

THE
Knox College Monthly

—AND—

PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

VOL. X.

SEPTEMBER, 1889.

No. 5.

FREEDOM AND NECESSITY.

A LECTURE.*

I PURPOSE, in this Lecture, to inquire whether, and in what sense, men are free agents; and whether, and in what sense, their actions are necessary.

In discussing these questions, we shall be groping in the dark, unless we have perfectly clear conceptions of what action is. I observe, therefore, that by voluntary action I mean an exertion of energy by an intelligent being, a subjective putting forth of effort, in the direction of an end which is in the mind's view. In this definition, which I give, not with the idea that any definition can explain the nature of action, but simply to assist you to the exercise of that reflection through which alone the thing defined can be understood, the two essential points involved are, that voluntary action is a subjective determination, and that it is directed towards an end. Let us look at these a little more particularly.

In the first place, voluntary action is a subjective energy, issuing, no doubt, in certain objective results but by no means to be confounded with these. For instance, I lift a glass of water and

*This lecture was delivered in Knox College on April 6th, 1870. Dr. Young was at that time Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Knox College.

raise it to my lips, and drink the water, in order to quench my thirst. As a number of separate movements may here be distinguished, let us fix attention on the first—the stretching forth of the hand to the glass; and let us suppose that this is consciously done with a view to the quenching of thirst as the ultimate end to be attained. In such a case, the true action is not the outward movement, but the energy which is exerted by the being whom I call myself, and which results in the movement.

Of course, we describe the action by referring to the movement. We say, the hand is moved towards the glass. This mode of speaking is all that the ordinary purposes of life require. But, if we desire to investigate the matter philosophically, we must look beneath the surface of verbal expression, and not derive our views of what actions are from the language in which they are customarily described. The movement of the hand is the purely mechanical effect of certain muscular contractions and expansions, produced through the application to the muscles of the stimulus of the nervous force, in precisely the same way in which the convulsions of the limbs of a dead frog follow a galvanic shock. Such movement, therefore, is not my action, properly so called, but only a result connected, and not even proximately connected, therewith.

This is the first point: Voluntary action is a subjective energy. The next is: It is directed to a definite end in the mind's view.

To say that voluntary action is consciously directed towards an end is the same thing as to say that it is done from motive; the presence of a desirable end to the mind being what constitutes motive.

There is a class of philosophers who carry out the doctrine of Association, and of Habit, as depending on Association, in such a manner as leads them to assert that voluntary actions may be done without motive. Utilitarian moralists, for instance, like Mr. John Stuart Mill, who believe in the existence of disinterested affections, are obliged to take this ground. For their theory of life is that pleasure is the only motive by which human beings can be influenced. And yet they believe in disinterested affections. How do they reconcile these seemingly inconsistent principles? They attempt to do so by showing that dis-

interested affections are generated, mainly through the influence of association, out of a primitive root of pure regard for Self, and that, when they have been thus generated, the voluntary actions in which they manifest themselves, are done from habit, without motive. Mr. Mill, after remarking that "a person of confirmed virtue, or any other person whose purposes are fixed, carries out his purposes without any thought of the pleasure he has in contemplating them, or expects to receive from their fulfilment," adds: "This, however, is but an instance of that familiar fact, the power of habit, and is in no wise confined to the case of virtuous actions. Many indifferent things, which men originally did from a motive of some sort, they continue to do from habit. Sometimes this is done unconsciously, the consciousness coming only after the action; at other times, with conscious volition, but volition which has become habitual and is put in operation by the power of habit." Now, I am not at present arguing against Utilitarianism, though the view for which I am contending, is, I believe, fatal to the Utilitarian theory. I am concerned solely with the assertion that, when a certain course of conduct has become habitual, actions may be done with conscious volition and yet without motive. This I cannot admit. For why is anything called a motive? Because, as it is in the view of the mind, it stimulates to action. Why do Utilitarians say that pleasure is a motive? Because pleasure is an end which men aim at in the actions which they perform. No other possible account of motive can be given, than that it is the end—the ultimate or true end—aimed at, which, contemplated by the mind, stimulates to action. Well, then, if a good Samaritan, to whom the practice of benevolence is become habitual, aims at the relief of a suffering neighbour, without any thought of the pleasure that is to accrue to himself, or without the thought of anything except benefiting the sufferer, is not the desire of attaining this end the motive of his action in precisely the same sense in which the desire of pleasure is the motive, where pleasure is the end sought? I do not deny that habit may lead to spontaneous action, where no end is consciously sought and, therefore, no motive felt. I object to Mr. Mill's statements only in so far as they relate to voluntary action. Habit renders voluntary action, in an accustomed course, easy. It does so by strengthening the impulses towards the

line of conduct to which we have habituated ourselves, and rendering weak the opposing influences. The practice of benevolence, for example, may have become so habitual, that the claims of Self may have practically ceased to make their voice heard in the presence of distress calling for relief. But this is not the annihilation of motive. It is merely the triumph of one motive over another; the *Veni, Vidi, Vici*, of a conqueror, who is scarcely, if at all, conscious of the resisting forces which pass away before his disciplined and imperial sweep.

Having thus endeavored to make clear the true conception of voluntary action, I am now prepared to indicate, what, in my opinion, philosophy is competent to teach regarding the free agency of man on the one hand, and the necessity of human actions on the other. I have asserted that men possess a power of voluntary action. In this lies their freedom. I have said also that voluntary action is performed under the influence of motives; and this, I believe, constitutes the sole necessity that governs human actions. These two articles form the Thesis, which, in the remainder of the Lecture, I am to develop and illustrate.

That men possess a power of voluntary acting, in the sense which has been described, is a proposition for the truth of which I can only appeal to consciousness. If I am conscious of anything, I am conscious of being an agent—not indeed of producing any outward results, but of putting forth energy, with which experience shows that such and such outward results are connected. I am conscious, at one moment, of listening to catch a sound; at another, of directing my eyes towards the countenance of a friend; again, of endeavoring to lift a weight; and again of resisting an impulse towards a particular gratification.

In saying that it is in the reality of this power of acting that freedom consists, I take a position different, in some measure, both from that of Edwards, and from that of Edwards' opponents. *They* hold that man's freedom is a Liberty of Indifference, in virtue of which, the mind, when solicited by a variety of motives, may choose any course, either this or that; *he*, that it is liberty to do as we will; a doctrine which may, at first sight, appear to be much the same as the former, but nevertheless is quite distinct. Let us look at these theories a little more closely.

The so-called Liberty of Indifference is a supposed equili-

trium of the Will, not indeed with respect to its inclination, but with respect to its power or ability to choose, in virtue of which, as I have said, when different motives present themselves, it can go either way. The ass, between the two bundles of hay, may be inclined towards the bundle on the right; or it may be inclined towards the bundle on the left; but, to which ever side the needle of inclination point, the Will, with respect to its power of choosing, remains in equilibrium, so that it can select either the one direction or the other. Such a doctrine, if the language in which it is expressed is to be taken with any degree of strictness, will not bear examination. For the only ground on which the Liberty in question can be asserted is the testimony of consciousness. If we are not conscious of a Liberty of Indifference, we can form no idea of what those mean, who contend for it. But we are not conscious of it. For consciousness declares only what is. In regard to what may be, it is dumb. I am conscious of freedom in everything that I do; in other words, I am conscious of being the real, and not the mere nominal agent, but it is a contradiction in terms to speak of my being conscious of freedom in regard to what is not being done, and never may be done.

Mr. J. S. Mill, after bringing forward, in opposition to the advocates of freedom, the argument which has just been stated, draws the conclusion, in a tone of considerable exultation, that the cause of freedom is lost. The appeal to consciousness, on which alone the assertion of freedom can be based, fails, because the circumstance which the witness is called to prove is one to which he cannot possibly depone. Mr. Mill's position here is impregnable, if the true conception of freedom be that which his argument assumes it to be. But I deny that this is the true conception of freedom. We are conscious of being free, not in respect of things which we are not doing and may never do, but in the actions which we perform. When we serve God, we serve him freely. When we commit sin, we sin freely. We are not forced to obey God. We are not forced to disobey God. We are conscious, when we obey, that we do it without constraint. We are conscious, when we disobey, that we do it without constraint. Consciousness, therefore, is a competent witness to human freedom, when the fact of freedom is rightly conceived;

this fact being nothing more than the true and proper agency of the being whose freedom is asserted.

In reasoning against the dogma of Liberty of Indifference, I have taken the position, that we are conscious of *freedom in acting*, but not of *freedom to act* in one or other of a variety of ways in which we are not acting at the moment. But it may be said: Do we not speak perpetually of men being at liberty to adopt one or other of two courses that may be opened to them? I answer: We do. The language is popular; it expresses briefly and intelligibly what is intended by those who use it; and to object to it in ordinary discourse, would be mere pedantry. I am at liberty either to leave the platform on which I stand, or to remain in my present position. Undoubtedly, I am. But what is here asserted is something altogether different from the Liberty of Indifference on which I have been remarking. The meaning is, I have learned, from past experience, that certain motions of my limbs are consequent on certain subjective energies; arguing, then, from the past to the future, I believe, that if I were at the present moment to put forth such and such energies, these would issue in movements of my limbs, in virtue of which I should step off the platform; while, if the requisite energies be not put forth, I shall remain where I am. But, though I am convinced that the one result or the other shall take place, according as certain subjective energies are or are not exerted, the conviction is not a datum of consciousness; it is an inference from experience, and one having nothing whatever to do with my free agency, properly so called, but only with the outward results which experience teaches us to connect with particular exertions of free agency.

In opposition to those who contend for an unthinkable Liberty of Indifference, Edwards represents our liberty as consisting in power to do as we will, or in (what he regards as being the same thing) the absence of hindrance to our doing as we will. How widely this is removed from the Liberty of Indifference, with which it might at first sight be confounded, will be apparent, when we attend to the meaning which Edwards attaches to the language he employs. By willing, he understands the choice or preference of the mind; and by doing, the result arising upon our choice, according to the constitution of things,

we know not how. The choice, he calls an act of Will ; the result of the choice, a voluntary action ; thus (most unhappily, in my opinion) distinguishing an act of Will from a voluntary action. But he admits that we are not conscious of the voluntary action ; we are conscious only of the act of Will, and of an expectation, founded on experience, that the action will follow. "There is nothing," he says, "which I am conscious of while I walk, but only of my preferring or choosing, through successive moments, that there should be such alterations of my external sensations and motions, together with a concurring habitual expectation that it will be so ; having ever found by experience, that on such an immediate preference such sensations do actually, instantaneously and constantly arise." From this it is plain, that when Edwards speaks of our being at liberty to do as we will he does not mean that we are at liberty to choose one or other of two alternatives, or at liberty to do anything, in the sense of exerting any subjective energy ; but what he means is this : supposing our choice to have been made in a particular manner, if there is no hindrance in the way, to prevent our choice taking effect in those outward results which experience has taught us to connect with particular volitions, then, and in that regard, we are free. The example by which he illustrates his doctrine is : a bird let loose is at liberty to fly. Its cage being open, there is no hindrance to its flying.

I cannot but wonder at the laudations which this view of liberty has received from a host of eminent writers. In my opinion it has no merit whatever. On the contrary, by representing liberty as lying merely in the absence of hindrance to the effects of our actions, effects confessedly occurring beyond the sphere of consciousness, it tends to obscure and perplex the great truth that there is a freedom of which we are conscious. No reasonings ever have been, or ever will be, able to drive out of men's minds the conviction that they are free ; free, not in the Edwardian sense, but with a liberty which belongs to their very nature as rational beings, and with which neither the presence nor the absence of hindrances to the motions of their limbs has anything to do. A man bound in chains is a free agent, as truly as if the fetters were removed. He is not free, you say, to cast off his chains. The bird is not at liberty to fly. I answer : What

you mean by this, is that no efforts which the man can put forth would result in breaking his chains. Granted. But what has that to do with the matter? You are merely asserting that certain external consequences would not follow from the man's actings. But the question of freedom, at least the only one worth discussing, is not, what consequences we are led by experience to believe would follow certain actions, but whether the subjective energies, which constitute our actions, are the unconstrained forth-puttings of a power inherent in Self; in other words, whether men are veritable, and not mere nominal agents.

It is on the miserable view of freedom, which considers it as having reference to the results of action, rather than as lying in the reality of the power of acting, that Locke, with whose statements on this point, the remarks of Edwards very closely coincide, proceeds in determining how far human freedom reaches. How far human freedom reaches! Are we not free, if free at all, in every action we perform? But let us hear Locke. Liberty, he tells us, is "the power in any agent to do or forbear any particular action according to the determination or thought of the mind, whereby either of them is preferred to the other." And from this conception of liberty he draws the conclusion that we are free, as far as we can produce results, but no farther. Thus, I am free to throw a quoit twenty yards, but not to throw it two hundred. Or, to give an illustration in Locke's own words: "A man falling into the water (a bridge breaking under him) has not herein liberty, is not a free agent. For, though he has volition, though he prefers his not falling to falling, yet, the forbearance of that motion not being in his power, the stop or cessation of that motion follows not upon his volition, and therefore he is not free." It seems to me that the more correct account of such a case would be, that "herein" the man does not act at all, either freely or necessarily. The general statement, that liberty is the power which we have to do or to forbear any particular action, according to the preference of the mind, I could accept, if it meant no more than this, that we are free, inasmuch as we are veritable agents. But this is not Locke's meaning. He unambiguously uses the word action to denote, not the subjective energy which the living being exerts, but the result in which that energy issues. Of course, if any one chooses to

define action in this way, he can do so. And if he chooses also to define freedom, so as to make it indicate merely the extent to which results follow our subjective exertions of energy, he can do so. But I repeat that this is not the freedom of which we are conscious, since it is only from experience that we learn to connect certain results with our exertions of energy. And I say still farther, that it is not the freedom which forms the basis of our responsibility. We feel ourselves, as true agents, to be responsible for what we do, for the energies which we direct towards certain ends ; equally responsible whether the ends be attained or not.

With these remarks on the first article of my thesis, which places freedom in the possession of a veritable power of voluntary action, I proceed to the second, in which voluntary action is considered as prompted by motive.

A preliminary verbal explanation must be here made. We have seen that Edwards distinguishes voluntary action from act of Will ; meaning, by the latter, the act of the mind whereby we choose anything ; and by the former, the effect consequent upon our choice. On the view which I have taken of action as a subjective energy, there is no distinction between act of Will and voluntary action. An act of Will *is* a voluntary action ; and there is no other kind of voluntary action. I act by willing. I bend my arm—in so far as I, the living being, do anything in the case—by willing to bend it. Hence, in speaking of motives, it is immaterial whether we say that they influence the Will, or that they prompt to action. The two statements are identical.

Can we then define the relation of motives to the Will, or to the conduct, more precisely than by simply saying that motives influence the choice, or that men act from motives? I do not believe that we can. But, as you are aware, philosophers of both the schools whose views we have been examining are of a contrary opinion. On the one hand, Edwards us tells that the strongest motive determines the Will according to a law of necessity. On the other hand, his opponents hold that the mind, by whatever motives it may be solicited, possesses a self-determining power. It is my task to show, as I hope to be able to do, that a criticism of these conflicting theories leads to the conclusion that there is no truth held by the disputants on either side which is not sub-

stantially held by both ; the system of neither party containing any positive thinkable truth over and above what I have mentioned : that men act from motives.

The principle of Edwards is, that the strongest motive determines the Will. But whatever there may be in this doctrine, we may at all events simplify the formula by striking out the word "strongest." For what is meant by strongest motive? There is no conceivable test by which the relative strength of two contending motives can be estimated, except the actual result in which a struggle between them issues. A strain is brought to bear upon a cable. Which of the two forces is the stronger, the strain or the tenacity of the rope? Wait and you shall see. If the rope break, the former. If it do not break, the latter. So, (I suppose Edwards would say), when two motives act upon the Will we can judge of their relative strength by the result. Good. Then, the stronger motive is by definition that which prevails. And hence the formula, the strongest motive determines the Will is reducible to this, the motive, which determines the Will, determines the Will, a proposition in which the utmost amount of truth that can possibly be contained is, that the Will is determined by motives.

The word "strongest" seemed to be somewhat, but has turned out to be nothing. It has vanished, and the simplified formula remains in our hands ; motives determine the Will.

Does this express anything more than the fact that voluntary action is performed from motive? To discover what more it expresses, if anything, we must inquire what the determination spoken of is. It is explained to be a species of casual relation, in which motives stand to volition. In fact, the sole positive proof which Edwards gives for his doctrine, and, therefore, the sole means we have for ascertaining the precise import of that doctrine, is founded on the principle that whatever comes to pass must have a cause. This in substance, is also the one positive argument employed by Leibnitz, in his *Theodicæe*, and in his correspondence with Clarke, in support of a conclusion similar to that of Edwards. We may safely assume, therefore, that it contains the whole gist of the matter.

Edwards explains that he employs the term cause "in a sense more extensive than that in which it is sometimes used." He

defines it as "any antecedent, either natural or moral, positive or negative, on which an event, either a thing or the manner and circumstance of a thing so depends, that it is a ground or reason either in whole or in part, why it is rather than not, or why it is as it is rather than otherwise." It is plain that in this definition, several things of entirely distinct sorts are brought together under a common name. A cause is any antecedent on which the result depends in any way. But there may be various antecedents on which the result depends in various ways; and therefore our volitions may have different causes to which they are in different ways due. For instance, the sustaining power of the Creator, exercised from moment to moment, is a ground or reason why our volitions are, rather than not; for if this sustaining power were withdrawn we should cease to exist. The Divine power is the efficient cause to which our existence, as beings possessed of the power of Will, is to be ascribed. I need not say that it is not in this sense that motives are held by philosophers of the school of Edwards to be the causes of our volitions. Neither are they considered to be of the nature of physical causes. What then? They are regarded as moral causes; and the necessity which is conceived to attach to their operation is a moral necessity.

You will keep in mind that we are trying to discover how much, if anything, is contained in the proposition: Motives determine the Will, beyond what is involved in the statement that voluntary action is performed from motive. The nut of the question lies in the word "determine;" and we have got thus far in our process of clearing up what that word implies: we have ascertained, namely, that the meaning intended to be conveyed is, that motives are the moral causes of our volitions, and that the necessity which attaches to their operation is a moral necessity. But what do the expressions, moral cause, and moral necessity mean? I do not know that any other answer can be given, than that they denote the relation which subsists between the nature of an intelligent agent and the ends, which in given circumstances, he prefers, or the actions, which under given circumstances, he voluntarily performs. One person is tempted to steal a sum of money. He is a good man, and resists the temptation. Another is tempted to steal. He is a bad man and

gives way to the temptation. In general, the course which a person takes when certain ends, in any respect desirable, are present to his mind, will depend on the answer to the question : What sort of a person is he? With given motives brought to bear upon you, you being such a person as you are, act as you do ; whereas, if you had been a different sort of a person you would have acted differently. This will probably be accepted by the most thorough-going disciples of Edwards as a substantially correct statement of what is most essential in the doctrine maintained by that writer. And now observe what it amounts to. A man's actions, in given circumstances, depend according to a law of moral causation on his nature. What the man does, flows by moral necessity from what he is. But what conception can we form of our nature except through the actings which exhibit it? We know what we are only in knowing what we do. Actions are merely the evolution of nature,—nature unfolding itself. The doctrine of moral necessity therefore, in so far as it pretends to go beyond the simple fact that men act from motives, is a mere truism. "*In presence of given desirable ends, a man must choose as he does.*" Of course he must ; for to suppose his choice to be different from what it is, would be to suppose that he is a different man from what he is. "*His actions must have a moral cause ; they must be according to his nature.*" Of course they must ; for we conceive nature as of this or that particular sort, only by conceiving the actions in which it develops itself. In admitting such statements and reasonings, we are manifestly admitting nothing, except that a man, being what he is, and being placed in the circumstances in which he is placed, acts with a view to the attainment of the ends, whose presence to the mind constitutes the motives by which on the Edwardian system the Will is held to be determined.

We have seen that in the only true and intelligible sense in which motives can be said to determine the Will, the phrase expresses nothing more than that men act from motives. Let us now turn to the other side and consider the position of those who contend for a self-determining power of the Will.

What is this self determining power? Edwards finds himself unable to conceive that the Will can determine itself to any particular act, otherwise than by a previous act. Why do I will

in such a manner? Because I will. And why do I will to will in this manner? Because I will. And why do I will to will to will in this manner? Because I will. And so on we go, down the bottomless inclined plane of an infinite series of volitions, as the condition of any volition whatever taking place. If this be what is meant by the self-determining power of the Will, Self-determination is manifestly impossible.

But the advocates of the self-determining power would certainly not admit that their position is correctly stated, when they are represented as conditioning each volition on a previous volition. No doubt, they are accustomed to use such expressions, as, that we will in this or that manner because we choose. But it would be unjust to press their language too closely, and to compel it to yield the signification, that every volition must be preceded by another. From their own expositions, of their views, it may be gathered that the power of self-determination, which they claim for the Will, is neither more nor less than that Liberty of Indifference which (as we have seen) they ascribe to the Will. A man is solicited by two opposing motives; neither of these, prior to the man's choice, can be considered as essentially stronger than its competitor, so as necessarily to determine the choice that shall be made; but the man, while drawn to the right hand by the one motive, and to the left by the other, can choose either direction. In popular phrase, he can choose as he pleases; by which, however, is not meant that his choice is determined by a previous act of choice, but simply that he can choose either this or that. The question, therefore, whether the Will has a self-determining power, is the same as the question whether the Will has a liberty of Indifference. Such liberty I have already shown to be inconceivable. It is an unmeaning expression, unless it denote something of which we are conscious; but conscious of it we cannot possibly be, for consciousness does not tell us what we may or may not do, but only what we do. Other reasons for rejecting the doctrine of Liberty of Indifference might easily be urged. The readers of Edwards will remember with what afflictive minuteness he treats the subject; but the single brief argument that has been advanced, is, in my judgment, so unanswerable, that to add anything to it would (to borrow a simile of a late President of the United States) be wasting powder on dead ducks.

If we cannot admit a self-determining power of the Will, in the sense that each volition is conditioned on a preceding volition, or in the sense that the Will is endowed with a Liberty of Indifference, it will scarcely be alleged that there is any truth in the self-determination theory, over and above this, that the mind, in its volitions, is under no constraint, but is itself the true and proper agent.

What is the conclusion of the whole matter? Edwards and his friends tell us that the strongest motive determines the Will. Against this the objection lies that the word "strongest" is at best a meaningless superfluity. But it is worse than superfluous, inasmuch as it tends naturally, and almost irresistibly, to convey the idea that the Will is somehow forced. For, let the position be laid down, that of two opposite motives, by which the mind is urged, there is something in the one, as compared with the other, which can intelligibly be called superiority of strength, prior to any action that the mind may take, then the mind seems to be reduced to the condition of a balance, with a heavy weight in one scale, and a light weight in the other, and freedom is destroyed; in other words the mind has no power of acting left to it. The word "strongest," therefore, must be thrown overboard. Thus simplified, the doctrine of Edwards is that motives determine the Will. On the other side, it is held that the Will determines itself. Who is in the right? Both parties are right, or neither is, according as their respective formulæ are interpreted. *The Will determines itself.* True, if you mean that the mind, in its volitions, is under no constraint, but is itself the real and proper agent; but not true, or rather unintelligible, if you mean anything else. *Motives determine the Will.* True, if you mean that a man, walking (for instance) northward rather than southward, does it from some motive; but false or unintelligible, if you mean more.

It may, perhaps, be said, that if the views which I have advanced are well founded, the controversy about man's free agency, and about the necessity that attaches to human actions, which has been so vehemently agitated, turns out to be a dispute about words. The whole thinkable truth, on the question under discussion, is contained (it seems) in the two propositions, that men are agents, and that they act from motives; propositions

not denied, either by Edwards or by those against whom Edwards wrote. Have giants, then, been fighting for ages about nothing? I answer, that I believe the contending parties to have been substantially agreed on the great facts of the case; yet the contest between them was not therefore altogether about words. The arguments, on both sides, were directed largely, and, in this respect, to good purpose, against unreal conceptions, which had been associated with the reality held by both parties in common. Wishing to extend their knowledge beyond the facts which exist to be known, and by this means to provide a support for convictions that could have stood well enough on their own behalf, the philosophers, whom I have been venturing to criticise, evoked chimæras from the abyss of inconceivability, and thrust these forward in front of the simple truth, as its main stay and hope; here, the chimæra of Strongest Motives; there, the chimæra of Liberty of Indifference; phantoms, which were regarded, the one by the combatants on the one side, and the other by the combatants on the other, as inconsistent with the very life of the truth they had been summoned to defend; and which certainly, as only darkening and defacing the truth by the smoke which they threw around it, behooved by all means to be driven from the field.

Throughout the whole of this Lecture, it has been assumed that the mental manifestations, of which we are conscious, are not the mere products of corporeal organization, but that, united with the body, there is in man an immaterial principle, the subject of thought and feeling, and the agent in volition. Were this denied, freedom, of course, could no longer be maintained; for the phenomena of mind would be reduced to the rank of a special class of material phenomena;—a very special and distinguished class, no doubt, but still subject to the same general law with the lower phenomena of matter, and therefore necessary in exactly the same manner in which the falling of a stone to the earth under the earth's attraction is necessary. Accordingly, those physiological psychologists, who either deny, or fail to recognize, the existence of an immaterial principle in man, are, with one consent, necessitarians, in a sense of the word necessity, in which necessity and freedom are incompatible with one another. We have an example of this in Professor Bain of

Aberdeen. That writer's view of the Will is as follows. It has two fundamental constituent elements. The first is, the existence of a spontaneous tendency—the response of the system to nutrition—for movement to take place, independently of the stimulus of feeling. The second is, the law that connects pleasure with increased vitality, and pain with diminished vitality. The manner in which these laws combine to produce Will, the following quotation will explain: “We suppose movements spontaneously begun, and accidentally causing pleasure; we then assume, that, with the pleasure, there will be an increase of vital energy, in which increase the fortunate movements will share, and thereby increase the pleasure. Or, on the other hand, we suppose the spontaneous movements to give pain; and assume, that, with the pain, there will be a decrease of energy, extending to the movements that cause the evil, and thereby providing a remedy. A few repetitions of the fortuitous concurrence of pleasure and a certain movement will tend to the forging of an acquired connection, under the law of Retentiveness or Continuity, so that, at a future time, the idea shall evoke the proper movement at once.” You will observe, that, in this theory of the origin of voluntary power, there is an entire ignoring of anything that can properly be called the exertion of energy by the mind. All the stages through which Professor Bain conducts us are such as might be laid down by one who did not believe that there is an immaterial principle in man, but who held that all the varieties of mental manifestation are merely the product of organization. Nutrition is received into the system. Nervous currents begin to flow. Movements follow. A movement accidentally leads to pleasure; this heightens the general vitality; and the fortunate movement shares in the increased vitality. Or, a movement leads to pain; this lessens the general vitality; and the unfortunate movement shares in the diminution of vitality. Association comes in, and plays its part in strengthening the bonds between pleasure and pain, on the one hand, and certain movements on the other; and the result is, that, ultimately, pleasure and pain, whether in fact or in idea, have a definite “volitional effect,” in the way of tending to produce movements. Into an examination of systems of this class, which contradict, as I believe, the most fundamental facts of human

nature, I have not entered ; but I have limited myself to what has proved a sufficiently extensive field for a single lecture, an examination of the ground that must be taken, on the question of human freedom and of the necessity of human actions, by those who admit that there is a personal intelligent agent, distinct from the nervous forces, that flow in response to nutrition and set the limbs in motion.

GEORGE PAXTON YOUNG.

“ LES ILLUSIONS PERDUS.”

I STOOD one eve within a forest's shade,
 I saw the sunlight glow,
 Flickering and dancing down the pillar'd glade,
 A golden shadow that with shadows play'd
 On a smooth sward below.

I saw the soft blue sky through latticed trees,
 Soft sky and tender cloud ;
 I saw the branches tremble to the breeze,—
 Saw, as they trembled, still and far-off leas,
 To holy musings vow'd.

The sweetness and the quiet of the place
 Deep through my soul had gone,
 Till, in some world not ours, I seem'd to trace
 The skirts of parting glory, and the face
 Of glory coming on.

Ah me ! I said, how beautiful and glad
 This sylvan realm might be,
 Peopled with shapes too holy to be sad,
 Shapes lovely as the fabled foreworld had,
 When Fancy yet was free.

Some pastoral quaint of ancient Greece were fit
 To be enacted here ;
 Or haply here the fairy court might sit,
 Or fairy children flowery garlands knit,
 To lead the silk-neck'd steer.

Or yet more fit, amid a scene so calm,
 Might deep-wing'd angels stand,
 Or dance, as in great Milton's lofty psalm,
 Face fronting face, and palm enfolding palm,
 A happy, seraph band.

So mused I, in that sacred forest shade,
 When suddenly I heard
 Low voices murmuring down the pillar'd glade,
 While, mixed with song, soft music round me play'd
 Till flowers and leaves were stirr'd.

See, through the boughs that part on every side,
 What children come this way!
 See, how the forest opens far and wide,
 For entrance to the joyous shapes that glide
 Into its emerald day!

Ah see, what pictures hang upon the air,
 Making the sunset dim!
 Full eyes, all lustrous with dark light are there,
 That gleam mysterious under golden hair,
 Round cheek and rosy limb.

Ah happy steer! by gentle children led,
 And wreath'd with flowery chain;
 Bend ever thus thy proud and graceful head,
 And bear us to some Eden, long, long fled,
 Or bring it back again.

O wonder not, though heaven should open wide,
 And o'er its flaming wall,
 A winged messenger should downward glide,
 Angels with children, angels, too, abide,
 Or come when children call.

Pass on, O dream of antique truth and love!
 Fade cherub, with thy flowers!
 Pass on, O gracious creatures, as ye move!
 Fair boys with garlands, sing of worlds above,
 And bring them down to ours.

Pass on, pass on, with merry shout and play!
 Pass on with flute and reed!
 Through the long forest aisles ye fade away,
 Sweet sounds, sweet shapes, ye fade with fading day,
 And leave us poor indeed.

Berlin.

JOHN KING.

PRESBYTERY AND PRELACY IN THE REFORMATION ERA.

FOLLOWING up the line of thought started by us towards the conclusion of our article in the July number of this magazine, let us advance to the era of the Reformation and see the intimate footing on which Presbyterians and Episcopalians stood to one another, the influence of Presbytery on Prelacy then, and how came about that isolation of the Church of England from the other Reformed Churches which has wrought so disastrously. During that happy, halcyon Indian Summer all was bright and fair. Episcopalians and Presbyterians lived in love and kept the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. They never looked askance at one another, or counted one another "avowed enemies" or an "organized opposition." All through there is the fullest recognition of one another's ecclesiastical standing. As Professor Fisher puts it "In all these free, unreserved communications, in which the differences among Protestants, as on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, are frequently considered, there is no hint of any trouble, alienation or want of sympathy on account of the difference of the English polity from that of the Continental Churches. The authors are engaged in a common cause, fighting under a common banner, and the question of Episcopacy does not excite a ripple of discontent with one another." Cranmer's favorite project was the banding together of all the Protestant Churches against the common foe, and in this, subsequently, such eminent prelates as Ussher, Stillington, Hooker and Hall, indeed all "the giants of those days" thoroughly coincided.

JOHN KNOX, CHAPLAIN OF EDWARD VI.

In December, 1551, John Knox, the great Scottish Reformer, was made one of his six chaplains by Edward VI. It shows the liberal spirit of the time in England, that so strict a Presbyterian should have been appointed a Royal chaplain at the English Court, associated with such men as Grindall, afterwards Archbishop of York, and Horne, afterwards Bishop of Winchester.

He preaches repeatedly before the King and Council in London. He takes some part in the Revision of the Liturgy and of what ultimately became the Thirty-nine Articles. His own writings and certain works of the Parker Society tell us of changes which Knox effected in the Episcopal Communion service. In a Conference at Oxford, in 1554, Dr. Weston, the Prolocutor, one of the Ritualists of his day, then a small minority, accuses sturdy, honest Bishop Latimer of complicity with Knox in this purging process. "A renegade Scot (as he calls him) did take away the adoration of Christ in the Sacrament." "So much," continues Weston, "prevailed the authority of that one man at that time."

Thus, in the most friendly way did the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches fraternize in this Reformation era of their history and for long after. What occasioned the change? To the influence of

ARCHBISHOP LAUD

must it be ascribed. Laud was a narrow-minded bigot. He wished to lead England back to Rome. To facilitate this Rome-ward move, he would have the Church of England suspend intercourse with foreign Protestant Churches. England's ambassadors on the Continent, who used freely to attend the Presbyterian services, were counselled to abstain from doing so for the future. A feeling antagonistic to England, was thus engendered, which boded no good when her day of trouble came.

The Earl of Clarendon, the great statesman and historian, once Lord High Chancellor of England, father-in-law of James II. and grandfather of Queens Mary and Anne, in his History of the Civil War says:—"In all former times the ambassadors, and all foreign ministers of State, employed from England into any parts where the Reformed religion was exercised, frequented their Churches, gave all possible countenance to their profession, and held correspondence with the most active and powerful persons of that relation. And especially the ambassador at Paris from the time of the Reformation, had diligently and constantly attended the Church at Charenton, where Claude, Daille, and other famous Presbyterians ministered." The solemn spirituality and severe simplicity of Presbyterianism did not suit the cravers after a sensuous, sensational service. "Some instructions were given to the ambassadors to 'forbear any extraordinary commerce with

that tribe.'” Clarendon informs us further that the English ambassador, Lord Scudamore, caused to be fitted up in his own house a chapel after the extremest Ritualistic model, and took pains to say that “the Church of England looked not on the Huguenots as a part of their communion,” which, Clarendon continues, was “too much and too industriously discussed at home.” These discussions helped to widen the breach between the two classes, and to hasten on the catastrophe in which both Prince and Prelate, Church and State, became involved.

HALLAM CONFIRMS CLARENDON.

In his *Constitutional History of England* we find Hallam writing thus :

The system pursued by Bancroft and his imitators, Bishops Neile and Laud, with the approbation of the king, was opposed to the healing counsels of Burleigh and Bacon, and was just such as low-born and little-minded men, raised to power by fortune's caprice, are ever found to pursue. * * * They began by preaching the Divine Right, as it is called, or absolute indispensability of Episcopacy ; a doctrine of which the first traces, as I apprehend, are found about the end of Elizabeth's reign. They insisted on the necessity of Episcopal succession regularly derived from the Apostles. They drew an inference from this tenet, that ordination by Presbyters was in all cases null. And as this affected all the Reformed Churches in Europe except their own, the Lutherans not having preserved the succession of their bishops, while the Calvinists had altogether abolished that order, they began to speak of them not as brethren of the same faith, united by the same cause, and distinguished only by differences little more material than those of political commonwealths (which had been the language of the Church of England ever since the Reformation) but as aliens to whom they were not at all related, and schismatics with whom they held no communion—nay, as wanting the very essence of a Christian society. This again brought them nearer, by irresistible consequence, to the disciples of Rome, whom, with becoming charity, but against the received creed of the Puritans and perhaps against their own Articles, they all acknowledged to be a part of the Catholic Church while they were withholding that appellation expressly or by inference from Heidelberg and Geneva.

In a note to this passage, Mr. Hallam adds :—

Lord Bacon in his advertisement, respecting the controversies of the Church of England, written under Elizabeth, speaks of the notion as newly broached. Yea, and some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the Churches abroad ; and that so far as some of our men ordained in foreign parts have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers.

In his History of England (vol. 1, page 382) Lord Macaulay writes thus:—

The founders of the Anglican Church had retained Episcopacy as an ancient, a decent, and a convenient ecclesiastical polity, but had not declared that form of Church Government to be of Divine institution. We have already seen how low an estimate Cranmer had formed of the office of a Bishop. In the reign of Elizabeth, Jewel, Cooper, Whitgift and other eminent doctors defended prelacy, as innocent, as useful, as what the State might lawfully establish, as what, when established by the State, was entitled to the respect of every citizen. But they never denied that a Christian community without a Bishop might be a pure Church. On the contrary, they regarded the Protestants of the Continent as of the same household of faith with themselves. An English Churchman, nay, even an English Prelate, if he went to Holland, conformed without scruple to the established religion of Holland.

In the year 1603, the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury solemnly recognized the Church of Scotland, a Church in which Episcopal control and Episcopal ordination were then unknown, as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. It was even held that Presbyterian ministers were entitled to place and voice in Œcumenical Councils.

Macaulay further notes the fact I have already mentioned that

When the States General of the United Provinces convoked at Dort a Synod of Doctors not episcopally ordained, an English Bishop and an English Dean, commissioned by the head of the English Church, sat with those Doctors, preached to them and voted with them on the gravest questions of Theology. Nay, many English benefices were held by divines who had been admitted to the ministry in the Calvinistic form used on the Continent, nor was re-ordination by a Bishop in such cases then thought necessary or even lawful.

The testimonies of the most eminent divines of the Church of England are in fullest harmony with those of the two great historians, Hallam and Macaulay. No higher authority can be quoted than Lathbury's History of the English Episcopacy:

The English Reformers did not contend for any system of Government or discipline in the Church as being *jure divino*. Nor did they refuse to recognize the validity of ordination in those foreign Churches that had renounced Episcopacy (page 19).

Referring to the reign of Elizabeth, this distinguished Anglican declares:

The question of Church Government was vehemently agitated this period. The Reformers were agreed that no precise form was laid down in the New Testament; but when the Puritans became divided into two parties the Presbyterian party advocated the Divine right of their system. Cranmer and all the Reformers asserted that the form of Government was left to the civil magistrate to determine according to times and circumstances. The

Prelates of this reign (i. e. of Queen Elizabeth's) maintained the same views. They did not consider any mode of government essential to the constitution of the Church. Hence the validity of ordination, as exercised in those Reformed Churches where Episcopacy was not retained, was admitted. By an Act passed in the thirteenth year of this reign, the ordinations of foreign reformed Churches were declared valid. Many who had received Presbyterian ordination abroad were allowed to exercise their ministry in the Church of England, provided they conformed. Travers, Whittingham, Cartwright and many others had received no other, and their ordination was never questioned. At a subsequent period, this practice was denounced.

Lathbury finds the germ of the High Church idea in Laud, and indicates that even Bancroft did not go his length as regards the Presbyterians, the regularity of whose ecclesiastical standing he was not prepared to dispute. Laud's notions on the subject of Church Government were at variance with those adopted by many of his predecessors, who, until the time of Bancroft, never claimed a Divine right for the Government of the English Church, and even Bancroft admitted the validity of the Presbyterian ordination, for, when it was suggested in 1610 that the Scottish Bishops elect should be ordained Presbyters, he opposed, on the ground that ordination by Presbyters was valid.

Keble, whose hymns are classic, and whose holy, humble, spirit we cannot but admire, strong though his ritualistic liking and great his leaning toward that rising mediæval school of thought which his name helped to further—Keble, with characteristic conscientiousness, in the preface to his edition of the works of the great Hooker, makes this frank admission :

It might have been expected that the defenders of the English Hierarchy against the first Puritans, should take the highest ground, and challenge for the Bishops the same unreserved submission, on the same plea of exclusive Apostolic prerogative, which their adversaries feared not to insist on for their Elders and Deacons. It is notorious, however, that such was not, in general, the line preferred by Jewel, Whitgift, Bishop Cooper and others to whom the management of this controversy was entrusted during the early part of Elizabeth's reign. * * * It is enough with them to show that the government by Archbishops and Bishops is ancient and allowable. They never venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the Succession with the validity of the Holy Sacraments. And yet it is obvious (and here the High Church proclivities of the amiable Keble crop out, making his frank admission of the opposite view of the Reformers all the stronger) it is obvious that such a course of argument alone (supposing it to be borne out by facts) could fully meet all the exigencies of the case.

A single witness from the Broad School will complete our

circle of testimony from Anglican sources. What more fitting representative than Dean Stanley, who, whatever may be said of his laxity on certain points of doctrine, is universally acknowledged to be an accurate historian and a thoroughly truthful man. In his lectures on the Church of Scotland, he says:

The sentiment toward Presbyterian Churches was far more generous and comprehensive in the century which followed the Reformation than it was in that which followed the Restoration. The English Articles are so expressed as to include the recognition of Presbyterian ministers.

The first English Act of Uniformity was passed with the express view of securing their services to the English Church. The first English Reformers and the statesmen of Elizabeth, would have been astonished at any claim of exclusive sanctity for the Episcopal order. * * * The Canons of the English Convocation enjoin that prayers are to be offered up for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christians dispersed throughout the world, especially for the Churches of England, Scotland and Ireland. There can be no doubt that the framers of this have meant to acknowledge the Northern ecclesiastical establishment, at that time Presbyterian, as a Christian Church. With the exception of the Roman Catholics, it was the only Christian communion then existing in Scotland, and questions regarding any other state of matters than that actually before them could not have occurred to the Convocation. It is this also which is recognized in the most solemn form in the British Constitution. The very first declaration which the Sovereign makes, *taking precedence even of the recognition of the rights and liberties of the English Church and nation*, which is postponed till the Day of Coronation, is that in which, on the day of the Accession, the Sovereign declares that he or she will maintain inviolate and intact the Church of Scotland. In the Act of Union itself which prescribes this Declaration, the same securities are exacted throughout for the Church of Scotland as were exacted for the Church of England, and it is on record that when the Act was passed, and some questions arose among the Peers as to the propriety of so complete a recognition of the Presbyterian Church, the then Primate of all England, "the old Rock," as he was called, Archbishop Tennison, rose, and said with a weight which carried all objections before it—"*The narrow notions of all Churches have been their ruin*. I believe that the Church of Scotland, though not as perfect as ours, is as true a Protestant Church as the Church of England.

Such was the spirit of the Church of England at the Reformation, the most glorious period of her history, and for a century thereafter. "Minding not high things;" making not any high-sounding pretensions, claiming no superiority in the matter of orders; allying herself lovingly with the other Churches of the Reformation, and finding a mouthpiece for the outbreathings of a soul truly Catholic and Apostolic, in good Bishop Hall, when he wrote "We do love and honor those our sister Churches, as

the dear spouse of Christ, and give zealous testimonies of our well-wishing to them."

This bright Indian Summer was followed by a gloomy Winter, during which these hopeful blossoms were nipped, and a freezing formalism prevailed. The Diotrephes spirit of Laud was in the ascendant, and although in the days of the Commonwealth it received a terrible check, and was taught the severest lessons, yet, with the return of Charles II. to the throne his father had left for the scaffold the old sacerdotal spirit revived, culminating and becoming crystallized in 1662 in the Act of Uniformity, which made "Episcopal consecration or ordination" essential, as a prerequisite to the ministry; thus reversing the entire policy of the Reformers, and isolating the English Church from all the other Churches of the Reformation. This baneful blunder of the Stuart faction that wrought so much misery for our empire in other ways, has been perpetuated, though at the Revolution of 1688, Archbishop Tillotson, the Primate of England, (whom there is every reason to believe was not episcopally ordained or even baptized) made an honest effort to end this state of isolation by making certain concessions, prominent amongst which was this: "that for the future, those who have been ordained in any of the Reformed Churches, be not required to be re-ordained here, to render them capable of preferment in this Church." Tillotson's well-interposed effort failed, and the Restoration reversal of the Reformation procedure is yet in force. It does indeed seem passing strange that any popish priest, on his simply declaring himself, on whatever grounds, a Protestant, may at once be received into the Communion of the Church of England without being re-ordained; while that privilege, if they had desired it, would not have been granted to Dr. Chalmers, or Guthrie or McLeod or Hodge, to R. M. McCheyne or Duff, Angell James, D'Aubigne, or Adolphe Monod, David Livingstone or Robert Hall. It gives a shock to every conviction of the conscience or sense of propriety that in such a professedly Protestant Church such great and good men should be thus humiliated, as to have their orders discarded, while the official standing of any outcomer from Rome would be respected. Is this true Protestantism? Is it ordinary courtesy? It matters nothing to the excluded but to the excluder.

There was a time, the true Golden Age of the Church of England, when it was far otherwise, when she fraternized most closely and cordially with other Churches, notably the Presbyterian. Then she shone forth "fair as the moon" in purity of character, "clear as the sun" in her exhibitions of sound doctrine, and in her faithful witness-bearing against all laxity of principle and practice, and her aggressive power against a world lying in wickedness, "terrible as an army with banners."

For generations the Church of England was in heartiest sympathy with the other Protestant Churches of Europe, which were mainly Presbyterian. Read the writings of that illustrious "quaternion" of Prelates, Cranmer, Parker, Grindal and Whitgift, the first four Protestant Archbishops of Canterbury, and you will not find a grain of the leaven of High Churchism. The "Zurich Letters" published under the auspices of the Parker (a Church of England) Society, embrace the era from the establishment of Protestantism in England till the death of Queen Elizabeth. These Letters passed between Cranmer, Corndale, Grindal, Fox, Hooper, Cox, Jewel and the like Episcopalians in England, and Calvin, Melancthon, Bucer, Bullinger, Martyn and the like Presbyterians on the Continent, and breathe a most fraternal spirit. Though differing on the matter of Church Government, they never thought of questioning the orders of their brethren of other Churches. Presbyterian professors were repeatedly appointed in Oxford and Cambridge to educate the English clergy. Presbyterian ministers were settled over English parishes "by virtue only (as Bishop Hall attests) of *that ordination* which they have *brought with them* from other Reformed Churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings without any exception against the lawfulness of their calling." Hall, when Dean, along with a Bishop, sat as the English Commissioners at the Synod of Dort, which was well-nigh altogether Presbyterian. Gillespie, Rutherford, Baillie and others formed the delegates from the Scotch Presbyterian Church in that great Westminster Assembly, which was mainly Episcopalian.

The Standards of the Church of England were repeatedly subjected to Presbyterian review. Bishop Jeremy Taylor declares that in the framing of the Liturgy, the English Reformers "joined to their own star all the shining tapers of the other

Reformed Churches, calling for the advice of the eminently learned and zealous Reformers, in other Kingdoms, that the light of all together might show them a clear path to walk in." The Book of Common Prayer was largely copied from the "Liturgy of Cologne," which was the work of Melancthon and Bucer (one of Calvin's disciples) and all of them good sound Presbyterians. "From this Liturgy" (says Archbishop Lawrence in his Bampton Lectures) "our offices bear evident marks of having been freely borrowed, liberally imitating, but not servilely copying it."

One might surely have expected (to use the words of another) that in coming to a new country where there is no Established Church and where there are no civil obligations in the way, the members of the Church of England would have sought out the old paths and returned to their noble Reformation traditions, recognizing the sisterhood of the Churches, and thus showing themselves, while not the less Church of England, the more Protestant and in the true sense, Catholic. Other Churches in Canada have acted in this spirit, forgetting old contests which still separate brethren at home and levelling the barriers which partisan feeling had erected. We trust that ere long, beloved brethren in the Church of England will follow the example, and abandoning a seclusion which is not recognized by her Constitution, and was forced on the parent Church in the servile days of the Stuarts, will resume the place of the Fathers by the side of the sister Churches of the Reformation.

Halifax.

R. F. BURNS.

CHURCH PRAISE AND THE MINISTRY.

IT is unnecessary for our purpose to dwell at any length in this paper on what all Christians agree, namely, the importance of praise as an element of worship. "Praise," says one, "makes worship complete, and without it the pillar of devotion lacks its capital." Praise is the crowning act of public worship—the most efficient means of conveying the devout aspirations of an assembly of people to God. There can be also but little difference of opinion as to who are the proper authorities to control and regulate this element of worship. Authority is centred where responsibility lies; and the minister in conjunction with the Session is charged with the solemn duty of superintending the worship of God in His house. Whatever else he may take in hand, the minister must not neglect this duty. No one has a better right than he to speak and act in the matter, and no one is as responsible as he to see that the acts of worship, among which praise is the crowning one, are properly and efficiently performed.

But the helplessness of the proper authorities in many of our churches in this matter is a well established fact. This is not the case in country congregations merely, where the psalmody may be low, but also in congregations which can command the highest musical talent. It is in the latter that the difficulty assumes the most alarming proportions. How often are the unity and effectiveness of a religious service destroyed by the arbitrary conduct of the choir-master or organist? Why should the fair fame of a church be scandalized by the employment of soloists of questionable social position, and with little sympathy with the work they are engaged to do, to "perform" before a worshipping congregation in the intervals of their operatic engagement? What again shall we say of the capricious choir—that little *imperium in imperio*, gathered out of the spoilt children of the church who fight among themselves and terrorize all around, and who are as gifted to play on the nerves of the minister as they are to do their proper work?

Though we speak thus, we offer no carping, destructive

criticism. Our desire is not to abolish these agencies, but to have them re-adjusted, developed, and purified. In insisting on the minister's part in church praise, we are not afraid of incurring the wrath of either precentor or organist. We know better things concerning them. The helplessness of the proper authorities in this matter is not to be ascribed to the inordinate ambition of musicians. No musician of the true stamp would desire the indifference of minister and Session. It is true that the musical minister often bores them, but true only when his interference exceeds his discretion. Injudicious meddling causes friction, but intelligent sympathy cannot fail to produce harmony: and without the intelligent sympathy of the minister no good musical work can be done in any church. Beecher had his *alter ego* in Zundel. Dr. Allon, of Islington, London, in whose church probably the finest *congregational* singing in England may be heard, has, for forty years, while engaging the services of the very best organists and choirmasters, selected the music as well as the hymns for the Sabbath services. Mr. Spurgeon also does the same. Ministers of lesser note may, by means of intelligent sympathy and friendly consultation, do much to inspire organists and choirmasters with a high, devotional interest in the service of praise.

In order to secure this harmonious working of minister and singers, it is necessary that the former should be trained to form a good opinion of what worship music should be, and have courage enough to be loyal to his own ideal. This he cannot do without making worship music a special study, and that study should be prosecuted alongside of and included in his college curriculum. Little we know of the musical methods of the ancient Jewish Church, but we know that music was taught with constant pains in the schools of the prophets. We would wish to see our present schools of the prophets taking a little more pains in the matter, and we point this out as absolutely necessary for a thorough improvement in our congregational singing.

In making these remarks, we are not influenced by any Roman Catholic or High Anglican notions. In these communions the clergy have to intone, and in their colleges music is not merely compulsory, but also held in high esteem. We cannot, however, ignore what is good even in these systems, lest by

so doing we may invest them with a permanent recommendation for the people's adoption. But we glean our materials from communions of a different order—Churches, influenced by Puritan and Calvinistic tradition, and guarding jealously the simplicity of worship. Among these, musical methods have been changed, and new departures, far-reaching in their results, have been taken. In an admirable work, "Studies in Worship Music," Mr. J. Spencer Curwen has a chapter on "Music in Theological Schools" in which he gives the results of an inquiry made into eighty Theological Schools. In the majority of the schools there is no official recognition of music, thirteen only including it in the curriculum. Of these thirteen, four are Presbyterian—the Free Church Colleges of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, and Magee College, Londonderry. Mr. Curwen further says, that in the American Theological Schools, both elocution and music are better treated than in England.

The apathy, though not antipathy, of college authorities in this matter is not much to be wondered at. The impression prevails that students should go elsewhere for their musical training. One of the replies which Mr. Curwen received is as follows: "Music is not taught in this college in any form. Musical students sing, and play the American organ, but only as amateurs. The college is for training *ministers*." The leading idea of college committees is preaching; and they are slow to admit that a music class may contribute to the making of a minister as do the classes on the other subjects—that lectures on Church music should be admitted on a par with those in Church history. Candor, however, demands the admission that even in colleges where music is not formally acknowledged, every effort to cultivate it among the students is under the sanction of the college authorities. Still, the work cannot be well done while the music practice or class has no status, but made to depend on the voluntary co-operation of a few students on the rather doubtful principle of mutual improvement. A complaint of inefficiency comes even from colleges where music is formally acknowledged. A report from Magee College states: "But until our Church makes attendance at a music class for two sessions compulsory, things will not be as they should. Last Assembly would not go so far. It merely *recommended* such attendance,

and a recommendation has about as much weight with students as the paper it is printed on."

It is argued that students are overburdened with other studies—that there is no time for music study. This is simply another way of saying that it is not important; for none but monomaniacs in music would say that the subject should occupy much time. All that is required is for the present voluntary and intermittent gatherings of students to sing, to take a formal shape and be conducted by a qualified teacher who can command the respect of the students. With a systematic elementary class, compulsory attendance, and an examination held at the close of the course for a certificate of competency, scarcely a man would leave college without possessing the ability to read at first sight common congregational tunes. To this should be added a few lectures on the history and principles of Church Praise. To obtain this happy result by the mutual improvement system, there are four serious difficulties in the way, namely: The subject is not officially acknowledged, the class is held out of study hours, attendance at it is purely optional, and the instruction given generally by one of the students.

Speaking from an old student point of view, there is little force in the time argument, for it is time well spent. Who has not felt the exhilarating, recreative effect of music on other studies, making them less dreary and infusing cheerfulness into college life? The monotony of theological studies should be frequently relieved by a little singing to preserve the balance of the faculties, for music is a true educative force and exerts an ennobling influence upon the character.

The present missionary movement among students affords a strong plea for the formal recognition of music as part of their training. Knowledge of music is to them indispensable. They can sing to the heathen long before they can preach to them, and missionaries have given us repeated testimonies of the helpfulness of music in their work. "If Satan were deprived of music," said Robert Moffat, "he would lose the chief pillar of his kingdom." He found this out after fifty years of work in South Africa.

The home missionary's outfit is certainly not complete without a certificate of competency to lead the psalmody. In most

fields it appears that the psalmody is very low. The missionary's first duty is to try to get others to do the work ; if that fails, he must do it himself. He has a fine scope here for doing good work, for his authority is unchallenged, and a singing practice can be kept up with much more enthusiasm in a country village than in towns. While no other branch of Home Mission work should be overlooked, it should be borne in mind that the hearts of the young people of these congregations can be won more effectually through music than they could through any other means not directly religious.

When the student becomes a settled minister, he will find it necessary to continue the study of church music, with its fascinating sister-study, Hymnology. He will have to study also the needs and capabilities of his congregation, for it must be remembered all the time that what is wanted is not fine music in a church of wood, brick, or stone, but fine music out of the living Church—true, "common" praise. He should make himself familiar with the tunes already known to the people, as well as to be able to suggest new and suitable tunes. The knowledge necessary to do all this he may command without being able to play on the piano or compose an anthem.

It requires all the training and courage of the minister to place himself at the head of a movement to develop musical talent in the congregation. Is not this the missing link in the musical culture of our congregations? All that the average congregation tries to do is to utilize talent trained already elsewhere. Consequently, the progress of the congregation in singing depends mainly on circumstances. An agency should be established to train the congregation in the art of singing. The merging of the precentor into the choirmaster shows that the principle is already applied to some extent amongst us. Henceforth, it should be distinctly understood that the full work of the choirmaster should include superintending the singing on the Sabbath day, training the choir, and holding elementary music classes for the children and the congregation generally. All other methods of improving the singing are wanting in the element of permanency. The people must be taught to read music. No minister should think it beneath his dignity to place himself at the head of a movement to popularise the knowledge

of music. The charge of amateurism should not terrify him. While studiously avoiding unnecessary collision with professional musicians, the matter is too important, too vital to the true interests of the Church to leave it at the will and convenience of musicians. The Tonic Sol-fa system—the most successful system known to teach music to the masses—has been popularised by ministers. Its founder, the Rev. J. Curwen, was a minister in London, and his system has been so successful in England, that Sir John Stayner, himself a Staff Notationist, has recommended the use of it in the day schools where music is compulsory. The Rev. A. Lowrie, of East Calder, introduced the system to the churches of Scotland, where it may be said to have been universally adopted. The Rev. J. Roberts popularised the system in Wales, where a rare treat can be enjoyed in listening to choirs of fifty or sixty strong, competing at the *Eisteddfodan* for a prize for singing at first sight, and to hear these choirs striking out in good tune and time, a glee or an anthem placed in their hands on the platform, is one of the best recommendations of the Tonic Sol-fa system. We will not discuss here the relative value of the two notations. As a rule, every Sol-faist who loves his art learns also the Staff Notation, and, consequently, he possesses a decided advantage over the mere Staff Notationist in acquiring a thorough knowledge of the principles of music. Before an adverse opinion on the Tonic Sol-fa system be delivered, let it have a fair trial in the sphere where it is intended to be of most use—among the masses—let us have proofs of its failure to attain the end proposed, and let us hear of some other system that will supply the missing link already mentioned in the musical culture of our congregations.

In addition to the suggestions already made, we offer the following—that the minister should extend his work on this line beyond his own congregation. A powerful means to rouse the interest of the people in this work would be for a number of congregations, near each other, to associate together for the purpose of working up a musical festival. Why should our congregations be so insulated, especially when we bear in mind the facilities of the Presbyterian system for united action? If half a dozen country congregations or two or three town congregations resolved on some united plan of action, draw out a musical pro-

gramme, spend, say, six months to practice the music at home, then unite into one grand choir on a certain date under the leadership of a first-rate musician, it would be the means of awakening enthusiasm in the choirs, enriching their repertory of useful tunes, and of affording a means of grace to the assembled congregations. This plan is practicable, but not without hard work.

We have still to learn the usefulness of music as an aid both for worship and for winning men. Men love it, and go after it. Music has cast out many an evil spirit from the hearts of men. Again, whatever we offer to the Lord in worship, it should be the best. We have no quarrel with the musical methods of our fathers, and certainly not with the spirit of their singing; but their methods cannot be ours. There is no reason why worship music should be so proverbially far behind other kinds of music. Above all, attention should be drawn to the spirit of true singing. The singing that affects the heart must come from the heart. Haydn once said that he never felt so pious in his life as when he was composing the "Creation." A friend entered Handel's study one day, and found the great musician sobbing like a child over the words—"He is despised and rejected of men." The divine pathos of the words had entered his heart, and here we discover the secret of the perennial beauty and pathos of this and other portions of the "Messiah." We need the aid of the same Spirit to sing with our lips, as well as to believe in our hearts and practice in our lives.

Warton.

JOHN GRIFFITH.

Missionary.

THE ADVANCE IN INDIA.

ONE of the most striking illustrations of the change and advance in India is given in the address of Baboo Pratāp Chandar Mazumdar, the leader of the Brahmo-Samajh movement in India since the death of Keshab Chandar Sen. Mr Mazumdar passed through Europe and America three years ago, and on his return to India spoke in anything but flattering terms of what he saw in the so-called Christian lands, and took up a very much more conservative and orthodox position in reference to Hinduism than Mr. Sen had done. Since then he seems to have advanced at even a more rapid rate than his old leader, and in an address given recently at Simla, he said that *caste, so far as it forbade eating certain kinds of food or different classes of men associating together, is fast becoming a thing of the past*, that is, caste in the Hindu sense of the term; and as caste is the only remaining prop of any strength that is upholding Hinduism, one can understand how great is the revolution the country is passing through. He uttered an earnest protest against the European drinking customs, deprecated any sudden changes in food and clothing, urged more intercourse between Europeans and natives, and then referred to the great religious changes and their duty in reference to them. Referring to the flood of infidel and sceptical literature that was flowing into India, he said that the Brahmo-Samajh dreaded Bradlaugh and Besant more than the orthodox Hinduism.

Rationalism, he said, was only a passing phase and could never be the ultimate resting place of the human mind. Monotheism (as of the Arayans and Mahomedans) could never become a national religion. It was a great advance on Polytheism, but before we could have a national religion we would have to listen to the voice of the prophets and avail ourselves of the religious teaching God had brought within our reach through

His Providence. *Of the Prophets, Christ, in Mr. Mazumdar's estimation, occupies a quite solitary pre-eminence.* The reporter says: "At times Mr. Mazumdar spoke almost as if he were a Christian, and a Christian in his own sense of the word he would, perhaps, claim to be. He said, '*the only escape from the rationalism and individualism which he (Mr. Mazumdar) deprecates lies in the acknowledgment of Christ as Lord, and in the acceptance of that Revelation which God has given to the world through Him.*'" The above is largely taken from the *Indian Standard*, and is therefore likely to be in every sense a trustworthy report of the address given in India's capital, before an audience of about 400 of the leading native minds in the city. Mazumdar is very clever, a clear thinker, and a natural orator, having an influence amongst the natives of India possibly second to none, and one that might make him the honored leader of the Hindoos into the Christian fold, if he but had the courage that would rise above self-interest and the conviction that comes from submission to Christ rather than the truth about Him. It is true that Baboo Keshab Chandar Sen advanced so near to Christianity that many thought him one, and yet he, in his later days, seemed to fall back into Monotheism and Hero Worship. It also true, however, that he did not carry back again with him native minds in which were planted so well the seeds of Gospel truth. We may sometimes doubt the honesty and condemn the inconsistency of these leaders, yet we cannot but rejoice in the work they are doing since they are but preparing the way for Christianity. The stagnation of former days is replaced by earnest questioning. The stupid impositions of the holy men are rapidly becoming impossible, the swarm of holy beggars are forced to seek a living by honest toil. The priests will soon ring their bells to waken the gods and to call the worshippers in vain. Fatalism's restful charm is fast losing its spell. Everything is tested by the touchstone of reason, and whatever does not meet that test is ruthlessly cast aside.

Dogmatic assertion and sensational pleading are alike useless. The hoary locks of antiquity fail to command respect. Truth, pure and unadulterated, is sought for and gradually being accepted. In those centres, especially where the Christian Colleges have been faithfully educating the minds and hearts of the people, we

find the greatest and most general advance, but from these centres the influence is slowly, but none the less surely, permeating the whole social fabric. Hinduism, hoary with age, built up with all the crafty ingenuity which the ages of the past possessed, fashioned to suit the depraved and degrading tastes of the natural man, added to from time to time as the priests saw would be pleasing to man, and yet help them to retain their power, is slowly crumbling to the dust, and soon will be as much a curiosity as the fabled faiths of Greece and Rome. May the day come speedily.

Toronto.

J. WILKIE.

OUR NORTH-WEST INDIANS.

AMONG the problems with which our Foreign Mission Committee has had to deal in late years, is that of the Indian population in the North-West Territories. That the Committee has been careful of this trust cannot be denied, whilst it must be acknowledged that the work in this section of the field is advancing with fair progress, and that the objects sought for when the work was inaugurated have been in a large measure realized. To one who has had the opportunity of visiting our Indians, this must be evident. The work of the Presbyterian Church amongst our Indian population differs from that of the other denominations in this respect: that it is for the most part confined to the education of the Indian youth, the object being that by the promotion of education and civilization in their midst they may ultimately become not only citizens, but Christian citizens. Within the boundaries of Manitoba and the North-West, there are to-day from 25,000 to 30,000 Indians under the protection of the Dominion Government; there are located on the reserves, Sioux, Wood Crees, Plain Crees, Blackfeet, Bloods, Piegan, Stonies, Sarcees, Swampies or Saulteaux, and Chippewayans; while in the far North are several tribes of

the Tinné family. These are in our own land, and to us, in part, is committed their civilization and evangelization. The work in these two departments is beset with difficulties. There are presented to us, among other obstacles, the political, social, and religious customs of the Indian.

The question may naturally be asked: What is peculiar about their religion that makes it an obstacle to the work of the Christian missionary? What is their religion? It may be said that their religion is in many respects directly at variance with the Christian religion. It is quite true that they have their belief in a god whom they call the Great Spirit or Great Sun. They offer their prayers, make their sacrifices, and among their traditions are recorded the Fall of Man, the Flood, the coming of a great Teacher, and other events closely allied to those in Bible History. Many of them at the present, manifest unbelief in the medicine-man, their religious teacher. Others believe him to be a priest sent by God, and not merely one of their number with no more power than they themselves possess. An interesting case is recorded as occurring some years ago among the Blackfeet. A missionary went to them to make known the way of life, and while engaged in his labors was encountered by the medicine-man of the tribe, who accused him of speaking falsely and proclaiming an empty religion. The medicine-man said that a Kootenay chief had died a short time before, and that having accepted Christianity, his spirit went to the white man's heaven. When he arrived at the door of heaven seeking admission, a voice from within asked his name, this being given, the voice replied that not being a white man, he could not be admitted. He, therefore, sought the heaven of the Indian, and when he had given his name he was told that although he had an Indian name and an Indian skin, yet he was not an Indian because he had accepted the white man's religion. Entrance there being denied him, the chief was perplexed. The attendant, observing his distress, said that another opportunity would be given him, if, on being allowed to return to the earth, he should tell all the Indians to retain their own religion. "Now," said the medicine-man, "the old chief has returned from the dead, is living in the Kootenay village, and has given his command that the Indians must retain their own religion, must pay no heed to the words of

the white missionary or heaven will be closed against them." The missionary was puzzled and asked to be given a few days in which to consider his answer, in the meantime sending two young Indians to the camp of the Kootenay chief to ascertain the facts of the case. In a few days they returned, and the people assembled to hear the answer of the missionary. He related how that he had sent these two young men to ascertain the truth, that they had found the old chief in good health, that he denied the medicine-man's story of his death and return from heaven, and that he sent two of his sons to bear witness to his testimony. When the people thus saw the deception of the medicine-man and observed his crest-fallen appearance, they lost all faith in him. To-day, on these reserves, the religion of the white man is taught to young and old. The Gospel of Christ is winning its way amongst the Indians and exerting a beneficial influence over them. There are, in the Indian's opinion, two religions; the one recorded in a book for the guidance of the white man, who, by paying heed to its precepts, will at last gain the white man's heaven: the other is recorded in the heads of the Indians, in the sky above them, and in the rivers, rocks, and mountains among which which they wander. The red man, who listens to God as He is in Nature, will hear him as He speaks, and by following His teaching will at last gain the Indian heaven. *i.e.*, the happy hunting-ground. Determined opposition to this religion will not win the way, but only such earnest efforts as will undermine their religion by shewing them one far superior, with purer customs, grander objects, and a nobler civilization than they now possess; preserving their past only in historical records and supplanting it by the nobler present.

Another serious obstacle to the work of the Christian Missionary is the very superstitious nature of the Indian. He is a firm believer in dreams, attaching great weight to visions passing before him in the hours when darkness shrouds his camp. All objects seen in these visions have a reality in his mind which constantly haunts him during his long journeys over the prairies of the West. No visions cause such great fear in the Indian mind as those in which the spirits of their dead friends appear, and occasionally, on the death of a chief, the whole tribe will seek another location far distant from the former appearances of their visions. Some of them to-day, if forced to pass the

graves of the dead after nightfall, will shoot off their rifles, give several wild war-whoops, all the time running at the greatest speed to escape the spirits which always linger in such places. When any of their number die, they are wrapped in a blanket and borne to the grave by a few friends and relatives, who place beside the departed in their graves, pipes, tobacco, and relics of greater or less value, an explanation of this may be seen in their religion. They are of the belief that everything in Nature has a spirit, and that the spirits even of inanimate things, which were the property of the departed Indian go with him, and are of use in the spirit world. They tell you that the substance only remains. This they assert of implements of war and domestic utensils, dogs, horses, etc., that their souls have gone to their "happy-hunting ground" to be there used by their master. A similar idea to this was held by the Gauls, who often contracted debts payable in a future existence. To the servant of Christ comes the task of removing these superstitions, and supplanting them by the belief that when their dead depart, trusting in the merits of Christ alone, they find not their happy hunting-ground but the abode of many mansions.

The work of the Indian missionary would not be complete without some effort being made to improve the position of Woman. That she has in the past been degraded, enslaved, her primitive virtue destroyed, cannot be denied. That even to-day she is forced to share the hut of some old Indian who has already several wives, only to be sold or exchanged for another when she gains the ill-will of her tyrannical master, is too true. In but few races is the ruddy glow of the maiden or young mother so soon replaced by the sorrowful expression and the bent form as among the Indian women of the present day. Only the refining influences of the Christian religion can alter this lamentable state of things, and raise the Indian woman to a position such as is held by her fairer sister in the East.

Against such obstacles as those I have mentioned, and others of greater or less magnitude such as are characteristic alone of the Indian race, have the missionaries of Christ to contend. The uplifting of the Indian, means not his acceptance of our customs merely, but the transformation of the whole man, and his development morally, mentally, physically.

At the present time there is a two-fold division of the work :

temporal affairs on the one hand, moral and spiritual on the other; the one undertaken by the State, the other falling to the Church, the two forces being combined for the education of the young. Each of these bodies has a plan of its own. The State contends, "Teach the Indians first to work, then to pray," the Church replies: "Christianize, then civilize." To impart a new love in the heart of the Indian, to change his manner of thought, to give him such a training as will lead him to a purer and better life implies the earnest work of both of these agencies, the one not antagonistic to but the complement of the other. The responsibility is great on all concerned. The lives of instructors and missionaries must exhibit no inconsistencies, for these in a great measure defeat the objects of the work. "Be honest, just and pure," says the instructor. The Indian replies to this: "Your Bible teaches us to that effect but the white man doesn't believe it or it would be seen in his life."

Do Indian Missions pay? Some there are who doubt their success. With many it is a simple question of dollars and cents. A certain amount is laid aside for the Indian work and an equivalent in conversions is expected. Indian missions are not judged by this standard. The work has been successful to a great degree. The Gospel of Christ has reached the heart of these dwellers on our prairies. Lord Lorne, in "Canadian Pictures" says: "In Canada, as in Africa and the South Seas the Gospel of Christ has won victories over ignorance and sin. The preaching of Redemption through the death of Christ on the Cross, has touched and cleansed savage hearts, and the Indian manifests no less than the white man the power of the spirit of God." By the introduction of Christianity, a grand standard in the person of Christ has been placed before the Indian, much of the immorality of the camps has been banished, native customs have been largely supplanted by those of a Christian people, and domestic relations are being purified. In many of the homes and camps where, in past years, only the wild songs of the Indian medicine-man and the ringing war-whoop of the dusky savage were heard, there now resounds in sweet and reverent strains the songs of Zion. Much yet remains to be done. The race is passing away. What we do must be done quickly. Grave responsibilities confront us. We must face them.

Touchwood Hills.

F. O. NICHOL.

Open Letter.

WANTED—A POLICY.

THE Alumni of Knox College have now three representatives in the Senate. These representatives are supposed to express there, the prevailing opinion of their constituents upon any question affecting College interests. It must be presumed that the Senate in granting the privilege of representation desired to obtain such an expression of opinion; and further, that these representatives in accepting this position, were willing to present these opinions when they were formulated. What is wanted is that they shall be formulated. The mill is ready, there is plenty of grain to be ground. What is needed now is some well defined system of supply. Until that is established there can be nothing done but the grinding of individual grists.

Unfortunately there is no such system of supply. The prevailing sentiment among Alumni in regard to what is needed seems to be one of total indifference. Their representatives have nothing to do as representatives, though they may be active as members of Senate. There seems no desire among the Alumni as a body to take advantage of the privilege accorded them. Yet to be effective the Alumni must act as a body, and must, of course, act, so far as is possible, in harmony. Hence arises the need for some well-defined policy according to which action may be taken.

I, for one, am convinced that there is no such wide-spread indifference as the silence of the Alumni upon questions of College interest would indicate. There is, rather, a sense of inability to act effectively, because of the lack of a definite line of action. If this were projected there is the spirit to follow it up and establish it. The manner in which the Goforth-Mission, the only well defined scheme the Alumni have undertaken, was adopted and carried out, is abundant evidence of such a spirit. The same spirit would also be manifested in the broader question of College Politics, if in this, also, it had a definite channel in which to operate.

The channel now offered is that of the Alumni Association. As the only recognised body of Alumni, the representatives naturally look to it to give expression to the opinions of their constituents. It is the part

of the Alumni to see that the Association *does* express their sentiments, and expresses them clearly and definitely.

The Annual Meeting of the Association is approaching. The Secretary's invitations are now in the hands of members. Now that Senate representation is an established fact, it is an opportune time to formulate a definite line of action, to make this representation effective.

There are questions more or less discussed among Alumni, but upon which discussion is so indefinite that no representative meaning can yet be gathered. There is a pretty definite opinion in the mind of each Alumnus in respect to the lengthening of the College term. But the expression of opinion so far has been purely individual. Would it not be possible to advance it a stage, and give this question a definite existence and shape, as the sentiment of the Alumni as a body? We know the opinion of individuals. These conflict, and the question is now held up at rest between them. If it is not to drop, and pass out of sight altogether, there must now be an endorsement of one or the other view on the part of the Alumni. To bring it within the range of College Politics we must have more than the opinion of the individual, we want the representative sentiment.

This question is by no means the only one that has passed the individual stage and awaits further action. One that should indeed take precedence of it is that of the continuance or reconstruction of the Preparatory Course in Knox College. All that can be said on either side has already been said, and what is needed now is to sum up, and obtain a representative endorsement. If our representatives could go into the Senate and declare the prevailing feeling and desire of these constituents upon this question, there would certainly be a strong factor contributed towards its settlement.

It is important that this expression of opinion be obtained before definite action is taken, otherwise this action may or may not become representative. At the last Annual Meeting of the Alumni Association, action was taken upon the Library Endowment Scheme. The Association pledged itself to raise \$2000 towards the Endowment. There was no representative expression for or against this pledge, but, relying upon the hearty endorsement of the scheme by the whole body of Alumni, those present entered into it. The result has not been satisfactory. Not twenty-five per cent. of the amount pledged has yet been subscribed, though double that amount should not be a burden in a constituency of 435. Through our representatives we made this offer. We believe it will be made good, but it would have given a greatly increased influence to those who represent us, if they could have reported now the fulfilment

of the pledge. Had it been representative action, I am convinced they could have so reported.

But how is such representative action to be obtained? The only medium offered is that of the Alumni Association. Clearly that, as it is at present constituted, is not adequate. The attendance at any of its meetings is not more than ten per cent. of those entitled to be present. Those who are present cannot be called representatives, in either sense of the term. That they are the progressive party is clearly shown in the threatened fate of the Library Endowment Scheme.

An extension of the Association is necessary to a full expression of opinion. Were there Branch Associations formed in each Presbytery where there are six Alumni; and were these not only recognised by the Central Association, but adopted and fostered by it, there could then be obtained a true representative expression of opinion upon any question of College interest before action need be taken.

The Central Association has now two meetings each year—An Interim Meeting in April, and the Annual Meeting in October. At the April meeting, usually a business meeting, let there be prepared a statement of the questions that have emerged during the year, and upon which it is desirable to have a representative judgment. Let these be sent down to the Branch Associations for their consideration and decision. Let these Branch Associations be requested to send representatives to the Annual Meeting of the Central Association in October, where these questions shall come up for final discussion and settlement. The Association has then the opinion of the entire constituency. Their instructions to the representatives will be in no sense individual, and these representatives will go into the Senate carrying not simply the influence of individuals but of the large body they represent. Only in some such way can any well-defined action be taken, the influence of the Alumni be brought to bear upon the deliberations of the Senate, and Alumni representation become something more than a name.

Toronto.

R. C. TIBB.

JESUITISM IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

THERE exists in our Territories an organization, bearing every outward mark of prosperity, firmly established, rich and powerful, and yet a little scrutiny reveals a state of internal morbid rottenness—a state of affairs which vividly illustrates our Lord's picture of the Pharisees, "a whited sepulchre full of dead men's bones." During the last year the writer has had opportunity of studying the workings of this organization and of observing the machinations of the men, who, in the words of the late President Lincoln, "are trained to commit the most cruel and diabolical deeds for the glory of God." In the northern part of the Territories Jesuitism has more firmly established itself, and here Jesuitical plotting and political wire-pulling is carried on to an alarming extent.

It has always been the policy of Rome to lay her hand upon and control the educational interests of the country; to have not only separate schools erected and maintained for her own benefit, but also to have expunged from the books of the public schools historical references to the cruelties of Rome. But in the N.-W. Territories she has not only her separate schools, but has also a Roman Catholic section of the School Board, which sets and examines the papers of Roman Catholic candidates for certificates. The result is apparent. A knowledge of the Roman Catholic catechism is the most essential qualification necessary for a certificate, as the following questions, selected from First, Second and Third Class examination papers of '88, show :

- "What is the doctrine on the Infallibility of the Pope ?
- "What is our devotion to the Blessed Virgin ?
- "What honor is due to the Saints ?
- "Has the priest the power of forgiving sins ?
- "How are mortal sins to be forgiven outside of Confession ?
- "How is sin remitted in its different degrees ?
- "What does the Immaculate Conception of Mary mean ?
- "Give the doctrine on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction.
- "What are the marks of the true Church ?"

This is one and the most important departments in which Roman Catholic teachers receive certificates, and also the stock-in-trade which they must retail to their pupils, even should the multiplication table be neglected. The writer knows one Roman Catholic teacher who is ignorant of the very rudiments of education, and yet at a recent exam-

ination was awarded a 3rd Class certificate. This, of course, secures for him the Government grant—a thing more desirable in the eyes of the Jesuits than education. On the same principle it may be explained how so many Sisters received certificates last year, a knowledge of the catechism compensating for any deficiency in mathematics. This state of affairs is bound to continue as long as a Roman Catholic section of the Board exists at Regina.

Again, in the Indian Department, the same Jesuitical craft may be found. Untiringly they pursue their plans of having Protestant agents and officials removed, and their places filled by "the faithful," whose pleasure is the will of the priest. And what they ask the servile authorities seldom refuse.

In 1886, the Government, at the request of the Rev. A. B. Baird, established an Indian school on the Stoney Plain Reserve, there being no other school on the Reserve at that time. Teachers in such schools are appointed by the Church under whose supervision the school is established, and receive an annual grant of \$300 from the Government, the Church providing a similar amount. This school afforded ample accommodation for all the children on the Reserve—for there were but forty-three of school age—and things went on harmoniously for more than a year, with an average daily attendance of from twenty-five to thirty. It is an unusual thing for the Government to erect a school for one denomination when another has already occupied the field, but R. C. influence is so strong at headquarters that they get what they desire. They applied for a Roman Catholic school, and one was erected within eighty rods of the one already there, and confusion has prevailed ever since. Lying and craft were at once resorted to. Rumors circulated that our teachers would do the children harm. Parents were told that they must take their children away from the Protestant and send them to the Catholic school. And all this enforced with the threat that until that was done they would not get more Government beef. Had it not been for the hold that our teacher, Mr. Anderson—who is a mechanic and had taught the Indians many useful things—had upon them, our school would have been depopulated. Had a R. C. school been established there first, and the Presbyterian Church asked the Government to erect one for them, they would have been politely told that the field was occupied.

St. Albert is the home of Jesuitism for the district of Alberta. It is nine miles north-west of Edmonton, and situated in a most beautiful part of the country. An immense nunnery, priests' palace and chapel form the nucleus of the settlement, and around them cluster the *habi-*

tants. As you approach it from the south-east a huge wooden cross on the brow of the hill informs you that you are in the domain of the Oblats of Mary Immaculate. This mission owns more than six thousand acres of land, the greater part of which was received as a grant from the Government, and from which it receives a large annual revenue. Yet, like all communities where Popery and superstition reign, here also poverty prevails. Last year the report of Superintendent Greisbach, in the Government Blue Books, shows that 663 people at St. Albert—this nursery of Catholicism—received Government rations. This is virtually a case of the Government supporting the Roman Catholic mission. The few dollars that the *habitant* may earn he takes out in prayers for the removal of the purgatorial coals from the body of some dead relative. Thus the coffers of the mission are filled and the Government is bled to support the faithful. Every year this state of affairs exists to a greater or less degree among the French half-breeds of St. Albert. How long shall people continue blind? How long shall wonderful and horrible things be committed in the land? How long shall politicians deal falsely, priests bear rule by their means, and the electors love to have it so?

W. A. BRADLEY.

Edmonton, N. W. T.

A THEOLOGICAL AND EXEGETICAL CLUB.

Now that the holiday season is over and ministers are making arrangements for another year's work, the time seems opportune for discussing the best means of promoting theological study. I would, therefore, ask those interested in this question to consider the suggestion embodied in the title of this letter.

Every studiously inclined minister knows how very difficult it is to prosecute theological study after graduation. Its importance is recognized, and spasmodic efforts are made to carry it out. But the incentives of examination and of association with other students being removed, and the duties of the pastorate and pulpit preparation becoming more absorbing and more exacting, the study of the great present-day theological problems, if attempted at all, is intermittent and too often profit-

less. Sometimes two or more neighboring ministers arrange to study the same subjects and meet occasionally for discussion. This is helpful, but, lacking variety of opinion, sometimes grows monotonous.

My suggestion is that those ministers who are really in earnest in Biblical and theological study, form themselves into a kind of club, draft a course of study for a season, and meet in Toronto, say once a month, for conference and discussion. At such meetings the discussions should be the freest possible, all serious convictions respected, and all honest doubts and intelligent beliefs tolerated. From the meetings of such a club, newspaper reporters would be excluded, and, in accordance with the operating principle of natural selection, the members, being lovers of and seekers after truth in a field where many treasures of truth are still hidden, would be trusty and sympathetic, and no man should feel constrained or hampered in the discussion of the most delicate question in Biblical Criticism or Theology. Were it otherwise, were the feelings after truth published abroad as final beliefs, or were truth regarded as a fixed and well ascertained quantum, and investigation stifled by fear or prohibited by obscurantism, then all such association of students would be worse than useless. But there would be no necessity for such restrictions, and among sober-minded scholars there would be no such disposition.

No one will seriously question the utility of such a society. With whole continents open, in which the large majority of Canadian ministers will confess themselves to be but strangers and pilgrims, there need be no fear as to the interest and profit connected with such exploring expeditions. The subjects are legion. The work of scientific and historical criticism will give employment to the thoughtful student for years to come. A few, at the opposite extremes of ignorance and knowledge, have settled views on all great critical subjects: but with many judgment is suspended on some points. There is the question of the Canon, and the very vital question of Inspiration. The Old Testament presents an almost limitless field. Sir William Dawson has not cleared up the first chapter of Genesis, and the whole question of Pentateuch or Hexateuch is still an open one to many students. Job and the Psalms, their origin and structure, Isaiah or the two Isaiahs, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, "and all the prophets"—questions of great importance and of present-day interest arise in connection with the study of almost every book in the Old Testament. New Testament problems are almost as numerous. If more general subjects are asked for the Hittites would admit of further acquaintance, and much benefit would be derived from the study of such subjects as the Influence of Outside Nations on the Destiny of Israel.

The work for such a society of students is truly great, as this list of subjects selected at random shows.

Some one may say that this field is already occupied by the various local ministerial associations. But anyone who has had experience will see that work such as I have outlined is not and cannot be done in the ordinary ministerial associations. Anyone who has attended these Monday-meetings knows how pleasant but—so far as serious study is concerned—how very profitless they are. If a really suggestive and scholarly paper on some important Biblical or theological topic is read—a very rare thing—the discussion is so Mondayish and desultory that no permanent advance in Biblical knowledge is made. Such, indeed, must be the case in associations or societies composed of men who for the most part are neither students nor scholars, unacquainted with the methods of Biblical study, and but little interested in the great questions raised by modern Biblical scholarship.

One of the main obstacles in the way of organization of such a Club as I suggest is one of time. This is a serious one for overwrought city ministers, especially, to face. Still I feel confident that if real and important work can be accomplished time will be found by those interested. I mentioned Toronto as the headquarters because it would be necessary to have a few specialists, around whom the other members would gather and who could give direction to discussion.

What I ask now is that ministers who are in sympathy with what I have suggested, correspond with myself, sending short open letters on the subject for publication in the October number of the MONTHLY. The fullest discussion is desirable.

Knox College, Toronto.

J. A. MACDONALD.

THE LITERARY SOCIETY.

IN the March number of KNOX COLLEGE MONTHLY there appeared an open letter, written, from Edinburgh, by the Editor, and advocating certain radical changes in the Metaphysical and Literary Society of Knox College. Unfortunately the letter appeared near the close of the session, and at a time when the students were busy with examination work, and, therefore, did not awaken that discussion which, in my judgment, should have followed a proposal of such a character. Now, that the students are preparing to return to college, and the work of a new college year about to begin, it seems proper to call attention to Mr

Macdonald's letter, and to ask the present generation of students, and also those who in former years were active members of the Literary Society, to give to this proposal due consideration, that, if possible, something may be done to make the Society more efficient, more productive of good to the members, and a greater source of strength to the College.

For myself I wish to say that, throughout my whole college course, I was an active and sympathetic member of the Society, and was often one of the very few who were usually on hand to form the quorum. I know how often even the truest and most loyal friends despaired of making the ordinary meetings sufficiently remunerative in benefit and instruction to warrant regular attendance. I have a clear recollection of the changes in the constitution which, like the specialties at a fair, were intended to add interest to the meetings, and give to the association a new lease of life. But on reviewing the whole question from the vantage-ground of after-life, I can see that, while the time spent at these weekly meetings was not altogether wasted, it was not as well spent as it might have been, nor as it should have been by a student for the ministry. And I can see, as was pointed out in the open letter referred to, that the weakness of the Society was not so much one of administration as of organization. As one who knew something of the patient and unwearied faithfulness of several committees, I can say that, under the circumstances, the Society could scarcely have been more efficiently managed. With the restrictions of the constitution no committee could give to the ordinary meetings of the Society a fresh and interesting programme every week, such as would attract serious students of theology. The range of subjects for discussion was very narrow, as a glance over the records of the Society will show, and these subjects were for the most part of almost no interest to the members, except as offering a little scope for mental gymnastics. Debates were arranged and carried on, not because there was truth to be ascertained, or because strong convictions were held on the subject, but for the sake of practice in debate, or for the still baser purpose of killing time. Experience has convinced me that Mr. Macdonald was true to facts in finding the cause of failure, as far as there has been failure, in the professed aim and constitution of the Society.

The earlier members will remember the organization of the Society many years ago, supplanting, as it did, the two societies, the Literary and the Philosophical (I think these were the names), which for several years previous had existed. That the Knox College society was fashioned after the pattern of the Literary and Scientific Society of University

College will be seen on comparing their constitutions. This was natural, because the framers of the Knox College constitution were trained in the University society, and brought with them the notions and methods there learned. To this should be added, perhaps, the laudable purpose of giving junior students exercise in composition and in public reading and speaking.

I do not say that the Society did not render valuable services in filling up what was lacking in the furnishings of some students in those early years, or that it did not, on the whole, serve a good purpose. What is alleged is that in the changed circumstances in which the College finds itself to-day, the Society does not do the work which needs to be done, and which the leading society in Knox College should do. In the opinion of many, whose opinion on such matters is entitled to respect, students during their Arts or Preparatory course should be active members of the University society, and that in Knox College the chief association should be of a more theological character. It does seem strange that a society of theological students, in a great theological college, should be prevented by their constitution from discussing theological problems, and it does seem reasonable to ask that University students take advantage of the opportunities offered by the University Literary and Scientific Society, or, at all events, that the Knox College society be reconstructed so as to admit of the discussion of the problems in religion and theology which as ministers we are brought face to face with every day.

I do not suggest amendments or changes, but only that amendments, changes or complete reconstruction be made. I leave it to those who have had experience in theological societies in other colleges to carry on the discussion and suggest lines along which such a society should work. There are many other graduates who are deeply interested in the Literary Society and who are in earnest in desiring to make it more useful than it was in their college days. If these would send short open letters to the Editor, I am sure, judging from his own letter of March last, he would give them deserving consideration, and, to such as brought any new light or suggestion, space in an early issue of the MONTHLY. The students will doubtless consider the proposal at their meetings, and will be much helped by the wise and sympathetic advice of their brethren in the ministry.

A GRADUATE.

Here and Away.

COLLEGE opens on Wednesday, October 2nd.

REV. DR. MACLAREN will deliver the opening lecture, and in it will discuss the question of organic Church union.

THE signs of the times indicate a large attendance of students next session. There will be no vacant rooms in the residence.

OUR good old friend, Rev. Dr. J. Monro Gibson, of London, is announced to preach in Toronto, on October 6th. Efforts are being made to have him present at the opening of College and at the alumni meeting. He would be given a right hearty welcome to his *alma mater*.

HERE AND AWAY received a postal card the other day with the following request:—

DRAWER 2607, TORONTO.

MY DEAR SIR,—*Would you kindly forward your Annual Subscription of \$..... towards the "Goforth Fund," as soon after September 15th as convenient. Yours truly,*

WM. BURNS, Treas.

Sept. 3rd, 1884.

The amount entered in the blank space made us catch our breath. Then we longed for some good angel to visit unpaid subscribers and jog their memories. We might make bricks without straw, but they would have no market value, and so if we make an assignment in favor of this "Goforth Fund," the blame will rest with those whose MONTHLY subscriptions, due in May last, are still unpaid. This piece of pleasantry may also remind subscribers to the "Goforth Fund" of their obligations.

JUST as the gloomy air of the last paragraph was settling down, marrow-chilling and dull, the postman threw in a letter, dated "Linch- ing, China, July 20th," and signed "Donald." Pull up the window blinds; the sun is shining; the birds are singing; it is a delightful morning. The fog has all cleared away, and we can see all the way to China, and hear MacGillivray shout for joy at the sight of a new number of the MONTHLY. He prays that we "may long be spared to conduct it to higher and higher degrees of excellence"—and by the kind help of a thousand subscribers his prayer will be answered. He also promises to contribute regularly to its pages, and sends an article by the same mail. If there were a few more men like Donald MacGillivray in this world, even an editor's life would have a few glints of sunshine, and might be worth living.

IN this issue is a sensible open letter from Mr. Tibb to the Alumni of Knox College. A policy is just what is wanted. There is materia

enough about to make a good platform for the Alumni Association if it were only dressed and matched. Mr. Tibb has pulled a few planks out of the pile and put them in the drying kiln. When properly seasoned a platform may be built strong and capacious enough for the whole Association.

But the furnace will require to be hot if the twisted and knotty question of the Preparatory Department is to be straightened out. We are quite with those who favor a full Arts course for all but "special cases," and who would limit the meaning of "special." Many a young man is the victim of zeal without knowledge and needs direction from the gentle but firm hand of authority. The Alumni might consider this whole question and give their representatives instructions.

This Department casts in its lot with those who advocate a longer college session. Cramming and superficiality is the inevitable result of short terms. It is simply impossible for any student to cover the ever widening field of theological study, in the few months at present allotted to it, and not be guilty of suicide. Without greatly interfering with Home Mission work the month of April might be added to the college year, and, considering the work to be done, a seven month's session of less than six month's college work is still too short. Our purpose holds to agitate this question until a decisive answer is given.

By the time this reaches the majority of readers the appointment of a successor to Prof. Young, in Toronto University, will in all probability have been made. Twenty-two candidates have applied; less than a half dozen Canadians, four or five from Britain, the rest Americans. The names of a few are known beyond the walls of their respective colleges, but the longest part of the ladder of fame is before the majority. Among them all, there is no man who is really distinguished. The successful candidate may make a name for himself in Toronto, as his predecessor did.

ONE of our hot weather surprises, one of the little things that break the monotony in our sanctum, was the cards of J. N. Elliott and Miss Mabel Tennant. We heard the "sough" of it some time ago but still it found us unprepared. Then the thought came—But it was not a thought that made proofs and "copy," piles of papers and books, a large waste basket and a few prints seem more home-like. However, we stand by our principles—a man sometimes finds himself with little left but his principles—we stand by our principles which go dead against complications of this sort during one's college course. One thing at a time, gentlemen. Seek first a college diploma. There are exceptions, but you are not among them. Mr. and Mrs. Elliott have gone to Princeton where J. N. purposes completing his college course. We wish them as much happiness as those enjoy whose example they have followed.

WHATEVER may be our opinions on matrimonial questions, there is another question raised about which we hold quite decided views, viz: Should Canadian students leave their own colleges and take their ordinary theological courses abroad? We hold that loyalty to his own Church, which has done so much for him, and to the colleges of his Church,

and to his native land, is a duty, the claims of which are not always met by the plea of supposed advantages to be gained abroad. We make no reference to individual cases, but to the principle, which seems disloyal. Besides, foreign birds have pretty feathers. We venture to say, that the theological course in Knox College will compare favorably with that in Princeton, or Union, or Edinburgh. In these and other great colleges, that look perfect at a distance, are to be found as much antiquated fossilized mediocrity as in any college in Canada. When you take out of the eight great colleges in Scotland—with their army of professors—Davidson, Dods, Flint, Bruce, and, perhaps, Salmond and Milligan, lecturing is a very humdrum affair. They have more than one who is inferior to the poorest apology for a professor the Canadian Church can show.

But though we speak thus, we would not be understood as saying that the course in Knox College cannot be greatly improved, and that addition, subtraction, multiplication and division would not produce a better total. The interests of the Church and her ministry must ever be considered as paramount to all other interests. Unless the College is kept abreast of the age some of our best students will be lost to the Church, and the College itself will suffer loss. Knox College should be more strongly equipped, and a policy of caution and hesitancy on the part of the Senate may not be the best. It should be that no Canadian student would go to a foreign college except for post-graduate study.

THE Acts and Proceedings of the Fifteenth General Assembly, quite a large volume, has been issued, and is now being distributed. If the size of the Report indicates the extent of our Church's work, considerable advance has been made during the past year. But if the printing arrangements explain the increase in size of the Report, it is not so much a matter for congratulation. From an artistic point of view the work is not a success. The parts printed by the different establishments may be satisfactory, but when bound together they do not make a very happy combination. The variety of paper used gives the Report the appearance of a paper manufacturer's sample book. If it is necessary to distribute the printing contracts, some provision should be made for uniformity of paper. Of course these are minor points; we leave the more important ones, the many excellencies of the Report, to be found out by those who are interested in the different departments of Church work. It is to be regretted that so few ministers and office-bearers make the Acts and Proceedings a subject of examination and study. Ministers in search of sermon-matter, would find it more fruitful than Dr. Pierson's "Second Probation" texts.

WHAT a ring of sterling worth there is about Dr. Alexander Whyte's address at the induction of Professor Marcus Dods! We can imagine the almost savage earnestness with which he would say: "Fathers and brethren, I greatly rejoice that, under a style that almost surpasses John Foster's own for classical purity, for unconventional and uncanonical phraseology, our new Professor holds with a firm and an increasing tenacity the everlasting essentials of the Apostolic, Calvinistic, and

evangelical faith." Coming from such a staunch old Puritan, words like these should calm our fears about Dr. Dods.

Here is another sentence that was doubtless uttered with much emphasis and which we would underline for the benefit of Canadian students. He is telling what will be expected from Dr. Dods: *We expect, and demand, that he will show all his students his secret. We expect also that he shall teach his classes something of his own open and opulent mind. We expect and insist that he will tell them that, as preachers, they will soon run dry, and will become a clog on the true progress of their Church, unless to old age they are still open to truth, and always learning; growing all their days in breaath and in grasp of mind, as also in docility of heart; telling them that whatever their mental gifts may be, that the usual qualities of industry, intelligence, love of truth, and openness to admit it will keep any minister from ever becoming old or superannuated.*

Dr. Whyte believes "it is one of the dangers of our Church, that so many weak minds, as soon as they come to have any vital connection with true religion, immediately think that they are called to be ministers," and says that, after presbyteries, examination boards and Senatuses have done their best "to weed his class of all incompetent and indolent men, Dr. Dods will still find that the love for serious study, and the ability to grapple with the serious questions that continually arise in such a class is not common even among our best students." It is of the Free Church of Scotland and her students that Dr. Whyte is speaking. But the same danger is threatening our Canadian Church, with this aggravation, that the "weeding out of incompetent and indolent men" is scarcely attempted. Any proposition to "weed" is silenced by some text of Scripture, like "not by might nor by power," or "the foolish things shall confound the wise." And it is perfectly true that when "the foolish things" appear at examination, or, in after years, on the probationers' list, the wisest examiners and committees are confounded.

We cannot resist the impulse to give another sentence from Dr. Whyte's address for the benefit of our good old friend Dr. Brookes, of St. Louis, and his genial little magazine. Listen, Doctor! You know you have advertised Marcus Dods as extensively as your voice and pen could send his name, and you have won great glory to yourself and have been lionized by some good and pious audiences. You will confess to the mild charge of blowing soap bubbles of orthodoxy for their entertainment. And, truth to tell, you are an expert at the business. But remember, good Doctor, there is an element of danger even in "blowing." Take this fine new "Dods Bubble" that you have patented, and exhibited to the infinite delight of the saucer faced crowd. What if, when you are blowing your very best, your lungs strained, every muscle stretched, your cheeks distended like two hemispheres of a cocoa-nut, and the audience fairly frantic with excitement—what if some adventurous and irreverent unbeliever should steal up and prick your gigantic bubble with the fine point of truth? What a sorry picture you would present! And how the audience would howl you off the stage! Now,

Doctor, hear what the minister of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, says. You know Whyte, or you have heard of him; and you know that, for orthodoxy, even you cannot show a better certificate; you know that he has forgotten more about Dods and his Church than you and all the Conference Hill speakers ever heard of; and you know that it would be a very unsafe thing for you to call him any of the hard names you apply to other respectable brethren. You know all this, Doctor. Now, read Dr. Whyte's address and then reckon how small a man must be who can deliberately and repeatedly abuse and malign such a man of God and slander and vilify such a noble Church. Do you think such a man would be visible to the naked eye?

Here are a few pregnant sentences: "The task the New Testament exegete is set to do in our day, and the methods and instruments he must apply to fulfil his task, all demand a mind of the first order, and of a strength and an equipment that very few among us can possess. Dr. Dods, by his Masters' liberality to him, and by his splendid loyalty to his Master's trust, possesses that mind, and its fit preparation, and the General Assembly has only *followed her Master's dear leading* in taking the step she has taken. . . . It would be unpardonable blindness to fine work, laboriously and skilfully executed, had we passed by our hard-working brother. . . . I, for one, am proud that the Free Church has had the insight to see and the courage to acknowledge Dr. Dods' essential, if sometimes unconventional, loyalty to evangelical truth. . . . Men who love neither his Church nor the truth he has been raised up to teach, are at present crowding round our friend, and making him their champion and their boast. Our new Professor is broad; but his breadth is not theirs any more than his depth. His breadth goes out on a plane as much higher than theirs as his depth goes down deeper than theirs. But because his studies and his style have sometimes led him to say some things that sounded to their ears not unlike their own unhallowed language about Holy Scripture, they have held him up as their ally and their champion. A passing misunderstanding also with some of his own brethren has, for the moment, made Dr. Dods an immensely popular man in quarters where popularity and patronage must be a sufficient chastisement and a real humiliation. But as time goes on and his true and untarnished loyalty to his Church, her Scriptures, and her Standards comes more clearly out, may we not hope that the authority of his judgment and the attractiveness of his character may yet win over many of such men also to the knowledge and the love of the truth?"