all His children, will it seem a matter of "least importance"? The writer admits there is enforced idleness, surely as a clergyman he does not mean what his words imply, that he and the Church are not to deal with and expose the unrighteousness of such laws and customs in the State which enforce idleness—which deprive his brother man of opportunity of producing what he needs. This is rather a strange theory of Separation of Church and State, that implies that the Church is not to expose and endeavour in its proper sphere to suppress gross wickedness because the citizens or a majority of them are agreed in preaching it. It is the duty of the Church to

condemn wickedness wherever found, and if in the State, to instruct the people *specifically* in ways that are just and right and equal, that they may remove the wickedness and enact laws according to the rule of Christ. Were we dwelling in a land where polygamy prevailed, would it not be the duty of Christian ministers to point out the evil and urge the abandonment of the custom? Or if slavery were permitted by the laws of the State, though the majority might not recognize the evil, and even the body of the clergy might defend it on Scriptural grounds, as they did in the South; yet would not each one who did recognize the injustice in this infringement of human rights, be bound to expose the wrong? Yet here, in our own day, is a monstrous wrong in our social adjustments which all can readily know is working direful effects, brought more prominently before us by the very facts of recent rapid strides in industrial progress. Are we not to declare the wrong—to speak of its existence? Whatever may be any one's personal views as to the cause of the evil or what may be its remedy, the fact itself—the existence of the wrong—cannot be doubted by any sane man. Let then, at least the fact be proclaimed even if we can see no further at present. The plea for not dealing with this labour question on the ground that the change must needs be made through State enactments is manifestly not an honest one, all the religious bodies having agitated for legislation in the matter of the liquor traffic, and most of them, right or wrong, having petitioned Parliament to pass a prohibitory law.

Are we to be frightened into disobeying the command of God by the cry without, "there is a lion in the way," or be restrained by some bugaboo conjured up in our minds, and frightened by our imaginings of what may befall us in advancing? Let us bravely face the cause of fear, awaiting the light, it will then be found to be but a bugaboo, vanishing like the baseless fabric of a vision before the dawning light. Or are we to be dismayed by some Goliath of the press or Church roll, who may stand out sneeringly demanding: Who are you who would defy the army of the Philistines; back to your prayer book and catechism.

The new order of things brought about by the rapid development in the arts and sciences, resulting in immensely increased production of all that men need and desire, is what has so intensified evils resulting from pre-existing wrong conditions, and our very pros-

perity now threatens to prove our destruction, for within the last few years a state of Society is fast being arrived at, more terrible to contemplate than any other form of human slavery that has yet existed in any civilized country, already have millions of our fellow creatures been brought to a condition worse than that of a slave.

Though we may fail, as we likely shall at first, to grasp the whole situation as to this labour question, now so profoundly moving the whole civilized world; yet I maintain, as Christians, we are in duty bound to seek earnestly to apply the rule of Christ in this matter, and for this end to *act* upon such light as we have though it be but a glimmer. Thus *acting*, more light will arise, as Christ himself has taught us. If we wait until we can see the end from the beginning—until we perceive all the bearings and relations of this complex question—we shall wait until doomsday, and then not have touched the burden with our little finger. The most penetrating gaze of the most highly gifted cannot see more than but a step ahead. Shall we not take the one step, or at least attempt it, and trust in God for the next? Our duty clearly is to attentively listen to what is the voice of God in the operation of His laws in this vast movement, and hearing, strive to bring Society into accord with these laws, that His will may be done on earth as it is in heaven. Christian faith asks not to see the *distant* scene, but trustingly follows the God-given light, though darkness be before. "This is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith," which trusts in God and in the abiding constancy of His laws, revealed to us either in Nature or in His Word. This is that faith illustrated for us in the life of Abraham and of all those worthies recorded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and expressed in the hymn

"Lead, kindly Light, \* \*  
\* \* One step enough for me."

How different this faith from that craven spirit, which under a form of sound words in religion so permeates the Churches to-day, from which comes ever the refrain "When *I* can read *my* title clear to mansions in the *skies*," a spirit utterly opposed to that of those noble prophets of old, and all the brave and good who have blessed mankind in the past.

The Church is the only power on earth capable of settling this momentous question on right lines, and unless it can be

sufficiently awakened to exercise its power, the prospect in the early future for modern civilization is dark in the extreme. Should socialism prevail, as is threatened by the existing state of things, it must, at all events in the present moral condition of mankind, in but a few years end in anarchy, bloodshed, and ruin. It becomes then every Christian, especially clergymen, to reflect, to study the subject and to enquire, to look up and beyond petty and partial views, and try to discover the signs of the times, and to apprehend the magnitude of the issues. "This kind cometh not out but by prayer and fasting," it is therefore the bounden duty of ministers of the gospel to seek information in every available quarter, by reading, observation, and study. The ignorance of even highly educated men on this subject, which so affects all mankind, is most deplorable, and what is most discouraging is, the more profound the ignorance, the more convinced individuals are that they know all about it, and that anyhow it is not their work to attend to such matters. To remain in darkness when light may be had is sinful in the extreme, it is nothing short of tempting God. If the Church expects the reformation of the world and its ultimate submission to Christ, other than in observing His rule in the conduct of human affairs, it is asking God to ignore His own laws. The present attitude of the Churches respecting this subject and cognate ones, is doing more than anything else in the world to quench all enthusiasm in men for truth and righteousness, which the blessed Saviour and His work is so fitted to enkindle. It is not of Christ that the world is ashamed to-day, but it is of the religious presentation of Him it is ashamed, and the utter disjointed and often perverted application of the mysteries of our holy religion. Many a true heart is made to burn with indignation or to turn sick with disgust, when ministers of the gospel and other religious people are asked to give their aid and counsel to rectify these social derangements, by the reply that it is not their calling to attend to such things, that their work is to save souls, as if this were not to save souls; the very thing Christ would have us do, save the world by leading it in Him to seek and follow the Father's will. No wonder men to whom God has given eyes to see will not identify themselves with such conceptions of Christianity, and they do well to be ashamed of it. These super-religious people, the righteous over much, ever intent on the form of religion,

talking religion, sound and unsound, orthodox and heterodox alike, are unable to perceive that this attitude of mind is the very contradiction and denial of the Christian faith. They are practically looking for a reversal or suspension of God's laws as they relate to social order instead of recognizing and trusting in the laws and the Lawgiver. They look for a sign, a miracle, a manifestation of supernatural power. Instead of implicitly trusting in God as he reveals Himself in nature and in His Word, they trust in an abnegation of God. As to the ordinary affairs of daily life, the religious world is full of this teaching. They presume to trust in what God has not revealed. As if one should hurl himself from a precipice trusting that he would not be dashed to pieces. This religion, call it Evangelical or what you please, is as vain as any superstition. It is not Christianity.

A lesson may be learned respecting this very thing from Christ's temptation in the wilderness, when the Devil tempted Him to cast Himself down from the pinnacle, in the trust that God would bear Him up. Our Saviour knew the law of gravitation to be the will of God and He trusted in this, to do the other would have been to mistrust God. Or again, being an hungered He was tempted by the Devil to turn stones into bread, but this is not God's way of providing bread for the hungry, and we live not by bread alone, but also by His Word. Are we trusting that the naked and hungry be warmed and filled by melancholy appeals to stones, to wealth and power, when God in His goodness has mercifully provided enough and to spare for all His creatures, and we might know that all might procure for themselves enough did not Society debar men from access to the bountiful provision of His Providence? Do we profess the hope that the whole world will become subject to the sceptre of the Messiah, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord? This hope cannot be realized by the Church bowing down and submitting itself, as she is doing, to unrighteous and unjust principles in the constitution of Society, but in conquering and subduing these by the truth. What is said of the Church in Isa. v. in immediate connection with evils in the State similar to those alluded to here, may be said regarding the Church now, "And He looked for judgment, but beheld oppression; for righteousness, but beheld a cry."

Principal Grant, in an excellent article on "Church Union" in

the March MONTHLY, suggests the possibility from present appearances of needing to go outside the Church to find the saints. Indeed it looks very much like this to-day, and the question may be asked seriously, Have the religious denominations become hindrances of the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth? Our Saviour asks, "When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith on the earth?" The spirit and bearing of the Churches in respect to the ordinary affairs of daily life, not to say anything of the serious concerns pertaining to our social, political and international relations, is one of mistrust in God. There is manifested want of faith both in God and man. The flock is wandering upon the dark mountains, and the Shepherd is obscured by those set to point to Him. They will neither go in themselves nor will they let others enter.

THOS. RITCHIE.

*Belleville.*

## ON THE HOLY HILL OF CHINA.

THE jaded and as yet callow student of Chinese men and letters often sighs for a change. In your study you grow weary of the spectacled ogre with the garlic-scented breath who sits opposite you, and you long for fresh air and freedom. How nice it is to dangle your legs over the shaft of the cart, and speculate as to the meaning of the hieroglyphics scrawled upon the walls and doors. The dictionary and the pundit are alike reposing far behind. Even the Sinologues of Peking are wont to lay aside for a season the dusty tomes which they delight to pore over for new evidences of their own ingenuity, and to take flight to the Western Hills not far away. We of Lin Ching are not so happily circumstanced. We are in the midst of the Great Plain through which the Yellow River, China's Prodigal Son, has wandered hither and thither for ages, and the mountains are some days off. Still, in this glorious October weather, a few days journey are not to be accounted of, when we take an outing to the most sacred of China's Five Holy Hills. Five days by cart, S. E. across the Yellow River and much mountain road, and we gain its base. Then if your time allows, a day and a half more will bring you to the ancient home and grave of Confucius!

If the mountain is interesting to the Chinese pilgrim, it is not less so to the missionary. First, this is the place where the sons of Han worshipped, perhaps, the true God, when the world was young and the song of the morning stars had not yet faded from the recollection of men. In the Chinese classics occurs the sentence: Every year in the second moon, Shun made a journey of investigation thither. And who was Shun? The second Emperor of China, who began to reign 2255 B.C.! About this time took place the dispersion of Babel. A monument on the summit records the fact that here Yao was wont to stand and enjoy the view. And who was Yao? The first Emperor of China, who began to reign 2356 B.C.! There is good evidence to believe that Emperors and people ascended this mountain to sacrifice, one hundred and fifty generations ago, nearly 1000 years before Moses stood on Pisgah. Second, it is now a centre of pilgrimages. The ancient objects of worship are all forgotten, and the pilgrim now climbs its sides to worship a goddess, called "Grandmother," of whom nothing certain



can be known. She is locally worshipped in many cities, as for example, Lin Ching and Hsun Hsien in Honan Third. The hill is studded with scores of arches and temples to men and fairies, demons and gods. Would you see heathenism? Go to Tai Shan, or the Great Mountain. There study its temples and you understand something of the many-headed monsters before which China periodically knocks its head. Fourth, the Taoist religion is here supreme. Do you wish to know Taoism? Go to this hill and learn of its priests and nuns. Lastly, we see the three religions peacefully fraternizing here. The Chinese never tire of quoting to you: The three religions are really one. Meditate on Tai Shan, and you will see that, however untrue theoretically, it is true practically.

We are going at the right time. We avoid the crowds of the regular tourist season, which is during the first, second and third months. If we went at that season we should find the roads thronged with pilgrims of all ages, sexes and ranks. The vast majority, clad in the dark blue of the peasantry, come afoot for hundreds of miles. We met one man who had come 560 miles afoot from Honan. The inns would have been crowded to overflowing. We might ask these incense guests (so the Chinese) why they were going; and the replies would be variously, "because others go," "to see the sights," "to gain merit," "to escape calamities." Gentle reader, do not imagine that they are all in worship bent, for the practical Chinese combine religion and business, much as the French Catholics combine Mass and mass meeting for political purposes. Every foot of the great Temple Ground in Lin Ching is alive with trade. So on the very top of the sacred mountain, for the first three months of the year, is held a great "camp meeting." Some Chinese Bunyan might well take it as the original of his "Vanity Fair."

We soon had evidences that we were drawing near a famous resort. Inn charges rose. Beggars began to beset the road. Old men and old women would give a "knock head" and ask for cash. Little children would run along beside the cart murmuring a pitiful sort of sing-song with one line repeated *ad libitum*. The burden is, Your excellency, who doeth good works, pity me and give me a few cash. Some of the beggars were apparently working in the public interest. Armed with wooden shovels (they would scoff at iron as

cumbersome), as soon as they spied a cart approaching they were very diligent in tossing the sand gently about. We exhorted them to remove the stones from a most villainous piece of road in the rear of us. They turned away with an injured look. Their harvest time was, however, past. At the base of the hill is the city of Tai Ngan Fe. Within this is a temple area which is a little city within a city. So large is the wall and space enclosed. Here the Emperors used to stay when they came on pilgrimages. Here are the remains of two ancient trees, one a cedar of 206 B.C., and the other an ash 618 A.D. From the city the mountain appears to be insignificant in height, but the nearer the pedestrian gets to the top, the higher his respect rises. The Chinese say it is thirteen miles high by the road, but this is much beyond the truth. The barometer shows it to be 5100 feet above the sea. Of course, it cannot compare with our Rockies.

There are two methods of ascending the hill. One is to be carried upon a mountain chair. The other method is to walk up. We chose the plebeian method. A paved road from twelve to fifteen feet wide, winds up the side of the gorge. The ascents are on the whole gradual, and the steps increase in number and frequency as you near the summit. The road now creeps along the brow of beetling crags, now crosses a brawling mountain stream, now aggravates you by descents, and at last boldly scales the steep and reaches the Heavenly Gate. Other roads lead off into other recesses of the hill, each with its own story of wonder. Across the road stand numerous arches, memorial or simply ornamental, while temples and shrines, some in total ruins, occur with greater or less frequency all the way. Tablets and engravings on the face of the rock record the visit of some great man, or sound forth the praises of the mountain. All these are, like the Apocalypse, not to be understood without a commentary. As we follow the gorge we trace a mountain stream to its source. Beautiful, for cypress and yew trees shade our path for most of the distance. Mountain grass in abundance grows on the slopes, and cows find a livelihood high up even on the very top. The mountain grandam it seems keeps cows. Manure cakes for sale can be seen in one of the summit temples. Peasants can be seen cutting grass and carrying it in bundles to the city far below. Over-hanging boulders gave shelter to the beggars, now mostly departed to fresh fields.

But we must now come to particulars. The ascent properly begins with the arch of the ancestral mount, a large decorated stone arch extending across the road. The next object of interest is the temple of the Pearly Emperor. This is not the Chinese Potentate, but one of the chief divinities of the Taoist sect. His worship dates from 1116 A.D. When the Emperor fell under the power of the magical rites and superstitions of the Taoists, he conferred the title on a magician who now is worshipped as a god. On this hill he has several other temples, and one on the extreme summit. One is glad to know that this deity is so recent. He is supposed to have all the power of heaven and earth. A few cash given to the ill-looking priest, and he opens the "mummy room." Here on a pedestal is set up and worshipped the desiccated corpse of a Taoist priest who died in the reign of Chien Lung (1736-1796 A.D.) Over his skull has been fitted a gilt mask with glass eyes. A yellow silk robe hangs loosely from his shoulders. Our red-nosed conductor says "He was *transformed*. His spirit left him while in a sitting posture, and he had neither ache nor pain, being fully convinced that he was not dying but being changed."

The next temple, a very large and gorgeous one, is that of the god of War, whose worship dates from 1594 A.D. In Honan they pray to him for rain. We went in to hear two priests and a boy novice chant morning prayers. When done they went out to eat. Our old guide quoted to us the proverb: Save Buddha, get clothes, trust Buddha, eat food, as *apropos* of the motives of the priesthood. At some distance from the road is seen the temple of the Royal Mother, the Taoist queen of the genii. In her gardens is a peach tree which puts forth leaves once in every three thousand years, and in three thousand more the fruit ripens. These were her birthdays and the gods held an ecumenical counsel to discuss the peaches.

Passing through the First Heavenly Gate we see a temple to the Buddhist goddess of Mercy who has two other temples on the hill. While Taoism dominates, Buddhism is also represented. Near by, an arch records the fact that here Confucius once stood. Entering the house of some priests we notice, as we pass, a foreign looking-glass. We are led out to the balcony which overlooks the ravine, and on the opposite side are pointed to the grave of the White Mule. An Emperor of the Tang Dynasty (cir. 700 A.D.)

having completed his sacrifice, was descending when his favorite mule suddenly died. He thereupon canonized him. This ravine is called the Lost Letter Gorge, because once a great man (960 A.D.) received a letter from home while at this point, and perceiving the character "peace" written therein, cast it into the gorge. Every Chinese envelope bears that character, whether it contains good or bad news, and we cannot conjecture why he should have acted in so reckless a manner. We could find no traces of the letter.

The next object is a small shrine to the Tai Shan Grandam, a boulder before it being engraved, the small Tai Shan. This is probably for the convenience of those who are too busy to go the whole way to the great temple. This will answer the purpose. Next is a large building spanning the road called the Tower of the Myriad Fairies. On enquiry we find that the present tenants are fleshly and carry on a small business. My comrade enquired ironically if some of the frowsy-headed hags who begged of us were the Fairies. Through the Red Gate, and we pass the Peck-Measure Mother Temple. Why not go in? the name is curious. Our guide informs us that here some ten Taoist nuns live. On our return we saw them, with queues and large feet like men. Our guide said, This is a fashionable brothel! Hence the temple is very rich. The Taoists make prominent the worship of the stars. The Peck-Measure Mother is the deity which presides over the North Star, which we locate by means of the "Dipper." This the Chinese liken to a peck measure, finding the same configuration as we do. As the goddess of Mercy is the heart of Buddhism, so she is of Taoism.

The Three Mandarins (Taoist) who rule Heaven, Earth and Men, claim a small temple. Their birthdays occur on the 15th of the 1st, 7th and 10th moons. At different points little shrines are built to the mountain sprite. Elegant summer-houses accommodate the gentry and officials, who climb this Hill Difficulty. To-day the shop regales us with flour dough strips and bad tea, and we are before the arch called the Steep of the Returning Horse. The tradition is that the founder of the Lung Dynasty (917 A.D.) succeeded in riding to this point, a feat impossible for all others. Up a long flight of stairs and we pass into the humble though cleanly home of the god of Medicine. Taoism makes much of

him. He was originally a Haulin graduate of Peking, but he retired to the mountains to search for immortality. Desiring to cure the 10,000 forms of disease, he tasted all kinds of herbs. In one day he ate seventy poisons. One of his attendants appropriately carries his bank book.

Around a corner, and we come to the Hall of the Three Religions. Here are seated Confucius on the left of the place of honor, Lao-ten in the centre, as the patron of Taoism, and Buddha to the right. Buddha, though a foreigner, is almost invariably placed in the centre. Passing through the Middle Heaven Arch we arrive at the Temple of the Two Tigers, which marks the half-way point in the ascent. The tiger has many mythical attributes. The first one came from a star. He lives to the age of 1,000 years. His claws are a powerful talisman, and ashes prepared from his skin and worn on the person prevent sickness. It is no wonder that he is occasionally deified.

Just beyond is a stretch of road called the Pleasant Mile because the road is level, to the great relief of the (foreign) pilgrim's aching back and legs. At the end of this mile we linger on a picturesque bridge called Cloud Step, which precedes the next ascent. A beautiful waterfall comes tumbling over the precipice. We ascend to the Flying Stone, a large boulder which fell down to its present position 300 years ago. Here, too, is the Stone of the Royal Tapestry, where an emperor rested over night. Near by are five ancient pines upon whom an emperor bestowed high rank, because a rain-storm having suddenly come on, he found shelter beneath their branches. Upward, still upward, and we turn aside into the Sun Facing Cave, in which is a little roofed shrine with its usual quota of gods. The South Heavenly Gate now appears in sight, but still distant. We examine a little temple to the Star of Longevity (Taoist), a god with a prodigious head, and then begin the ascent of the Eighteen Flights, specially designated, because they have no landings. At the sides we see iron chains, which old women may clutch to aid their progress. We pause frequently to enjoy the view. The day on the Hill is clear; the morning clouds which the mountain daily pierces have melted. Below us lies the Great Plain, dark spots indicate the sites of villages shrouded in trees. Forty *li* away a silver streak of river winds its sluggish length into the haze.

The road now runs along the top of the mountain. We pass a wretched village, up more steps and we are in the Temple of the Green and Crimson Mists, where the Mountain Grandam lives in state. The roof is covered with yellow tiles, and bronze tiles weighing thirty pounds each. In three rooms she has gigantic gilt images. The main building is the Royal Bed Chamber; here she sits on the side of a bed and looks down on the floor covered with cash, women's shoes, rolls of cloth, cakes, jewellery, beads and the like. But the real object of worship is a little image in a small pavilion which stands in the centre of the court. As we walk about, men, but chiefly women praying for sons, come in, and burn great paper ingots of gold and silver, go forward, kneel and knock head three times to the goddess, as they rise throwing down a few cash. At each knock a priest, whose shaven pate reveals his inanity, strikes a gong to notify divinity. Here a late emperor who visited the Hill thrice has erected two large bronze tablets. The venter only is bronze, but the gods know naught of this. In a side room is a high tablet of that Chinese pearl called jade, the gift of an emperor.

Around behind we find men at work making copies of Rock Inscriptions. The process consists in rubbing the plane surface over with ink, pressing the paper on it, and the deep cut characters are left white upon the copy.

Here is a neglected temple to Confucius, here are empty observatories (the Taoists are astrologers) and tablets in plenty. The extreme summit is crowned with a temple to the Pearly Emperor in such bad repair that the two side rooms have been deserted by the gods. The roof of the main building has also largely fallen in. One is disgusted that the top is desecrated with this wretched structure to a wizard. In front of this temple is a very large tablet with no characters on it, erected by an emperor (B.C. 221) who was a bitter hater of the literati. Hence the eccentricity of the tablet.

Here we get a grand view of the ravines and peaks of the range. The natives say you can see the sea three hundred miles away from this point. Needless to add, we gazed in vain. Adjacent is Love Life Precipice, originally known as Suicide Rock from the number of suicides. A wall is now built across it to prevent people from yielding to the fascination of the dizzy height. A tablet near

by records the fact that "here stood Confucius when he remarked that the boundaries of the kingdom were small."

One survey of this hill is full of instruction. We have described only those objects on or near the road. But the whole mountain has its place of interest as you may see in the two-hundred page Chinese guide book. Lao-tyn, the founder of Taoism, who would never father it as it now is, has four temples in different places. The Taoist religion is an attempt to adapt the Indian religion to Chinese civilization. The elixir of immortality is the quest of their alchemy. The hosts of heaven and hell are the objects of their superstitious reverence. Mystic rites, necromancy, sorcery and magic are the staple of the sect.

To gain merit, some Chinese will endure hardness, although the tortures of Hinduism are unknown. Their worship may have some sort of sincerity, but solemnity it has none. We saw men lighting their pipes with burning incense sticks plucked from before the god. Imagine men lighting their cigars at the pulpit jets during prayer! They worship they know not what. We have sought in vain for any light as to who this Grandam is. Who knows? say the Chinese. One observer says there is a small altar to Heaven on the summit. We saw no traces of it. Men wandered farther and farther from the true light, following the imaginations of their own hearts, and this hill is the witness against them. They have persuaded themselves that after all the three religions are one, and they would like to include ours in the same unity. A clever writer has lately used the following figure to illustrate this point: Suppose there are three snakes. The second snake seizes the first and swallows it as far as the head. The third in like manner seizes the second and swallows him up to the head. But the first snake having a mouth of unlimited capacity bends down and swallows the third snake from the tail to his head. So there is nothing seen but three heads! In like manner Taoism swallowed Buddhism and Confucianism but finally Confucianism swallowed them both!

*We say: the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the serpent, and many nations shall come and say: Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and He will teach us of His ways and we will walk in His paths, for the law shall go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.*

D. MACGILLIVRAY.

## THE EDITOR'S BOOK SHELF.

It is not around the Atonement, or the Decrees, or the doctrine of the Trinity, or any question in Eschatology that the battle of faith is hottest to-day. These questions have all had their day and for their solution appeals were made to the inspired Bible, whose testimony was regarded as conclusive. But the doubters of to-day have raised the previous question, and the authority of Scripture is disputed, accepted theories of inspiration are rejected, and the fiercest warfare wages around the Bible itself. Whether we like it or not, we must face again this perplexing problem, the most perplexing problem before the minds of students of theology at the present time. In the fierce light which recent criticism has turned upon every verse and every word of Scripture is it still possible for honest and intelligent men to believe in the Bible as our fathers did? To say that this question is settled is to confess ignorance of current thought; to deny the legitimacy of the inquiry is obscurantism; to shirk it because fearful of results is cowardice more dishonouring than doubt.

It is therefore but right that a book discussing this all-important subject should be given precedence of all other books on the Shelf. And as the Old Testament is in the forefront of the battle, an intelligent and competent discussion of the inspiration of the Old Testament is doubly welcome. The appearance of a second edition of Principal Cave's "Inspiration of the Old Testament" gives us the opportunity of calling the attention of Canadian students to the most satisfactory book, perhaps, among all those in recent literature dealing with the subject. The first edition appeared nearly two years ago and was favourably received by men of opposite schools. The present edition is less expensive and brings the book within the reach of every student.

Principal Cave is already well known to students of theology. His previously published works gave him rank among the foremost British theologians of the day, and his sympathy with conservative positions, whilst cognizant of the latest results of scientific and historical criticism, has made him leader of a large body of intelligent students who are earnest

\*The Inspiration of the Old Testament inductively considered. By Alfred Cave, B.A., D.D., Principal of Hackney College. Second Edition. London: Congregational Union. Toronto: Willard Tract Depository. Pp. 508. Price \$2.00.



in investigation but who cherish well-grounded suspicions of reckless radicalism and cold-blooded rationalism.

In the present volume Dr. Cave sets himself to discuss two questions, viz: on the one hand, the *Data*, and, on the other hand, the *Doctrine*, of the inspiration of the Old Testament. His method is inductive, not dogmatic. Assuming the substantial accuracy and reliableness of the common Hebrew text, established by textual and exegetical criticism, he proceeds to a critical examination of the contents of the Old Testament to ascertain the testimony borne to its truthfulness, its truth, its origin. Familiar conclusions of Protestant theology are not assumed, and that circle of reasoning by which the book is assessed by the texts, and the texts by the book, is carefully avoided.

The discussion occupies ten lectures, a large part of which is given, and wisely given, to a detailed study of the Pentateuchal Question. Under "Genesis and Ethnic Tradition," a comparison is instituted between the stories in Genesis and those preserved by other races, shewing those of Genesis to be independent and historical. Questions of cosmogony, ethnology, philology, and history are discussed in the third lecture, under "Genesis and Science," the work of Sir J. W. Dawson doing good service. The argument is further carried on, dealing with "The Authorship of Genesis," "The Authorship of the Pentateuch," "The Divine Origin of the Law," "The Divine Origin of Hebrew Prophecy," and having thus covered the entire field, marshalling the data and indicating the logical conclusions therefrom, the discussion closes with a consideration of "The Doctrine of the Inspiration of the Old Testament."

Dr. Cave's attitude towards the presently popular hypothesis of the Law is quite unmistakable. He states the two rival theories, the Evolutionary and the Journal, examines critically the evidence for each, and decides, after pages of patient investigation, against Reuss, Kuenen, Wellhausen, and in favor of the Mosaic authorship.

Space does not admit of more detailed review. Principal Cave has given us a work both scholarly and readable. He is more competent than Lee, because more modern, and to most students who are not specialists, he is a safer guide than Ladd, whose great and scholarly work must be read with an open eye. The Shelf does not wish to appear dictatorial, but would humbly suggest to the authorities that Cave's work be made a college text-book. It would make an acceptable substitute for Lee.

---

Standing on the Shelf next to Cave's book on the Old Testament, is a much smaller and less pretentious looking volume on the New Testament.

This is Dr. Marcus Dods' Introduction to the New Testament,\* already in its third edition, one of the "Theological Educator" series, edited by Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll. This series is an excellent one and contains several Manuals which should be better known to Canadian students, one very useful text-book being "An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," by Prof. Warfield, of Princeton. Several of the Manuals with which we are familiar might be used as college text-books, as Dr. Warfield's Introduction is in the colleges of the Free Church of Scotland.

The present volume is a model of clearness and simplicity of style, giving in succinct form an intelligible presentation of the *status questionis* regarding each book of the New Testament. Dr. C. W. Hodge, of Princeton, himself a specialist, says: "It is marvellously full, clear, bright, and readable. One wonders why an enormous literature has been called for to produce what may be so fairly represented in a pocket volume. The tone of the book is defensive in all questions of canonicity, with a sober estimate of critical objections." Dr. Dods has no superior in Britain in the department of theological study to which this book belongs. He is out and away the first New Testament critic in Scotland, as his colleague, Dr. A. B. Davidson, is first in Old Testament matters. And when students, perplexed by the strife of tongues, turn to Dr. Dods they will find him sympathetic, intelligent, candid. He has been all over the field of New Testament criticism and is not afraid to report. He hates irreverence and faithlessness under the guise of reverence, and the audacious telling of lies for God which too long misled students of the Bible. And, therefore, when a man of such ripe scholarship, such openness of mind, such frankness of expression, takes conservative positions on all, or nearly all, the great controverted points in New Testament criticism, contending for the authenticity of the Pauline epistles, and the reliableness of the Synoptists, and pronouncing as ignorant of the recent history of criticism, whoever would not agree that "this storm which threatened to blow our New Testament in pieces has spent its force, and that the New Testament remains very much as it was,"—when a man like Dr. Dods takes the positions taken in this "Introduction," men who are not specialists may rest assured that the critical method which proved harmless in the hands of Baur and his school, is not likely to do much damage in the hands of smaller critics.

Prof. Dods in his Manual follows the order of the English Bible. In a more elaborate treatise, attention would doubtless be paid to historical

\*An Introduction to the new Testament. By Marcus Dods, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Toronto: Willard Tract Depository.

unity and the several books studied in chronological order. For the objects in view, however, the familiar order of the English version serves a good purpose. Those who cannot afford a more exhaustive work like Weiss', or who would lose their way in his superabundance, and therefore prefer something less cumbersome and less technical, will find Dods' little book entirely satisfactory.

---

It may seem a long step from the critical school of Cave and Dods to the workshop of men like A. N. Somerville, the venerable missionary evangelist of the Free Church of Scotland, the bosom friend, in the early days, of Robert Murray McCheyne, and during later years, of the saintly Bonars. And yet it seems quite natural to take up the next book on the Shelf, a volume of sermons by the late Dr. A. N. Somerville.\* The two schools are not so far apart as many suppose. In all that makes for righteousness of life and fulness of service, in desire to know God, in unwavering loyalty to Christ, in love for the souls of men, they are at one. The successors of the Disruption Worthies are not the men who, parrot-like, repeat their words, or imitate their tone and gesture. Their true successors are those who desire to know Truth at first hand, to stand loyal to Duty against all odds, to face present-day problems in present-day light, and, above all, to know, be faithful to, and serve their Master Christ. That oneness of spirit makes Dods and Davidson and Bruce and Stalker and Smith and Drummond and Martin and an ever increasing number of kindred souls in the Free Church, the true spiritual children of Chalmers, Cunningham and Candlish, Guthrie, McCheyne and the Bonars. Craven-hearted criers after Use and Wont may be children after the flesh, but the true seed are they who breathe the same free spirit and stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ makes His people free.

"Precious Seed" opens with a fine vignette portrait of Dr. Somerville—a very striking face. The biographical sketch gives such personal items of information as strangers require,—his labours at home and abroad,—visits to the Jews,—to heathen lands—and to our own Canada. Indeed he barely escaped being a Canadian himself, having been called to St. Andrew's Church, London, in 1845.

Of the sermons, which constitute the large part of the book, little need to be said. They are unique in their way, like the preacher himself, earnest, glowing, evangelical. There is no great variety of subject, nor is the method of treatment unusually fresh. They may not stimulate thought

\**Precious Seed Sown in Many Lands.* Sermons by the late Rev. A. N. Somerville D.D., with biographical sketch. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Toronto: Willard Tract Depository. 1890.

in other preachers, but they are admirably adapted for home reading. We remember how in the olden time sermons were read aloud in the home circle every Sabbath evening—McCheyne, golden-mouthed Whitefield, philosophical Candlish, Flavel, Boston, or ponderous Trill. To those fathers who follow that good old fashion, we heartily commend Somerville. His "Precious Seed" is colloquial and homely in style, his thought strong, his tone evangelical, his spirit Christ-like.

---

But after all's said and done, critical theories and eloquent sermons go but a little way. Christianity is not a theory to be accepted and substantiated, or a system to be grasped and expounded, but a spirit to be manifested, a life to be lived. The best exposition on the Life of Christ is not Farrar or Geikie or Edersheim. The most powerful apologetic for Christianity, is not Paley or the immortal "Analogy." Their facts we may dispute, their logic we may despise. But the appeal to Life, the logic of experience, the undenied facts of sincere, self-forgetful, redeeming lives—this is the great apologetic, the truest commentary. The story of some great, good, simple life is more effective than any argument stated in syllogistic formula. Such a story is "Fishin' Jimmy," re-published recently from the now defunct *New Princeton*. Another, equally powerful, we have just laid down, "The Old Missionary,"\* by Sir W. W. Hunter, re-printed from the *Contemporary*.

"The Old Missionary" takes far us away from the strife of contending schools into an Indian jungle. Instead of rows of books and magazines we see rice-fields and mulberry gardens, here and there a native's rude hut, and yonder squads of wild hillmen bent on plunder. We hear nothing of Criticism, "Higher" or "Lower," but, instead, the jargon of rebellious borderers, the wild incantations of a heathen festival, or the familiar air of some Scotch psalm sung in Bengali by lips that have but recently learned to say, "The Lord's my Shepherd." The great man in all this District is not a German critic or his English imitator, but Trafalgar Douglas the Old Missionary, "a striking figure, tall and gaunt, with a long white beard and large sunken eyes, which had in them a look of settled calm." And we read on and on through its one hundred and sixteen pages, seeing the Old Missionary now a judge among angry disputants, now a scholar at work on a grammar, dictionary, or translation of the New Testament, now a statesman controlling a race of aboriginal hillmen, and now, in "the

\*The Old Missionary. A narrative in four chapters. By Sir William Wilson Hunter, K.C.S.I., LL.D. New York. A. D. F. Randolph. Toronto: Presbyterian News Co., 1890.

going down of the sun," fading away into the brighter light, the wild passionate grief of a multitude of hill people and men of the plains finding vent in the air of blended tenderness and triumph, raised in Bengali by the native deacon, its refrain now sounding as a song of assured victory—"For ever with the Lord."

---

A heavy hand was laid upon the Shelf last month, making it creak and bend. Were it not tough-fibred and stout, the good old board might have broken under the crushing weight of a grave and reverend LL.D's ponderous fist. The chastisement seemed grievous at first, but afterwards—well, it caused much rejoicing.

You see we are in the habit of telling the truth about books—a journalistic weakness, perhaps, but one not too common among Canadian reviewers—and so we get into trouble and are called hard names. In March we ventured a few criticisms on a Canadian production, "The Great Hymns of the Church." This was the head and front of our offending. But within a week or two the author was made a D.D., the evidence of scholarship meriting this distinction being, according to the report, the volume reviewed. It was felt that something should be done to turn the edge of the Shelf's criticism, otherwise Canadian honorary degrees might fall into disrepute. Dr. Neil McNish, himself a classical scholar of no mean order, took up the cudgels, and in the *Presbyterian College Journal* for April struck a heavy blow where the offending reviewer was supposed to be. But he was not there. And so the sturdy Doctor, after expressing himself on several not very pertinent questions of Latin verse, forgets his *role* and goes on to justify our criticisms. He says "it is always difficult to have typographical accuracy." It is impossible in hurried journalistic work, as the Doctor has learned, perhaps, by experience; but glaring mistakes in more pretentious authorship are unpardonable. But Dr. McNish himself turns critic. Here is what he says: "In the very low translation"—What's that, Doctor? *Low* translation! *Low*! Why that's worse than anything we ever dreamed of saying. We did want to say that turning English hymns into Latin is harmless work for a retired minister. If several other ex-pastors were given constant employment in the same line, it might go hard with the Latin, but it would give their congregations a foretaste of the millennium. But we would not call their worst doggerel "low."

Dr. McNish suggests a change in one translation. Here are his words as printed, italics and all: "In the very low translation of Lead, kindly light, *capio* occurs where *cupid* must surely have been intended." Very

good. On the authority of so distinguished a classical scholar we read "cupid."

Serva pedes—non cupid longingua  
Videre.

Will Dr. McNish rise and translate, please? No, Doctor, a D.D. may accept that, but the lads for whom you used to set papers in Toronto University have a different idea of Cupid. The word may be of good stock but it does not look well in a hymn-book. The types were against you, Doctor. You were expected to curse us, and, behold, you have blessed us altogether. Well, it can't be helped, so we'll join hands and say "Whatever is, is best."

## HERE AND AWAY.

The question is now being asked, Is not the time ripe for the publication in Canada of a good theological and literary review, independent of any college journal, or representative of all college publications and their constituencies? It is true that the Presbyterian Church, for example, is not satisfactorily represented in the field of literature. Division and sectionalism has been our curse. Our resources, ample for our needs if husbanded and properly utilized, have been squandered. All honour to those weeklies and monthlies that have awakened and kept alive in our Church the literary flame. They deserve credit for their pioneer work. But the charge of literary barrenness may still be made.

Take the matter of magazine literature. The several colleges have done nobly. Experienced journalists would never attempt what they have accomplished. College students

"have ventured,  
Like little wanton boys that swim on bladders,  
These many summers, in a sea of glory."

And if at times they have gone beyond their depth, the experience has made them more gallant swimmers, better able to breast the waves when enterprises more important than the frail craft of college journalism are imperilled. But student editors, however capable and earnest, and college magazines, however creditable and useful, representing either in name or reality their individual institutions, cannot, satisfactorily, and cannot reasonably be expected to, supply the one pressing need for a broad-minded, intelligent, thoroughly representative review, discussing the larger questions of thought and action, and appealing to the higher intelligence of all schools and parties and sections of our Canadian Church.

In so writing, this Department is not forgetful of the many kind and complimentary things that have been said by sympathetic friends, intelligent critics and disinterested observers, of KNOX COLLEGE MONTHLY, the only Canadian magazine that has confessedly stepped out of the ranks of college journalism. And we join in saying just as kind and just as complimentary things of the periodicals published in connection with the other

colleges. But the fact remains, and no one, whose knowledge warrants an opinion, and who is not a one-eyed partizan, will hesitate to admit it, that the desired Canadian review has not been announced.

Such a review should be devoted to theology, and the other sciences in relation to theology, literature and Christian work. Its standpoint should be Canadian ; its outlook wide ; its attitude fair ; its tone reverent. The financial basis of such a review should be such as would command the best Canadian thought. The editorial management should be such as would ensure catholicity and make subservience to merely local or party interests an impossibility.

Is there a field for such a magazine in the Presbyterian Church in Canada? A united and vigorous Church in a young and growing country ; stretching across a continent ; with six theological colleges, one university, and enjoying the sympathy and support of the majority of the leading professors in the non-sectarian and state universities ; with a ministry decidedly the strongest and most scholarly in the country, and a membership the most intelligent, as college statistics shew, and as journalists and book-sellers have learned by experience ; with questions of doctrine, polity, and methods of work, of world-wide interest, pressing heavily for solution, —is there not a field for such a publication? Was ever field more inviting? Was ever need more urgent? Was ever time more opportune? A dozen questions of theology are awaiting fresh examination and study. Creed revision, long postponed, must soon be faced. Ecclesiastical reconstruction,—continued separation, federation, or organic unity,—is already forced upon us. What shall be done with these subjects? To shirk them would be unworthy ; to depend on foreign solution would be a humiliating confession of our own babyhood. But how can they be satisfactorily discussed without such a review? It cannot be done in any well-edited weekly newspaper, for the newspaper's material is news, passing events, isolated facts. It is the magazine that, careless of mere news, marshals isolated facts as substantiating a theory, observes casual occurrences as indicating a tendency, correlates passing events as constituting a current. The sphere of the newspaper and of magazine are quite distinct and separate. And the critical examination and exhaustive discussion of such problems as those mentioned belongs, in the main, not to the newspaper, but to the more judicial review.

Can such a review be produced in Canada? "It can be done and England should do it." But how? Several plans are suggested. (1) An entirely new enterprise. Let some publishing firm launch a periodical of



the kind desiderated, competing with those already published, but appealing to the entire Canadian Church. (2) A development of an existing magazine. Let the basis of the MONTHLY, for example, be broadened and its collegiate name and whatever remains of its local tone dropped. (3) Consolidation. Let the various college magazines throw their entire strength and literary ability into one high-class review, representative of all but giving prominence to none, appealing to the constituency of each and to an important section not now reached by any, and controlled in such a way as shall conserve the interests of each, further the cause of truth, and give to the Church a worthy representative in the magazine world.

This Department does not commit itself to any one of the plans suggested, or, indeed, to any change. We are simply reporting in systematic form what has been canvassed and proposed by representative professors and graduates of the three largest colleges, Knox, Queen's and Montreal. We have been urged to submit the question to readers of the MONTHLY, graduates of all the Canadian colleges and of foreign institutions, that it may be considered in the light of present necessities and that suggestions may be offered such as may aid to a satisfactory solution. We have yielded to the request, and now invite correspondence. Whatever the solution, the question is one of vast importance.