

... THE ...

Reformed Presbyterian Witness.

"Ye are my Witnesses, saith the Lord."—*Isaiah.*

"The truth I speak. impugn it whoso list."—*John Knox.*

MAY, 1904.

THE SCOTTISH EDUCATION BILL.

THE promised Bill for Scotland has at last appeared, and in many respects it has commended itself to the favourable opinion of the community. In no country are the advantages of education more appreciated than in Scotland, and the Scottish people are ready to hail with gladness any measure that gives good promise for the education and advancement of their children. It must be thankfully acknowledged that in various directions the Bill that has just been introduced into Parliament will be beneficial to the educational interests of the country. There is one respect, however, in which the Bill is disappointing. To be a Scottish Bill it, like some other Scottish Bills, betrays too much of the English leaven. The hands are Esau's, the voice is Jacob's. It is marked by one feature that is a palpable blot on its character, a feature that no Prime Minister or Secretary for Scotland who is a Scotsman should have sent to the Northern part of the kingdom with his imprimatur. That feature is that it makes provision permissively for denominational, or, in other words, for ritualistic and Romish teaching in Scotland. In short, one part of the measure is a covert, but distinct concession to Rome. It was feared by some, after the Education Bill for England appeared, that the same policy that dictated it would find a place in the Scottish measure. And yet it was thought, after the manner in which that measure had been received, and the just indignation which it had aroused in every part of the country, that the Government would surely not be so unwise as to commit the same blunder again. And in

one sense neither it has been. But it has changed, not its principle or its policy, only its method. It seems resolved to carry out the same principle, but less openly, to follow up the same policy, but more warily. The English Bill, it is admitted on all hands, was a distinct concession to Romanism; in it the Government plainly gave itself away, for, unblushingly, it handed over the education of the rising generation to the control of the Romanising clergy in the country. The Scottish measure is less bold and compromising, but it proposes to give the School Boards the power to do what the Government had not the courage to determine at first hand. The case stands thus:—Instead of deciding at headquarters that Romish schools should be rate-supported, the Bill proposes that School Boards shall have the power to give them rate-aid if they will. Government manifestly would like to see this thing done, but the responsibility of doing it, and the odium (which they dread) of doing it, they would leave on the School Boards.

At present Roman Catholic schools are not under the control of the Boards, and accordingly they receive no support from the rates, which are levied by the Boards. As the School Boards have no voice in their management, in the appointment of their teachers, in the direction of their work, so they give them none of their money. These schools are inspected by the Government Inspectors, and they receive Government grants, but they are wholly independent of the local Boards. But by this new Bill the School Boards are, if they choose to do it, to be empowered to help such institutions as are within their boundaries, whether they are managed by them or not. The Secretary for Scotland said, in introducing the Bill, that he did not shrink from leaving it to School Boards, on such conditions as they liked, to help out of the rates Roman Catholic and other sectarian educational establishments in the country. Should this provision in the measure become law, it will mean that the Protestants of Scotland will be compelled, should any School Board so decide, to pay rates for the support of the Roman Catholic religion in a large number of private venture schools. It so happens that already there is a large number of convent and monastic schools in Scotland. There will soon be more of them if this Bill be passed. There is at present in our country a crowd of teachers in the shape of monks and nuns, recently landed on our shores, driven from France—they had to leave their country for their country's good, and they

are ready to step into such work as soon as the emoluments are made sure. It may, therefore, be taken for granted that these schools will rapidly increase, and this Bill opens up the way for all of them being supported from the rates. The measure, therefore, means, in this part of it, practically a fresh endowment of Rome. The Church of Rome has, in a matter of this kind, the wisdom of the men of the world who are wise in their generation. And while there are some details in this Bill which Romanists will keenly resist, such as the abolition of the cumulative vote, they will welcome, with open arms, a measure so favourable to all their plans.

One fatal defect of the English Bill is repeated in this Bill, it surrenders the principle of popular control. The receiving of rate-aid may be independent of School Board management. We do not suppose that Romanists will for a moment submit to have their schools managed, or controlled, or inspected by School Boards chosen by the community, but they will seek to obtain the School Board's money all the same. And the Bill encourages this. It proposes to empower the Boards, if so minded, to hand over to them the people's money, without insisting on the people's control. Should such a Bill, as it now stands, pass, it will be another backward step for our country—for a Romeward step is a backward step. Scotland will have to fight as bitter a fight as the Nonconformists of England and Wales have had to fight against Rome's advancing forces. Hitherto Popery has been supported by the nation from the national funds—which is bad enough—but by this new measure the members of the community will be liable to be called on, whether they will or not, to support the Church of Rome directly out of their own pockets.

Romanists, of course, will urge that, as they contribute to the rates, they have a right to assistance from the rates; but, in such case, they must place their schools under the control of those who pay the rates. At the present time Romanists are found, thanks to the cumulative vote, in many School Boards, sharing in the management of schools which they forbid their own children to enter; and nothing would please them better than to be allowed to continue such joint control, and, at the same time, receive liberal support from the rates for schools that are *exclusively* managed by themselves. This is the fly in the ointment of Mr. Graham Murray's Bill; and it is hoped that the Protestant sentiment of the country will eliminate this proposal from the measure.

"THY WILL BE DONE."

By Professor LYND, D.D.

It is difficult for us to see behind law and the general principles and maxims by which our lives are ordered by a personal ruler. There are laws that we know. There are those who execute them, from judges and sheriffs down to clerks in the poor-rate collector's office. And we know that it is undesirable to put ourselves in opposition to the laws of the land. And we never think of one person of whose will these laws are the expression. If we were in the position of the savage, whose chief utters his command and enforces obedience with a club, we should have less difficulty in realising that law was the expression of the mind and will of a person. We consider that our political system is a great advance on that of the African tribe. And very properly. But our familiarity with law, as something abstract, has the effect of making it hard for us to realise that moral law is more than a wisely devised code of moral conduct; that it is the expression of the mind and will of one supreme person. Yet that is what it is. It is not a set of conclusions to which the commonsense of most has attained. It is the expression of infinite wisdom and goodness speaking with supreme authority. Rather it is the revealed will of the infinitely wise and good God, whose authority is over all.

This view the Scriptures impress upon us, unless our eyes are closed and our ears deaf to their teaching. The first and great commandment we are taught is love, not to order and just principle and abstract right, but to a living and supreme person—the Lord thy God. When the law was given at Sinai, it was prefaced with the declaration, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." And our Lord Jesus Christ makes claim upon His disciples, not just that they should love the right and do the just and kind, but that they love Him and keep His commandments. We find all through Scripture this voice calling on us to recognise the personality of the lawgiver, and our responsibility to Him directly; and teaching us clearly that violation of His law is dishonour to His person. This is one of those teachings which is always needed, and never more so than when social life becomes complex, as it is in all civilised countries; and when the inevitable way of looking at human laws moves us to look at divine laws in the same way—as merely so many wise and suitable regulations which good judgment and regard for consequences should move us to observe; and when we are in danger of losing sense of relation to the person of God, sense of honour due to Him, the sense that in all our actions it is a question between His will and our own, between honouring Him and dishonouring Him.

Now, there is one exercise prescribed for us, one privilege given us, the performance and use of which combine with the whole teaching of Scripture to keep alive the sense of the divine personality, and our own immediate relation to a personal God. That is the exercise and privilege of prayer. He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is the rewarder of them that seek Him. When we pray we speak to God, we lay hold on Him as the living God, in such relation to us that He hears, that He judges, that He meets us and imparts to us of His goodwill what we require. It is to Him, and not to any personification of abstract principles, we pay homage in prayer. It is not the favour of the nature of things that we invoke, but the love of our Father which is in heaven. Our confessions are acknowledgments of dishonour done to Him, of rebellion against Him, of slighting gifts that come from His hand. We see this implied in the prayer which our Lord taught His disciples. In the petition, "Thy will be done," we see a bringing of all that is worthy, just, upright, dutiful, into one lofty and more potent conception—*THY WILL*. Let us consider the will of God, and our own duty in the presence of it.

First. All that is good and true and just, all that is dutiful and obligatory is summed up for us in "Thy will be done." We speak of the supremacy of right, we hear of a power that makes for righteousness; we speak of the voice of duty, and the obligation to obey that voice before and above all other voices. All these are embraced for us in the will of God. And, regarded as the will of God, the authority and obligation of these is not diminished, but heightened. I have heard a member of Parliament say—"You owe certain duties to Society, and if you don't fulfil these duties Society will take a birch rod to you." True enough. But was there not a vagueness about the conception? Was it sufficiently plain and imperative? Is the standard of Society's expectations invariable? Is it sufficiently broad and high? Does it apply the birch rod always with justice and wisdom? Society applied its birch rod in the most literal fashion to the backs of Paul and Silas, because they did not answer to its demands in Philippi. Society applied the birch rod to Paul's Master in the shape of the scourge and cross because He did not meet its demands. Society has been proved in these cases to have been utterly wrong, and its birch rod was the instrument of gross injustice and crime. And in thousands of cases besides. Conceptions of duty and right must be brought to some other standard than that of the sense of the community. There is one standard—the *will of God*. And all that is just and upright, honourable and dutiful, good and kind, is so because it answers to the will of God.

Whence comes a true sense of what is right and dutiful, and of what is wrong, unjust, destructive? Is it not from this will of God? Whence comes the sanction for the application of Society's

birch rod to those who deserve it, and for deserved cause, but from the will of God? For Society, for the individual, the standard of conduct, the basis of duty, is in the will of God as He has made it known to men. Right and justice, mercy and kindness, have unimpregnable sanction, because they are just the will of God. "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good." So when we pray for the triumph of righteousness, it is that the will of God may be done in earth as in heaven. When we teach and warn and exhort against evil in any of its multitudinous forms it is that the will of God may be accepted, and the life conformed to it. When we set before ourselves and others the attractions or the rewards of virtue, we present what that good and acceptable and perfect will of the Lord is. Absolutely supreme, absolutely perfect, the fountain of all duty, the guide of all conduct, is the will of God.

Second. This being so, what is to be done in view of the revelation of that will? It is to be accepted, and conformity to it is to be sought and striven after. We are to seek to know it and submit our own wills to it.

It might be thought that it is easy enough to know the will of God. It is revealed to us plainly enough in commandment, promise, threatening, example, and warning. Yes, we are not straitened in Him. He has made it clear. But we are straitened in ourselves. And that not more from want of capacity to know than from want of heart—unwillingness to know. Many of the Jews who heard and saw John the Baptist and Jesus Christ learned nothing from them—learned but little from the Scriptures, which some of them made a study of. What prevented them? Their prejudices, their unwillingness to know. Indifference often stands in the way of knowing, but stronger than indifference is the self-willed heart. The course of life has in some particular been dictated by selfishness. Let the law of God be presented on that subject, and the life that has been opposed to it in action refuses to accept it. The judgment refuses to be convinced. With our acknowledgment of the Scriptures as the Word of God, and the rule of faith and practice, there are points on which most of us refuse to know the will of the Lord. We desire not the knowledge of the Highest. Is that consistent with the prayer, "Thy will be done." The heart is deceitful and desperately wicked, who can know it? Never prophet, or Apostle, or pastor, or teacher yet proclaimed the will of God but there were those who set their necks and would not hearken; because they had been following a course of their own and were determined to follow it. "We will go into Egypt," said the men who had asked Jeremiah to inquire of the Lord what they should do; and when told to dwell in the land of Judah, "We will bake cakes and offer them to the queen of heaven," said the men and their wives who were told to renounce their idolatries and worship God only. It is he who wills to do the doctrine that knows. "Lord have mercy upon us and incline our hearts to keep this law" should be the earnest response of every

heart to every jot and tittle of the revealed will of God. When He says, "Seek ye My face," the answer of the heart should be, "Thy face, above all things, Lord, will I seek."

When *known*, the will of God is to be *done*. It is not "Thy will be revealed," but "*done*." It is a rule for our *practice* as well as for our faith. It is not to be ignored as if we had it not, nor contravened as though the doing of it were a matter which we were at liberty to decide for ourselves without any blame attaching if we decided not to do it. It is not to be postponed, as if it were a grievous burden, the taking up of which might be deferred to a more convenient season. It is not to be split up or divided into sections, some of which might be imperative, while others may be relegated to the obedience of those whose inclinations are toward such precepts, or whose circumstances are more favourable. What means this prayer on the lips of any particular man? Does it not mean, Thy will, Thy whole will as it relates to me, be done by me, done by me now and always? Thy will, in the circumstances in which Thou hast placed me, with the talents Thou hast given me, with the opportunities Thou bestowest upon me, with the calls Thou makest upon me. Thy will be done by me first, and by all men everywhere. Surely, as we pray this prayer, we should make the inquiry, Lord, what wilt Thou have *me to do*?

"But, oh, this is so difficult." May not the difficulty arise hence, that we begin at the wrong point to try to do the will of God? There is such a thing in life's common work as beginning a job at the wrong end. And it means double labour, and vexation, and unsatisfactory work. Luther began at the wrong end when he sought to appease God and render himself acceptable to Him by works of righteousness. And after vain and disappointing toil he found the right end when he was led to rest in Jesus Christ for forgiveness and acceptance. This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent. This is the will of the Father, that we should believe on the Son and be one with Him; and receive the Holy Spirit, and love Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. Then His commandments will not be grievous. Then, with hearts enlarged by faith and love, we shall run in the way of His precepts. Then, loving the Author of the law, we shall love the law of God. Then, in measure, at least, we shall be able to say, with all humility, but in all sincerity, "I love Thy law." Then, more deeply conscious than ever of shortcomings, knowing this is the will of God, even our sanctification, we shall work out our salvation with fear and trembling. And knowing, too, that it is not the will of God that any should perish, but that all should turn to Him and live, we shall, as far as in us lies, seek that others shall know the will of God, and shall betake themselves to His mercy, and, participating therein, shall glorify His name by walking in His ordinances and commandments blamelessly.

But there may come, probably will come, times when, if we

pray this prayer, it will be with the emphasis on the first word of it, *Thy* will be done. Not mine, but Thine. Thus He prayed in Gethsemane who taught His disciples this prayer. There come experiences into our lives from which flesh and blood shrink. We are bound and carried whither we would not. Disappointment clouds our sky. What we had laboured and hoped for comes not. Some prize that we strove for has eluded our grasp and fallen into other hands. An unforeseen turn in business, or the dishonesty or incompetence of some in whom we trusted, has brought serious loss. Or we watch with deepening anxiety and fearful and heavy hearts the illness of some loved one. We pray for life to be spared. But it is ordered otherwise. Death closes the scene. The light of the home has gone out. Or weary months of weakness and pain are our portion. Health, strength are craved, the best human skill is summoned to the conflict with disease. Then the prayer that was Christ's in Gethsemane lies waiting us to take up and use. Not *my* will, but *Thy* will be done. Hard it is, most of us know. "Thy breaking waves pass over me, yea, and Thy billows all," has been our plaint more than once. We must submit, we hear some say, in such an hour. Ah, is that the same as "Thy will be done?" There may be the submission to the inevitable, as the fatalist bows before what is to be and cannot be helped. And there may be that submission which bows humbly and uncomplainingly, even amid the deepest grief, to the ordering of God as infinitely wise and righteous—that submission to which angels come and minister, and which finds a deep and solemn peace in the knowledge that it is the will of the heavenly Father. We see it in the afflicted man of Uz, "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord." We see it in Richard Cameron's father when to him in his prison were presented the hands of the son who lived praying and preaching, and fell on Airmoss praying and fighting. "Yes, I know them," he said, amid his tears. "They are my son's, my own dear son's; it is the Lord, good is the will of the Lord, who cannot wrong me nor mine, but has made goodness and mercy to follow us all the days of our lives."

But note this; they who have been able to speak thus, to pray in such cases "*Thy* will be done," are they who have prayed in other circumstances "*Thy* will be done," and have sought that the will of God should be wrought in them and by them. Richard Cameron's father is in prison for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ. He has been doing and bearing the will of God heretofore. Job was a perfect and upright man, one that feared God and eschewed evil. Our Lord had come not to do His own will, but the will of the Father who sent Him, and He did always the things that pleased Him. We cannot *begin* with "*Thy* will be done" when that will means agony of body and laceration of heart; we have been praying before, and seeking that the prayer should be fulfilled, "*Thy* will be done." If thou

hast run with the footmen and they have wearied thee, or if thou hast shrunk from the race altogether, how wilt thou contend with horses? And if in the land of peace the will of God has been grievous, and a burden not to be borne, what wilt thou do in the swelling of Jordan? For the dark days and the stormy that will in all probability come, and for the peace of God that even now will keep heart and mind, and be a peace that passeth all understanding, we ought to seek the peace of God now—that peace that is the portion of those justified by faith in Christ. For the honour of God and the attainment of the chiefest end, let us seek that the will of God be known and embraced in its fulness, that it be done in us and by us, as children of the heavenly Father. Then, come what may, ours will be the calm, triumphant spirit that shall be able to say, “The will of the Lord be done.”



ANTIOCH MISSION BUILDINGS.

By Rev. JAMES MARTIN, M.A., M.D.

[At a meeting of the Foreign Mission Committee of the Scottish R.P. Synod, held in Glasgow on the 25th March, the following statement from Rev. Dr. Martin was laid on the table and considered. The statement explains itself, and presents in the clearest manner the situation at Antioch in the matter of mission buildings. The Scottish and Irish Committees have both agreed that Dr. Martin should proceed at once to endeavour to obtain a permit. Should it be obtained, an appeal will be made to both Churches for funds to erect the needed premises—an appeal that is sure to meet with a hearty response.]

Some twenty-five years ago our Church resolved to provide her Mission in Antioch with a meeting-house and school buildings. It was for these purposes that the land, here held by us, was purchased. A permit to build was duly obtained from the municipality of Antioch. It may be in the memory of some of you that when we began building operations soldiers were sent to stop the workmen, and that the municipality intimated to us that a new law had been promulgated in the empire forbidding any such buildings to be erected without an imperial *Firman* given by the Sultan himself.

As explained by the British Consul at Aleppo, of that day, in writing to his Government in London, this new law was made in consequence of trespasses by the Popish Missionaries at Aleppo, which had provoked the Turkish Government to great wrath. Then we made application for a *Firman*. But although we prosecuted this with the persistent aid of the British Embassy for about twenty-four months, we failed to obtain the *Firman*,

and were obliged to give up the obviously hopeless effort. After this failure to obtain leave to erect school buildings, &c., I sought and received a permit to erect a residence for myself. In so doing I broadened a little the plan of one-half of the house, so as to give us a preaching-room. And this is the only mission building, up till the present, obtained by us. We had, last year, some three hundred pupils in our mission schools in Antioch. About half of these were boys and half of them girls. And the numbers this year are not far short of what they were last year. The accommodation we are able to find for these schools by hiring, as we have hitherto had to do, an Antioch dwelling house, meets neither the requirements of the children's health nor, indeed, the claims of decency. In a room fifteen feet by fourteen we sometimes have sixty to seventy children; and the room very ill-ventilated and ill-lighted. As regards the sanitary provision, it is shamefully inadequate.

Consul Barnham, the present British Consul at Aleppo, aware of the purpose for which our land was bought, and of my hope that we might yet realise our purpose of building on it a meeting-house and schools, kept this in mind when the rare opportunity for extending our privileges was afforded by the new and enlarged demands on behalf of her missions and missionaries lately successfully imposed by France upon the Turkish Government (namely, after France had temporarily occupied Mitylene); and when the British Government demanded a corresponding extension of privileges for British missions and missionaries.

Mr. Barnham first tried to get, direct from Constantinople, permission for us to build when we might wish to do so. That he failed in this I am not surprised, seeing the British Ambassador there is a Romanist. Not, however, giving up pursuit of his kind purpose, Consul Barnham then telegraphed for me to come up to Aleppo. Receiving this telegram on the 29th December, I set out for Aleppo on the 30th. Consul Barnham obtained from the Governor-General a very favourable arrangement, by which a high official, who is very friendly to Consul Barnham and also to British interests, was charged with the attention to this matter and to us in respect to it. To this official Consul Barnham kindly introduced me. The official conversed with the Consul and me upon the matter, and he gave me particulars, which I noted down, of the terms of petition for leave to build a meeting-house and schools, and of the data to be therein included. This official later visited me, and I am to expect him as my guest when he visits Antioch, as he purposes soon to do. I told Consul Barnham, however, that I could not, of course, say anything definite as to undertaking building operations before consulting our Mission Board. The Consul, believing the present time specially favourable, and that we ought to embrace the rare opportunity, advised me to consult the Board without delay. Accordingly, I hereby write to ask the Board to take this matter into consideration, and

to inform me whether they are willing to erect a meeting-house and school buildings in Antioch for the mission.

I have mentioned reasons why school buildings are urgently needed. And, as reasons showing that we also need a meeting-house, I would add that our preaching-room is unable to receive the numbers who come to hear on certain occasions, especially on Communion Sabbaths, and that this has been the case for years past. As to what might be the cost of such buildings, I have been giving that question careful consideration. And I have taken into consultation thereon our Vice-Consul here, who has himself lately erected some considerable buildings; and with him one of our school teachers, who was formerly a mason by trade. I first arrived at £1150 (eleven hundred and fifty pounds) as the probable cost. But this was on the assumption that the building work would be of the same kind as that of the present mission building. When, however, we considered that meeting-house and schools are used only in the day time, ordinarily, and took into account the warmth of the Syrian day, I perceived that it would not be at all necessary to have either the walls or the window frames and shutters so expensively constructed as is desirable in the case of a missionary residence. The walls of this manse are faced all over with hewn stones, and the windows are made nearly as strong and as close-fitting as in a manse in the British Isles. But for the walls of a meeting-house and of school-houses here a less expensive fabric would well suffice; and hewn stones would not be needed, except for margins of doors and windows; and, likewise, the windows would be less expensively constructed as to wood-work. And I conclude that £850 (eight hundred and fifty pounds) would meet the whole cost; namely, say £330 for a meeting-house to accommodate some four hundred people, and £250 each for boys' and girls' school-houses. Be it observed that in Syria school buildings for boys and girls ought not to be under the same roof, but separate the one from the other.

In the year 1880 I built, on Mount Cassius, a little house in which to spend summer retirement to the mountains. Not only has it proved exceedingly commodious and satisfactory, but, in view of conditions, customs, and so forth here, I think that a house on the same plan, only wider, would be the most suitable design for a school-house in Antioch. It is built simply but strongly. It cost about £160. It has a central stairway, on either side of which is one room below and one above, making four good rooms in all. The house, indeed, contains five, and sometimes six, apartments; but this is by dividing one or two of those four rooms by partition or curtain. Each of the four rooms of my mountain house is about nineteen feet long (namely, from front to back of house), but only nine or ten feet in width. No hewn stones were used in the walls, but it is roofed with Marseilles tiles, and so it is as expensively roofed as meeting-house or school-house in Antioch would need to be. Our mission schools here, with simple

curriculum, but one thoroughly pervaded at every step with religious and missionary teaching, I consider of great importance, and our large number of pupils affords us a very desirable and precious opportunity. To see numbers who have come to attend our meetings obliged to turn away from the preaching-room door unable to find entrance is very painful. And hardly less so is our present inability safely or decently to accommodate the pupils who press into our mission schools. And I have forgotten to mention what is also a serious matter, that with the schools in a hired house in town, at a distance from the mission grounds and my residence, it is very inadequate oversight that it is possible for me to give, compared to the close observation of them which I could maintain if they were here on the mission grounds. The building ground sufficient in extent we have ready and awaiting use. Though lying waste, taxes have to be paid upon it as building ground. And the house hired in town for our schools costs us a rental of about £21 (twenty-one pounds sterling) a year, besides most of the large items for periodical repairs. Since the establishment of our mission in Antioch this rent, with the expense of the repairs, must have cost us considerably more than would build school-houses. Should the Board of Foreign Missions be pleased to proceed towards building here, I should like to present petition for permit to the Aleppo Government, through Consul Barnham, as soon as possible.

BEHIND THE LAST RAMPART.

By Rev. A. C. GREGG, B.A.

THE last rampart in affliction is our Lord's word:—"Let not your heart be troubled; believe in God, believe also in Me." It is the last and the best and the impregnable defence. I sometimes think we are too severe in our feeling towards those eleven sorrowing men who were about to be deprived of the presence of their dear Master. We make too little of their distress. We see from the sequel of events that all their fear and commotion were superfluous, and we are inclined to be impatient with them. Our own troubles, we think, are so piercingly real, and our own sorrows so fully justified, that we cannot sympathise with those whose very trials were their triumph, whose very loss was their glorious and eternal gain. But Christ did not make light of their fears. To His eyes their hearts were truly pained, as indeed they were. No one knew better than He how groundless were their apprehensions, but no one knew better than He how sore and sad the heart can be over things which seem to be against us, while they are really for us. Jacob was not justified

in saying, "All these things are against me," but his distress was none the less genuine for all that. It is all one, so far as the fear goes, whether the thing feared has or has not any existence. A child wakes up at night screaming that there is a wild beast running after it, when all is peace and safety, but the child's fright is as terrible and its little frame as shaken as if the horrid dream were true. Jesus saw the largeness and blackness of these men's fears, and He was moved with compassion towards them. They really loved Him, and they really keenly sorrowed when He told them He must leave them. He addressed Himself to their fears. Just as a loving mother will turn and calm the vision-haunted child, because she is filled with sympathy and love, so Jesus, in His love, turned the sweet flow of pledge, promise, and persuasion upon the disciples' troubled hearts. "I sought the Lord, and He answered me, and delivered me from all my fears."

Does it not go a great length in the way of comfort to us all to realise that our Saviour has His eye upon the troubles that are in our hearts without cause, as well as upon the things which are objective, absolute causes of trouble? It may be we vex ourselves for nought; it may be we make a mountain out of a mole-hill; yes, it may even be that what we deem our bitterest cross is actually our brightest crown, but that does not hinder our Lord from feeling for us and ministering to us. Our friends and neighbours may laugh at the dark, shadowy pictures we draw, and at the dismal future which we conjure up; but if it is no play to us, it is none to Jesus. We are sure to receive from Him a brotherly, priestly, heavenly sympathy.

The Redeemer does not take it that a troubled heart is a necessary and inevitable ingredient of our cup. That is what we are so apt to take for granted. We set it down that nothing else is to be expected, that it is the common lot of man, and that it is as useless to fight against fears and failings of the spirit as against the incoming tide or the gloomy approach of winter. Jesus lifts His voice and traverses this doctrine of despair through and through. "Let not your heart be troubled." It is quite another thing to say that there will be nothing to try our hearts. There will be. Christ Himself marks the distinction with clearness. "In the world ye shall have tribulation, *but* be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." Tribulation is not to annihilate good cheer. There is a difference between being driven before the storm and riding in the teeth of the storm. A seaworthy ship is not a ship which must never put out to sea, never catch a hurricane. It is a ship which will weather the hurricane. Christ is not for keeping His people out of storms, but He is for having them brave the storm and benefit from it. His word is:—Let not your heart be *thrown into panic*, tossed wildly about like a thing not capable of being master of itself. Let sorrow, loss, pain, defeat, darkness come into your life if it be

God's will; but let not your heart be torn from its anchor, let not your soul be the victim of hard circumstances. Even though your heart be assaulted, let it not surrender. Let it stand its ground.

This is fine counsel; but how to perform it? The fight is a good fight; but where is the weapon? How is my poor heart to make this gallant stand? Is it enough for Jesus to say, "Let not your heart be troubled?" No, it is not enough. But there is more:—"Believe in God, believe also in Me." To prevent dismay, disorder, and torpor from setting up their black reign in our heart, we are bidden to believe in God, to believe in Jesus. That is to say, we are to fall back within a line of defence, the last that remains for the human soul; trust in our Redeemer as God and Man, all-holy and all-loving. This is the great Physician's one remedy for our so smitten and so wounded hearts.

Now we might see God's reason for many of our trials, and recognise that it is a good and sufficient reason. Then we would not need, on that point, to fall back upon faith. Seeing, we would be satisfied. For instance, I am quite sure that the eleven *might* have known that it was necessary for Jesus to die. Their Scriptures said so, and Jesus Himself had said so. But they did not see it in that light. Even Jesus Himself had not succeeded in convincing them that this was His proper path to His glory. What, then, could He do more with them? He could only entreat them to believe in Him, to trust Him that all would be well. They *might* have understood the Atonement before the Lord's death, but they did not. So they must just trust Him. What an enormous demand on *them*! Can we not trust Him where the darkness is not so thick as they felt theirs to be? Their faith failed, or nearly failed, as well it might with their great ignorance; but are we so far at sea as they were? Have we not the glorious triumph of the Cross, the wonder of redemption by His death, to stimulate us to trust Him in days that can never be so dark as were those three days in Jerusalem?

It is surely a blessed alteration in our concerns when we have been able by divine grace to shift the centre of charge from ourselves to our God and His dear Son. "Do not let the matter prey upon *your hearts*, but deliver it over to God and to Me. We are willing to be responsible." That is the speech and the manner of the great Lord. The eleven thought that if things did not come off in *their* way, they could not come off in the right way. Peter was convinced that for Jesus to be put to death would be the most decided calamity for God and His kingdom. Likewise, also, thought they all. They could not fit such an event into *their* plan of the kingdom. And, of course, they staggered under the load which they insisted on carrying. God did not lay that load on them. It was their own work. "Don't take such a load upon you," says their Lord to

them; "let God have His own way. Let Me have My way. Let Us have the charge. If you cannot fathom Our purpose, at least trust Us that We have a purpose, and can find a way to redeem it. Believe in God, believe also in Me."

So might it be said to every troubled Christian. It is hard for you to acquiesce in these sore afflictions. You cannot be expected to see the why and the wherefore of them all. They seem so cruel, so accumulated, so much more dreadful on every new review of them, that it is evident God has gone beyond you and dumbfounded you. But still He is God. Remember that. He is still good; He is still your Father. Remember that. Christ is still at His right hand, still making intercession for you. And your only happiness is in leaving the matter with Him. Tell Him you have given up trying to find Him out. Say to Him that you will hold Him answerable to you, or rather, answerable to His own promise and covenant, when you meet Him at the day of judgment. Shift the burden to Him, and let not *your* heart be troubled.

What is our holy religion in its last essence but just believing in God and His only begotten Son? Christianity does not remove speculative difficulties; it rather adds to them, for the more and stronger the light, the deeper is the shadow. The whole heart of our religion is to trust our living and reigning Lord. Where He cannot give us explanations, He gives us Himself to cling to. What is His command here—"Believe in God, and believe in Me"—but simply a command to practise our religion, to do what we profess to do—that is, accept Him as the Answer to all puzzles, and wait for Him to put all things right? It may be the hardest of all tasks to do it, but it is the most obvious and reasonable of all the divine requirements. If we will not trust to Him, it is because we must have our own way, and affairs managed to our own mind. Now, dare we make such a demand coolly and dispassionately? Does it not shame us even the moment it is put into words? If, then, we do think that He is a wiser Governor than ourselves, let us trust in Him when He moves in a mysterious way.

Christ's cure for trouble has this wondrous charm, that it fits all possible times and kinds of trouble. Is it your own sin that weighs upon your heart? Is it an erring friend? Is it the dark cloud in a loved one's life? Is it fear of the future? Is it hope deferred that maketh the heart sick? For all these and all other trials here is His one sufficient word, "Let not your heart be troubled; believe in God, believe also in Me."

One may answer, "I don't see that this makes my difficulty any clearer. It doesn't explain." No, neither it does. But it gives us a great God and a loving Saviour to depend upon. Christ does not pretend to explain. He only asks us to believe in the everlasting love, and to lie in the everlasting arms. And that is better for our weary heart than many explanations.

THE ROMISH MASS—WHAT IT IS.

By J. M'D.

THE Romish Mass professes to be the sacrament instituted by our Lord that night on which He was betrayed—that ordinance which He appointed to be a memorial of His death to the end of time. It is well known that it is the most elaborate of all the ordinances of Rome, the grandest and most imposing of all her acts of worship; it is, in fact, with all its richness of colour, and music, and dramatic display, the crowning exhibition of her priestly power and ceremonial magnificence. Perhaps it is on this account that it has at times such an attraction for certain sections of Protestants. It is no uncommon thing at the opening of some new chapel or cathedral to find Protestants there eager to witness the High Mass with which it is opened; and it is a very common thing, on the occasion of the death of some prominent member of the Romish Church, king, or ecclesiastic, to find royalty and municipal magnates present at the celebration of Requiem Mass. All this being so, we ought to know what the Romish Mass really is.

Is it what it professes to be? Does it bear, either in spirit or in letter, the faintest resemblance to the divine original? We answer "No." In the Mass Christ's ordinance is, beyond all recognition, changed; and we say this, not forgetting the tremendous responsibility that any man or church incurs that would tamper with the last will and testament of Christ. Let us note the changes that Rome has made in the ordinances, and then call attention to the fatal errors that she has foisted upon it.

The changes that Rome has made on the Sacrament of the Supper are great and grievous. We enumerate the most striking. First, instead of a simple table, with bread and wine, there is an altar, often an ornate and costly altar, for the offering of a literal and actual sacrifice; and on that altar, side by side with the bread and wine, there is a pan of incense, a pot of water, a crucifix, and a bell, with two wax candles, which are to be kept burning, even in the light of day. Second, instead of a presiding minister to lead in the memorial feast and distribute the symbolic elements, there is a priest, a literal priest, clad in special vestments, duly blessed, to represent the various stages in the sufferings of Christ; a priest, moreover, endowed with miraculous power to turn the bread and wine into the veritable body and blood of Christ. Third, instead of an ordinance whose great design is to commemorate a dying Saviour's love, there is professedly an actual putting to death anew of the Son of God, an actual repetition, in fact, of the suffering and agony of the cross; for the priest is declared to "immolate" Christ afresh at every Mass on every Romish altar.

Fourth, instead of a simple and loving commemorative service, there is a prolonged and complicated dramatic display, with multitudinous priestly movements and genuflexions, in which the leading actor keeps his face to the altar and his back to the audience, and all is conducted in the Latin tongue, which the worshippers do not understand. Fifth, instead of a simple distribution of the elements in token of the partaker's faith in Christ, the bread is not broken, for there is no bread, but only a wafer, which is laid on the tongue by the priest; and the wine is not in any case touched by the people, for it is consumed wholly by the priest. Sixth, instead of a sacrament expressly designed for the spiritual edification and comfort of believers through faith in the finished sacrifice of Calvary, there is professedly an actual sacrifice which, in and of itself, appeases God, advantages both the living and the dead, secures the pardon of sin, lessens the time of the sufferer in Purgatory, and hastens the admission of the released soul to heaven. And lastly, instead of an ordinance uniform in its simplicity, there is a service as varied as the priestly mind can make it, and as varied as the purposes for which it performed; there is low Mass and high Mass and chanted Mass, there is private Mass and requiem Mass, there are Masses for the living and Masses for the dead, there are Masses for animals sick, or stolen, or strayed, and Mr. McCarthy, himself a Romanist, tells us in his "Priests and People" that in Tipperary and Waterford and Cork there are Masses to keep the cows from being bewitched, and to make their milk more fruitful in butter. Such are the main elements and accompaniments of the Romish Mass, and it would be almost an insult to our readers to remind them that of all this there was nothing in the upper room in Jerusalem.

The Romish Mass, then, is not a copy of the pattern set by Christ, it is a departure from it in every line and particular. It is not a reflection of its spirit in one solitary detail, but a blasphemous travesty of it from beginning to end. Were Peter himself, whom Rome claims as specially her own, to return to earth and enter a Romish chapel, he could only say of Rome's bastard ordinance, as Mary said on another occasion, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." Yes, Rome has changed the ordinance. She has transformed it, profaned it, destroyed it. That which was designed to be a fountain of blessing she has turned into a snare for souls. John Knox said long ago—and he knew what he said, for he had been a priest of Rome himself—that he feared one Mass more than an army of ten thousand men. And so he might, for he saw in it those forces that fought with the eternal truth of God, and he traced in it those insidious snares by which men and nations were taken and held captive by the man of sin.

Let us single out some of the most flagrant and fatal errors

that enter into the Mass. And, first, its chief corner stone is the doctrine of transubstantiation.

What is transubstantiation? The Catechism of the Council of Trent defines it thus:—"After the words of consecration are uttered by the priest, the bread and the wine, although admittedly unchanged in their appearance, their smell, their taste, are yet changed in their substance into the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, and the bones and nerves of Christ." In other words, the bread is no longer bread, and the wine is no longer wine; they are actually changed into the person of that Christ whose humiliation *we know* was ended when He ascended on high from Bethany, whose body *we know* could not see corruption, whose glorified body *we know* is now at the right hand of God, and whom, *Peter tells us*, the heavens must retain until the times of the restitution of all things. What a conception to enter into the mind of mortal man, that the priest at every Romish altar has the power to compel the Son of God to come down from heaven to be humbled anew under the appearance of bread and wine, to be put to death afresh, ay, to be literally consumed by sinful men at every Mass till the end of time! And yet that is the power ascribed by the Church of Rome to all her priests.

Lest any should think that we exaggerate, here let us quote the words of an Irish priest as they are given *verbatim* in "Priests and People." Father Gildea, of Donegal, not long ago made the following statement in a special sermon:—"The rulers of the earth issue commands, but a greater power far is given to the priest of God. Every day in the sacrifice of the Mass he can say to the Son, Come down from heaven, and immediately Christ obeys. . . . Comes and meekly rests on our altars, within the little chalice or the cold ciborium. What earthly power can vie with this, or heavenly power either? The angels, indeed, see our Lord face to face, but then they are not permitted to hold Him in their hands, or to control His movements." Oh, the blasphemy of all this, the absurdity and profanity of it! No wonder Mr. M'Carthy adds in comment, after he quotes this address, "What are chief secretaries, prime ministers, lord lieutenants, even kings themselves, compared with the young priest of Donegal?" And all this is of the very fibre of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

And on what foundation does this irrational repellent dogma rest? The Fathers did not teach it, even Cardinal Bellarmine declared that it was not to be found in Scripture, but the Council of Trent professed to find it in the words of institution, "This is my body." The interpretation is utterly insane. Why, it would mean that in the upper room in Jerusalem the Son of Man had two bodies, the one alive and sitting at the table, the other sacrificed and resting on the table, the one body breaking, distributing, and partaking of the other body, the one body to be

offered up a sacrifice on Calvary the following day, the other body an actual sacrifice on the table at that hour. Absurdity in interpretation could not farther go. No; He who said, "I am the vine," here, speaking after the same manner, says, "This is My body." Even after He used those words He called that which had been bread still bread. And He declared that He would not henceforth be present bodily on any earthly altars, "for as often as ye eat this bread ye do show the Lord's death till He come." "Till He come"—now He is in glory. Of the wafer deity of Rome we must say, in the words of Hosea, "The workman made it, therefore it is not God."

A second fatal error in the Romish Mass is that it assumes to be a literal sacrifice of the body of Christ. The Catechism of the Council of Trent is explicit here. It says:—"We confess that the sacrifice of the Mass is one and the same sacrifice with that upon the cross, the victim is one and the same, Jesus Christ, the bloody and the unbloody sacrifice is still one and the same; the holy sacrifice of the Mass, therefore, is not only a commemoration of the sacrifice of the cross, but also a sacrifice of propitiation by which God is appeased and rendered propitious." Language could not be plainer than this, and no error could be more fatal.

How utterly opposed this is to every page of the Word of God. Paul said, "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more." Peter said, "Christ also hath once suffered for sins." All Scripture declares that the work of Divine sacrifice was completed when Jesus yielded up the ghost on Calvary. What a dishonour to the memory of that work to say that it needs to be repeated, or that it can be repeated. And then what an affront to the Lord Himself to say that Romish priests can, at will, bring Him down from heaven and lay Him upon the altar of humiliation again on earth. On the heels, moreover, of all this, what shall we say of the trafficking in sin that is interwoven with it all? What of the daring presumption that emboldens the priest to say that he carries at his girdle the keys of the eternal world? In the New Testament there are neither priests nor Masses; the Apostles laid emphasis on the truth that the sacrifice of Calvary alone can save.

A third fatal error is the bold embodiment of idolatry which characterises the Mass. Short of this error Rome could not stop. And Rome does not hesitate here. The bread and wine on the altar, when once consecrated by the priest, are avowedly worshipped as Christ. The priest, as he serves at the altar, must, on bended knee, adore these elements, and he must pray to them as Christ in the words, "Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world, have mercy on me." And by the injunction of the Council of Trent every Romanist present, whether partaking of the Sacrament or not, must adore the bread and wine with *latria*, the highest of all worship, that which is given to God. And in Romish countries where the host is carried

through the streets all who meet it must uncover and kneel, or the Romish mob will know the reason why. Yes, the Mass is idolatry. And is it less heinous to worship a wafer than a piece of wood or stone, to worship an idol in Britain than an idol in India or Africa? Or is it less heinous for present-day worshippers, in the light of the Gospel, to worship an idol than for the worshippers among the godless Canaanites long ago? The truth is, the idolatry of Rome exceeds that of the most benighted lands. Cicero said, "Was any man ever so mad as to take that which he feeds on for a god?" But it has been left to Rome first, out of bread, to make its god, then to adore, and finally to consume that god.

There are other features of the Mass which, for lack of space, we cannot now discuss. But there is a practical question, What interest have we Protestants in such a subject? Some will say, Better ignore it altogether. But we cannot. It forces itself on us whether we will or not. This is the ordinance which many Protestants on special occasions patronise with their presence. It is the ordinance to which royalty at times, notwithstanding a royal oath, gives formal countenance. It is the ordinance which has found sure footing in thousands of churches in the English State Establishment, and is, therefore, supported by the nation's money. It is the ordinance whose fatal errors are being taught the rising generation, under the English Education Act, in thousands of the schools of England to-day. So that the Mass is not merely an evil pertaining to the Antichrist, it is an institution that has planted itself in the national institutions of our country. To that extent the nation is responsible, and the God of nations will hold her guilty.

Our Pulpit.

By REV. GAWIN DOUGLAS.

Phil. iii. 8.—"Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord."

THE Apostle Paul had enjoyed uncommon privileges as a Jew, so that if anyone had a right to glory in things of this kind, he more. Moreover, he was a man of genius, and had received a finished education in the schools of Tarsus, and afterwards at Jerusalem, under celebrated doctors. Besides, he was a Roman citizen, stood high with the ruling powers in Judea, and had he continued his persecuting career would doubtless have risen to a high station of honour and power among his countrymen. But these advantages he regarded as nothing in comparison with the Gospel. A striking change had passed over the mind of this ardent and zealous young man. The *ci-devant* persecutor of Christianity is now its most able, zealous, and indefatigable

preacher and defender. The loss which he sustained by becoming a Christian he counted nothing, yea, he counted it gain—"But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord."

1. *The knowledge of Christ.* The knowledge of *His person*. There are three points involved in the doctrine of the person of Christ—His absolute divinity as the eternal Son of God, co-equal, co-essential, and co-eternal with God the Father, and His perfect manhood; He is very God of very God, and very man of very man. The person is the eternal Son of God. "The only Redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and continueth to be, God and man in two distinct natures, and one person for ever." "Great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh." "The word was made flesh and dwelt among us."

Again, the knowledge of *His offices*. These are reckoned three in number, the prophetic, the priestly, and the kingly. These are not to be regarded as three offices, but as three functions of the one indivisible office of Mediator; for though abstractly distinguishable in the concrete and in their exercise, they qualify one another in every act. Christ executes all these offices in reference to His people, and as to the order in which He executes them, His prophetic office goes before His priestly office, and His priestly office before His kingly office. But with respect to the natural order of these offices, the priestly office stands first. It lies at the foundation of His whole work, and opens a way by the sacrifice which He offered for the exercise of His other offices.

Still farther, the knowledge of *His work without us*, and of *His work within us*, as carried on by His Spirit, the grand source of all illumination and life. What was this work without us? "He came into the world to save sinners." "The Son of Man came to seek and save that which was lost." How is this salvation to be effected? It is "by finishing transgression, making an end of sin, making reconciliation for iniquity, and bringing in everlasting righteousness." These terms Jesus fulfilled to the very letter. What was the work within us carried on by His Spirit? "The Spirit applies to us the redemption purchased by Christ, by working faith in us, and thereby uniting us to Christ in our effectual calling." The Spirit is given to us for regeneration, for bestowing comforts, and for progressive sanctification. He perfects the image of Christ formed in regeneration. He made the first rough draft, and He gave the finishing stroke.

Again, the knowledge of *Christ as our great Exemplar* to be copied after. Christ has left us an example that we should follow His steps. And it is a most lovely example, so pure and holy, so free from all the gross principles of sin, the essence of beauty, the archetype of perfection.

II. *The excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord.* Contemplate the excellency of that knowledge which so captivated the mind and engaged the heart of the Apostle. The excellency of the knowledge of Christ arises from the fact that in Him all divine and human excellencies are combined. He is a *nonpareil*.

"All human beauties, all divine
In our Jesus meet and shine."

Again, this knowledge has a transforming and assimilating influence on all who believingly contemplate it. This effect is the natural consequence of a spiritual view of the glory of Christ, for the affections are excited by this view, and our likeness to the moral image of God consists chiefly in holy affections. Still farther, this knowledge is hope-producing and joy-inspiring. Amid the greatest trials with which we may be visited this knowledge will not only afford us support and inspire us with patience, but it will enable us to rejoice, believing that these light afflictions, which are but for a moment, will work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Again, this knowledge fits the soul for the enjoyment of heaven. Heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people. The object of this knowledge is the same to the saints above and believers here below; the difference consists in the clearness of the vision. Here we see through a glass darkly, there face to face. Here we know only in part, there we shall know as we are known. Finally, this knowledge will be for ever increasing. Our knowledge in heaven is progressive, and this progression is eternal. In heaven illumination will be poured upon our faculties to the utmost extent which they are able to bear. Our understandings, through an endless eternity, shall continue to be brightening, and our views shall be more and more enlarged, though still falling far beneath the object of our contemplation.

III. *The estimation in which this knowledge was held by the Apostle*, and is held by every true disciple of Christ. He reckons all but loss as an object of pursuit. For what is the Apostle running? "That I may win Christ." "That I may know Him." It is the language of unwearied exertion. "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." There is earnestness for you! Again, he counts all but loss as a meritorious ground of hope. He deprecates all human merits, batters down the stronghold of righteousness with the hammer of a resistless logic, and shows that there is a golden thread of grace extending from election to glorification. Still farther, he counts all but loss for the sake of his new acquisition and cause of glorying. What are learning and power and wealth compared with the spiritual knowledge of Christ? Hear heaven's decision—"Thus saith the Lord, let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches;" and hear the New

Testament version of the same—"Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord."

(1) Let us seek to know Christ more. Let us employ all our privileges for this purpose. (2) Let us labour to make Christ more known. We should aim at nothing less than the conversion of the whole world.

SERMON JOTTINGS—THE BIBLE GOD'S MESSAGE.

By REV. J. M. FOSTER.

THAT the Bible is God's message to the nations we know from its *unity*. Here is a volume made up of sixty-six different books, divided just like the book of Isaiah. The first thirty-nine chapters of that book are historical, the last twenty-seven are prophetic. The first thirty-nine books are Old Testament, the last twenty-seven are New Testament. The Bible was written by some forty-two different men. They lived over a period of fifteen hundred years. They were in different localities. They used three different languages, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Some wrote poetry, others prose; some wrote history, others biography, others didactic statement. Some wrote gospels, others epistles, proverbs, psalms, prophecies; some were educated, others were ignorant and unlearned. They represented every different occupation. Some were prophets, others were priests, and others kings. There were herdsmen, shepherds, fishermen, mechanics, physicians, lawyers among them. And often part were ignorant of what others had written. And yet, with all this variety of circumstances, when you come to put their writings together in a volume called the Bible, they make a perfect unit. These facts cannot be explained only on the supposition that a Divine mind operated through these men, so that they wrote in harmony. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Suppose you determined to put up a building. You employ forty-two different carpenters. You say to them:—"You must go to your shops and work for a year. No one must know the plan the others are working upon, or the material the others are using, or the part of the building the others are preparing. There must be no collusion. And at the end of the year, without any consultation, you must come and put your work together, and it must make a well-proportioned house." Does any sane man suppose their work would go together? Not one. And yet the Bible—the grand temple of truth—was built upon these conditions, and it went together, making a beautiful, symmetrical temple, the habitation of our God. This can only be explained on the supposition that the Divine Architect executed His plan through these men. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of

God." Nathaniel Hawthorne said:—"The Bible is a grand cathedral with divinely pictured windows; standing without, you can see no beauty, nor possibly can imagine any; standing within, every ray of light reveals a harmony of unspeakable splendour." The infidel stands outside and criticises; he does not know what he is talking about. The Bible contains a remedial scheme, and only those who have tried it are qualified to bear testimony. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them; but he that is spiritual judgeth all things." A man is brought into court charged with murder. Some one comes forward to give testimony against him. The judge asks—"Are you acquainted with the prisoner?" "No." "Did you see him commit the crime?" "No." "Have you any knowledge of the charges made?" "No." "Well, why are you here as a witness against him?" "Why, I *feel* that he is guilty." "Your feelings are not evidence. You can retire." That is the infidel giving testimony against the Bible. He is exposing his own ignorance and making a spectacle of himself.

We know that the Bible is God's message to the nations from its *effects*. Take our city of Boston. Remove all the churches, all the Bibles, and all who read and study and practise the Bible, and leave the city to the saloons, low dives, thieves, drunkards, and libertines. All the policemen in Massachusetts could not keep order. It would be a perfect pandemonium. On the other hand, take away all the saloons and gambling dens, all the thieves, Sabbath-breakers, drunkards, and libertines, and leave it to the churches, Bibles, and those who honour the Book. You would need no policemen. The people would be a law unto themselves. The Queen of England was asked in the fifties, What is the secret of England's greatness? "That Book," she replied, pointing to the Bible. Three hundred years of the Bible has converted the rocky isle of Scotland into a beautiful garden; while Spain, with her far greater natural resources, without the Bible, has become a wilderness and an effete kingdom.

Infidels quote the lines of Tennyson:—

"There dwells more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half the creeds!"

Such persons have not read Tennyson's works. They saw this line in some newspaper. They do not know what Tennyson says farther:—

"He fought his doubts, he gathered strength,
He would not make his judgment blind;
He faced the spectres of his mind,
And laid them; thus he came at last
To find a stronger faith his own
And *Power was given him in the night*
That made the darkness and the light,
And dwells not in the light alone."

For the Young.

COURAGE—THE EMPEROR AND HIS PILOT.

THERE are different kinds of courage. Boys often think that it is a brave thing to bully boys smaller than themselves, to smoke, and swear, and act as braggarts in the boisterous games in which they sometimes engage. But there is no courage in these things. The truest courage is always to do the right. The noblest bravery is not that of brute force, but that of a true, loving, faithful spirit. Luther was a brave man when he entered the city of Worms that was full of his enemies. He said he would go although there were as many devils as there were tiles on the houses. Knox was a brave man when he entered the presence of Queen Mary, and would be moved neither by her tears nor her threats from his loyalty to Christ. And boys and girls may both be brave, brave in telling the truth, brave in doing the right, brave in reproving the wrong, brave in standing up for the weak, afraid neither of laughter nor blows, that they may have the commendation of Christ.

Here is a short story of a brave man who was prepared to do the right, even at the risk of offending an Emperor. The brave man was a Norwegian pilot, and the Emperor was the Emperor of Germany. They were entering a Norwegian harbour in His Majesty's yacht the "Hohenzollern." The entrance to the harbour was very narrow and tortuous. The whole peninsula is surrounded by islands and peaks of rocks jutting out of the water, and the channels often run so close to them that, standing on the deck of a ship, it seems that you could almost touch them by reaching out your hand. The Norwegians know these channels so well that they can run through them at high speed. Indeed, they become so expert that in foggy weather they control the ship by the revolutions of the screw. The indicator on the bridge tells them how fast the engines are going, and, by counting the revolutions, they know when to put the wheel over. Round invisible cliffs and pointed rocks the pilots whirl the ships without a tremor when the variation of a hair's breadth, almost, would tear the bottom out of the vessel and sink her with all she carried.

The entrance of the Harbour of Odda is especially dangerous, and Nordhuus, on his first trip on the yacht, was carrying the "Hohenzollern" in at half-speed when the Emperor came on the bridge in one of his fits of impatience, and ordered everybody below, declaring that they did not know how to handle a ship; they were a set of cowards for running so slowly, and he was going to take charge of the vessel himself. The German officers promptly obeyed, though they expected in a few minutes to be

struggling in the sea, but Nordhuus stood stolidly at his post, ceaselessly shifting the wheel.

He was a man of medium height, with the fair hair of the Norwegian type, wearing a yellow beard, and having the bold, strong features of his Viking ancestors. The Emperor strode across the bridge and rang the bell for full speed ahead, at the same time putting out his other hand to take the wheel. Nordhuus placed himself in the way, and, leaning over the wheel, called down the tube to the engine room, "Half speed. Never mind the bell."

"You countermand my orders?" cried the Emperor, giving the bell another jerk.

"Disregard the bell," called Nordhuus through the tube, unmoved.

The Emperor glared at the pilot a moment, and then, drawing himself up stiffly, said, majestically, "Go below, and report yourself under arrest."

"Leave the bridge," responded Nordhuus, grimly, grasping the wheel more firmly. "The ship is in my charge, and I'll have no interference with my orders, from King or seaman."

The officers on the deck hurried silently aft, wishing well to the pilot. Nordhuus stood at his post, unshaken by threats, unheeding commands, and carried the royal yacht safely into the harbour.

The next day the Emperor decorated the sturdy pilot with one of the lower grades of the order of the Black Eagle, and made him his life-pilot for Norwegian waters.

Answers to Questions in April Number.

No. VII.—Joseph's tomb. (In this question the sixth line should have been, "*He*, living, went away.") No. VIII.—Moses. (Num. xi. 15), Elijah (1 Kings xix. 4), Jeremiah (Jer. xx. 14-18), Jonah (Jonah iv. 3). No. IX.—Aaron's rod (Num. xvii. 6-8).

Bible Questions for May.

No. X.

A sound that now means great dislike
To one who fails to please,
In Bible times and lands was used
To gather swarms of bees.

No. XI.

When in a neighbour's garden,
Little boys may "eat their fill,"
But "pouching" is against the rules
For either Jack or Jill.

There may be some who do not know
 This homely law's divine;
 But read the books of Moses,
 And you'll get it line for line.

NO. XII.

Will you tell me a name that is honoured and great
 On the pages of Scripture both early and late;
 In seven different forms it appears in the Word,
 And one of the seven was owned by our Lord.

The World of Missions.

R.P. MISSION IN ANTIOCH.

Letter from Dr. MARTIN.

BEFORE going up to Aleppo, which, on my late tour, I reached on 1st January, I had been writing to our Consul there, asking him—in connection with new regulations exempting us from customs duties—to prevent, by all means, the entering of my name by the local authorities as a *râhaib* (monk), as they were, I understood, proposing; including me under the same title with the Romanist missionaries, with whom, at Aleppo, they have long been familiar. And I had informed the Consul that I would forego the customs immunity rather than have my name registered under such a heading. In an application I had made to the authorities here for the customs exemption, I had, it would seem, written my profession down “minister.” I was hardly less amused than shocked to find, on arrival in Aleppo, that the authorities, reading the word “minister” as “monaster,” had refused to concede me the privileges of missionaries respecting customs, until I should inform them as to what “the monastery” was which, it appeared, I had.

An outstanding experience on my tour was to discover the bold and unabashed aggressiveness of false teachers, who, as preachers representing a so-called Protestant mission, north of our field, insinuate themselves amongst our people, and proclaim the doctrines of “the Higher Criticism.” In former letters, I have mentioned the adoption, by the Theological Seminary in the mission referred to, of a noted text-book of “the Higher Criticism.” And I was not surprised, though greatly distressed, at learning the results. I was informed, by very good authority, that such influence has the Higher Criticism already obtained

in that mission's congregations that a considerable section of the people no longer welcome a certain missionary of that mission because he still maintains the doctrine of the Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures. That missionary has long been a special friend of mine. It is, I understand, acknowledged that there is not in the large missionary corps of that mission any one who excels him in learning, nor any one who has mastered as he has, or speaks as he does, the language of the people. A native pastor of that mission was present at a meeting of mine, when I discoursed and catechised on "The Bible: its Inerrancy," and so forth; and he was, the next day, attacking my teaching as false. For years, and especially since the Higher Criticism entered Syria, I have been, on my every tour, giving our people a discourse on the Holy Scriptures, warning them against the teaching of the "Higher Critics." I had the happiness to perceive that these false teachers had not found our members deceivable. Certain of these preachers had been telling some of our people that, for instance, the history (in Joshua x.) about the sun and the moon standing still is not true. When I said that if that was not true, neither, of course, was it true that Christ rose from the dead, in which case Gospel teaching is vain, and our faith is also vain. Our people heartily replied, "That is clear." When I remarked that "to say there is no miracle is to say there is no God," they answered with warm assent, "Certainly." Here, as elsewhere, it will be observed "the Higher Criticism" lays down as its foundation the infidel postulate that miracles—"the supernatural"—must be denied. To certain of our people, who had asked, "Are not these strange doctrines novelties in your mission?" the false teacher had answered, "Well, yes; they are new. Our missionaries formerly taught as your missionary does, but science has greatly advanced since then." "But science!" What a libel upon science, to attribute to it these unscientific postulates; these oppositions of science, falsely so called, which some, professing, have erred concerning the faith!

My missionary opportunities in Aleppo and Idlib were deeply interesting; and although the season was midwinter, and snow fell repeatedly, I had frequent meetings and good audiences. During my three weeks in Aleppo, I often, in the mornings, read in the Hebrew Bible, under the kind guidance of the Rev. W. Melville Christie, of the Jewish Mission, with whom some of us, in the autumn, on Mount Cassius, read large portions of the New Testament in the Greek. On Sabbath, 6th March, I preached a special sermon on "The Bible and what we owe to it; and on the Bible Society Work," with special reference to the centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, a society so very helpful to our mission. The congregation, in the week following, manifested a very warm interest in the Bible Society, and many donations were brought to me for it. The zeal of a number of the

children in bringing their little subscriptions, generally from their own earnings, and especially of some who have known the pinch of want and hunger, was quite affecting to me. One of the first to contribute was a poor man, father in a large family, who have repeatedly been in very deep poverty. He handed me a Turkish dollar, saying his wife had sent five piastres ($8\frac{1}{2}d$) of it, their eldest little boy, from his own earnings, a *bishlik* ($5\frac{1}{2}d$), and that the remainder was from himself; and he added that one of his youngest children had said, "Father, I wish I could give a *metallik* (a halfpenny) to the Bible Society," and that he answered her, "My daughter, when you are bigger I hope you will give to it too." A very poor couple, who could give nothing—but whose little daughter, from her own scanty earnings, brought an offering—took up a Bible, and said, "God be thanked who sent you here with that Book." Two members of the Greek Church, a mother and daughter, coming to the medical dispensary, I said to the daughter, who had been a pupil in our mission schools, "I want a quarter-dollar from you for the Bible Society." I do not think I felt the least hope of getting it; but on their next call they handed me the quarter-dollar for the Bible Society. We pray that abundant divine blessing may accompany these and all the world-wide gifts towards the society's "Centenary Fund."

At our Communion here, on 27th March, I was assisted by Rev. C. Augustine Dodds, of Suadea, and I am to assist him (*D.V.*) next week at his Communion service in Suadea.

Temperance.

INTERESTING JOTTINGS.

THE Licensing Courts throughout Scotland have just been held, and over all there is a diminution of licensed houses in the country. The sentiment on the bench, as a rule, was in favour of restriction, and in all the large towns the hour of ten o'clock for closing was adopted unhesitatingly. There are still, however, houses and hours enough left to ensure that the coming year will have its usual sad holocaust of victims. One licence-holder who lost her licence through bankruptcy, made the remark afterwards to a neighbour, "After all, I am glad I lost the licence; my children were growing up, and they saw no good; it is better for them that I am out of the business." True words, and honest.

The following is given in a contemporary as a good example of brewery company promoting. The firm of Watney, Coombe, Reid & Co., was a combination of three separate companies in 1897. The value of the properties was put down at £3,389,000 as separate concerns. When they were amalgamated the valuation jumped up to the great sum of £8,593,000, which would

suggest that, at least, £5,000,000 was "water." The company is now in a bad way—the vendors having each obtained the purchase money from the public when the three concerns were amalgamated.

A striking indication of temperance sentiment among the magisterial classes has just been given in the form of an illuminated address presented to Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, expressing sympathy with him in the recent persecution to which he has been subjected for conscience sake, and adherence to the temperance reform for which he stands. The address was signed by twelve hundred licensing magistrates, representing ninety-five shires where county magistrates are found, and most of the great towns and cities. It is the answer of the magistrates to the threat of Mr. Balfour that their power shall be crippled. These magistrates understand that they are the servants and the protectors of the community, and not the henchmen of the brewers and publicans.

The London *Daily News* has been making an exhaustive inquiry into the ownership of the liquor trade, and the following are some of the suggestive figures it has compiled. In the House of Commons there are 670 members; of these 129 have an interest in the liquor trade, or one in every five. Only four of these represent Scottish constituencies. In the House of Lords there are 598 members; of these 167 are interested in the trade, or one in every four. The members of the Privy Council are 250; of these 60 are in the list. In the case of the Irish Privy Council, 17 out of 65 are in the list. Of titled persons in the community who are outside the legislature, 880 have an interest in the trade. And the sum that these members of the ruling class and the aristocracy hold in their own right amounts to nine and a half million pounds. As the *Daily News* sagely remarks:—"Mr. Balfour is at this moment inviting Dukes, Marquises, wealthy peers, and comfortable capitalists to vote themselves a douceur out of the taxes paid by the middle classes and the artisans. It is not the will of the publican, but the will of the peer which dictates his legislation. The retailer in a tied house will be kept by his titled masters at a very safe distance from the golden stream."

The temperance outlook in New Zealand is said to be much brighter than it is at home. The temperance vote is growing larger every year; woman suffrage is augmenting it at every election. Already a majority of the people have registered themselves at the polls as in favour of the annihilation of the liquor traffic; and when three-fifths of the people vote that way, as undoubtedly it is said they soon will, then the death knell of the saloon will have been sounded in all parts of one of the large dominions of the English-speaking race, and national prohibition will have come to one country on the earth. In our own country legislative measures are being pushed forward that will give the drink trade a firmer foothold in the country than ever.

Church News.

Close of the Session of the Theological Hall, Ireland.

THE session for 1903-1904 closed on Thursday, 7th April, when the Committee of Superintendence met. Ten students had been in attendance. Of these one completed his course. There were five students of the second year, and four of the first year. The Professors were able to present very encouraging reports of the diligence and progress of the young men under their care. It might interest readers of *The Witness* to know just what studies young men at the Theological pursue. They have systematic theology and Christian ethics with Dr. Dick, church history and pastoral theology with Professor Houston, and Hebrew Bible and Greek New Testament with Dr. Lynd. Each student delivers a sermon in public during the session. The first year men give, besides, an exposition of a Psalm; the second year men give an exercise on a passage from the Greek Testament; and the third year men give a lecture and an exercise from a passage in the Hebrew Bible. These sermons and exercises are criticised by the students and Professors, and such suggestions as seem necessary and profitable are given.

The Archibald Bursary, given at the close of each session, was divided between Mr. J. A. Lyons, B.A., of the second year, and Mr. T. B. McFarlane, B.A., of the first year, their marks being equal. It would be a worthy and helpful service if some member of the Church were to place a second prize at the disposal of the committee when a "tie" occurs between two students, or when two are very close to each other, as a prize of £5, when divided, does not give a large sum to students who have worked faithfully and made marked progress either during the session or between the sessions.

The closing lecture of the session was delivered in the Hall of the Dublin Road Church in the evening by Rev. S. R. McNeilly, B.A., his subject being "The True Foundations of National Greatness and Glory." A vote of thanks was passed to the lecturer, and a request for the publication of the lecture in the *Covenanters* was acceded to.

The joint Presbyteries of Edinburgh and Glasgow meet on Monday, 9th May, at 4 o'clock.

The Synod will meet in the evening of the same day at 7.30.

On Sabbath morning, 10th April, immediately after public worship, Loanhead R.P. Congregation was alarmed to find that fire had broken out in the hall adjoining the Church, close to the

flue of the heating chamber. Attempts to get at the fire were soon stopped by the vast volumes of suffocating smoke, and the local firemen were summoned in haste. With promptness and skill they succeeded in subduing the fire. Had it not been noticed and dealt with at once, the whole fabric of hall and Church would have been speedily destroyed. The damage, which was considerable, is covered by insurance.

Opening services, extending over the first three Sabbaths of last month, were held in connection with the new Church buildings of the R.P. Church at Larne, of which the Rev. S. Hanna, B.A., is the esteemed minister. Drs. Kerr and Lynd preached on the first two Sabbaths. The total cost of the buildings is over £1300, and more than three-fourths of this sum has been contributed by the Congregation.

Notes on the Papacy.

It is reported, with what truth we do not know, that Pius X. has been reading Dr. Robertson's volume, "The Roman Catholic Church in Italy," and that he has profited by the study. For it is announced in Rome that he has decided to send visitors to each of the 263 diocesan sees in Italy to inquire into "the state of religion, the character and work of the priests, and the instruction given to the children." Reports very much depend on the bias of the reporters; but if these visitors use their eyes and ears to discover all the facts and make a faithful return, then the Pope will find out that it is time he was setting his house in order. When he has put Italy right, his work is not finished. Let him read the three volumes of one of his own sons, Mr. M. J. McCarthy, about Ireland, the last of which, "Rome in Ireland," is just now published. Mr. McCarthy is a writer who understands what he writes about, and he is specially strong in his facts. The Pope would do well to sit for a few weeks at the feet of the Dublin barrister.

Romanists everywhere carry out the principle, if they can, of the Irish Catholic Association, that is, to "come out on top." King Edward has sanctioned a new table of precedence for the Australian Commonwealth. Immediately after the State Governor, who, presumably, represents Royalty, and before the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, are to come Cardinal Moran, the Roman Catholic "Primate" of Australia, and Archbishop Saumarez Smith, the Anglican Primate, *side by side*. As for the King, we presume that, in a matter of this kind, he does as he is instructed, and his instructions are presumably in accordance with the spirit of the "Constitution," but in regard

to the other two, one hardly knows what to wonder at most, the arrogant assumption of the Cardinal, or the humiliating weakness of the Archbishop.

The Confessional has a secure place in the Anglican Church, and the Prime Minister did not need to appoint a Royal Commission to discover it. One of his bishops, Dr. Gott, could have given him information at first hand. The Bishop of Truro is the author of a volume, "The Parish Priest of the Town," in which he commends to the Priests of his Church—the nation's Church—a book written by a Roman Catholic, *Abbe Gaume's Manual for Confessors*, of which the following extracts are a specimen:—"The ordinary and right custom among the faithful is to bring children to confession when they are seven years old." "The Priest in the Confessional is to act as God, for it is not man, but God, whom the penitent in the Confessional obeys." "He who obeys his confessor is sure not to be called to account for his actions by God." "Even shameful sins must be confessed. The Father confessor is to say, Courage, do not be afraid, make a good confession. Do not keep back anything through shame." The confessor is urged to be "charitable and discreet with every one, but especially with women, in helping them to confess shameful sins." In fact, the worst abominations and crimes of the Confessional are admitted in this book, which is strongly commended by the Lord Bishop of Truro. After all, an English Bishop and a Romish Cardinal may well walk *side by side*, for there is little to separate them.

Cardinal Gibbons, one of Rome's leading American bishops, has been vapouring in the *Century* as to what Leo. XIII. would have done for the city of Rome if only he had had the opportunity. But the *New York Observer* does not believe him. It recalls the time under Pius IX., when the condition of Rome was a scandal throughout the civilised world, and a foreign army protected the Pope from his own people. Dr. A. D. White, in his *Recollections of Diplomatic Life*, says that when he saw Rome under Pius IX. "it was dirty, unkempt, wretched, every noble thought repressed, every legitimate aspiration stifled, but now, under the King of Italy, he saw the city extended, beautified in outward appearance, strengthened in the character of its people, superior in every respect to what it had been under the Pope King." Sambuy, the eminent syndic of Turin, declares that, even if the kingdom of Italy were destroyed to-morrow, the Papal Government could never again rule Rome.

A very forcible leaflet has been issued by the Convent Inquiry Society, which puts the case against the foreign Orders that are flocking into this country from France into the most compact form. It quotes a significant passage from the eminent French statesman, M. Yves Guyot:—"The religious congregations, *i.e.*, orders of monks and nuns, are a State within a State. But they

are not merely that. They also possess a terribly solvent force, and, like the strong vinegar that bursts granite rocks, are capable of undermining the most solid edifice raised by the most united people. . . . The secret of the power wielded by the congregations lies in the fact that time is on their side. They live for ever. They never flag, never weary, never scatter their forces, and never abandon their aims. They try, try, and try again, profiting by every difficulty, domestic or foreign, in which we may get entangled, and creating them where they do not occur in the natural course of events, until at last a breach is made through which they can enter." Truer words were never spoken. France understands this; Britain does not.

Interesting Items.

THE next meeting of the Presbyterian Council will be held in Liverpool this year, and its meetings will extend from 28th June to 7th July. It will consist of about 300 delegates from Churches in Scotland, England, Ireland, Wales, from the Reformed Churches of the Continent, from the colonies of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, from the United States and South America, and from different parts of Africa and Asia. They will represent about 90 Churches, 240 Synods, 1400 Presbyteries, 27,000 ministers, 130,000 elders, and 500,000 members. These figures give some idea of the ecclesiastical organisation represented in the Presbyterian Alliance.

General Booth, talking to an interviewer on his last birthday, was asked whether he was satisfied with his life's work. "No," he answered. "Satisfied? Who could be satisfied amid the indifference and disbelief of to-day? Look at the multitudes around us who care nothing for God. Look at the growing agnosticism of the people. Look at the wretchedness and sufferings of the poor. Look at our national sins. Never was selfishness so marked as a national vice as it is to-day. How can a man be satisfied when sin has got hold of the nation so?"

The wealth of Britain is enormous, as may be guessed from the Exchequer revenue, which, this last year, was £139,060,000. And yet, this great sum is insufficient to meet the country's liabilities. It is computed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will need, next year, not less than £142,800,000, a sum which will call for additional taxation. He proposes to raise £2,000,000 of the sum wanted by adding a penny to the income-tax; another £2,000,000 by an additional duty of twopence on tea; and half a million by taxation on tobacco. There seems to be room and great need for reform in the matter of national extravagance.

The normal expenditure of the State has risen by nearly £60,000,000 in less than a quarter of a century. During the past ten years it has been increasing at the rate of four and a quarter millions a year, while £160,000,000 have been added to the National Debt. Very much of the extravagance is due to the spirit of militarism, and the sooner a halt is called the better. The nation, moreover, spends in strong drink alone not only as much as would cover all this national expenditure, but thirty-two millions more. Figures of this kind should give people serious pause to think.

A German newspaper—the Bavarian *Kirchenbote*—gives the following reminiscence of Professor Tholuck:—"The Professor once related—"I could not for a long time understand why the Psalms of revenge (not revenge, but righteous retribution), containing such fearful wishes against the enemies of God, were placed in the Bible. Then I once met a student, and asked him how he had got free from his sins and found God. This youth confessed that, after one day reading one of these Psalms, it overpowered him with such a fear of sin, and conception of the holiness of God, that his conversion began with the reading of these Psalms. Even all which stands in the Holy Scriptures has its aim—one portion is written for our consolation and strengthening; another for exhortation and warning. We must only sharpen our inner ear, that we may at all times listen to the voice of the Holy Spirit."

Notes and Comments.

The British Flag over Italian Convents.

THE community or the State that would fight with Rome must be up early in the morning, for there is no system so astute or wideawake as Rome. Dr. Robertson, of Venice, calls attention to an illustration of this in Italy at the present time. In 1870, when the Pope lost his temporal power, the Italian Chamber passed a law suppressing all the monasteries and nunneries in Italy. No new monastic buildings could be erected, and no new monks or nuns created. A life interest was given to the then existing religious orders; but, as they died out, the monasteries and nunneries were to be turned to other uses. They have been turned into barracks for soldiers, hospitals for the poor and sick, schools, and business-houses. In ordinary cases this law would have given, as it was meant to give, short shrift to all these institutions, but Rome's cunning was equal to the emergency. Foreigners could still hold property in Italy, no matter what the

property might be—church, or monastery, or private dwelling. An Englishman, therefore, could, if so disposed, buy an old monastery, or build a new one. Accordingly, when an old monastic building fell in through the decease of those who had occupied it in 1870, an English Roman Catholic peer, or Romish society, was got to buy it; and in some cases even to buy land, especially in Rome, and build monasteries on it. In the same way, a foreigner having property in Italy could have as many servants as he chose, and clothe them as he liked. Accordingly, these English-bought and English-owned establishments were filled with monks and nuns, who were registered as servants of the English proprietors, and dressed in the garb of monks and nuns. These buildings rank as private property, and the monks and nuns are the servants of their English masters; in the eyes of the law they are tolerated as such. They are monks and nuns, however, all the same, and they carry on, in the teeth of the law, the work that was declared illegal in 1870. These English-owned establishments have of late greatly increased, till now in Rome alone they number 362. The wonder is, on the one hand, that Britain allows her flag to fly over institutions that are constructively illegal, and even treasonable, in lands with whose rulers she is on friendly terms; and, on the other hand, that the Italian Government tolerates this foreign invasion and violation of law. Italy, however, is becoming alive to the danger, and already an agitation is on foot that, it is hoped, will before long lead to their suppression. It is expected that at an early date a bill will be introduced into the House of Deputies to deal with them.

Great Britain and France.

In these days when a great war is in progress in the Far East, and when a spark might at any moment kindle a great conflagration nearer home, it is like good news from a far country to learn of the friendly agreement that has just been come to between Great Britain and France. War is such an inhuman way of settling national quarrels, and so out of harmony with the spirit of the Gospel of Christ, that we are glad to hail any step that makes unnecessary or impossible the terrible arbitrament of the sword. A treaty has just been framed between two strong nations by which formidable outstanding differences have been amicably settled. The treaty is a very complicated diplomatic arrangement, and it sweeps away dangerous questions that menaced the peace of these nations in different parts of the world—in Newfoundland, West Africa, Morocco, Siam, Egypt, and the New Hebrides. Diplomats have been wrangling over these questions for years, and from time to time it was feared that some unhappy blunder might plunge these countries into war; but now these questions are agreeably, to all parties,

settled. Each nation seems to have reason to be satisfied. Perhaps France has gained most in the compact; but, after Egypt and Fashoda, Britain need not be ungenerous. Three conventions have been signed. The first deals with Egypt and Morocco; the second with Newfoundland and West Africa; and the third with Siam, the New Hebrides, and Madagascar. In Egypt, Britain obtains a free hand, while France secures the neutralisation of the Suez Canal, and a guarantee for Free Trade for thirty years. In regard to the other countries, all causes of friction have been removed. The hope was recently expressed in the British House of Lords, a hope honourable to that House, that this compact with France would form a precedent that might be usefully followed in Britain's negotiations with other countries. The utterance of such a hope was a frank, direct invitation to the diplomatists of all nations to come and discuss all the questions on which their countries and ours differ. Diplomacy, with its cautious reserve and its open questions, is often no better than it is called; it is often suspected of lacking the desired elements of straightforwardness and truth; and if diplomacy could be supplanted by honest attempts, pervaded with the spirit of righteousness and truth, to discuss and settle all questions of national differences, it would be the inauguration of a new era among the nations. A good beginning, at any rate, has been made in this treaty.

The English Licensing Bill.

Of late years the Brewster Sessions in England, which correspond to the Licensing Courts in Scotland, have been reducing the number of licenses in those districts where they were considered unnecessary, and a reduction of some 6000 has been effected during the past twenty years. This reduction notwithstanding, however, there are still 100,778 licenses in England, or one to every sixty families. A few months ago the brewers, who thought their craft was in danger, sent a deputation to the Prime Minister with an appeal *ad misericordiam*, and drew from him a reproof to the magistrates, and the promise that he would introduce a Bill that would calm their fears and place their calling on a more stable foundation. He has kept his word. Last month he introduced the promised Bill. It has given satisfaction to "The Trade" as "an honest endeavour to settle a difficult and complex question," and it has filled with disgust all who earnestly desire to see Britain a sober nation. The Bill contains two main provisions. First, it limits the discretionary power of the licensing magistrates, for it takes from them the power altogether of refusing renewals unless for misconduct. Second, it puts into the hands of the Quarter Sessions, *i.e.*, all the Justices of the Peace for each county as a Court of Appeal, to decide as to whether licenses should be withdrawn when not needed, and

where licenses are withdrawn for that cause it decrees that compensation shall be provided out of a fund to be raised from the trade itself by a graduated scheme of license duties. A majority of 167 in the House of Commons favoured the first reading of the measure. Oddly enough, Mr. Balfour defended his Bill as "a great temperance measure." He would have us regard him as a temperance reformer, just as in another department of his political labours he would have us regard him as "an ardent Protestant." If he is either the one or the other, both temperance and Protestantism may say, "Save us from our friends." But his policy is to win the support of the trade, for he is not oblivious of the fact that one of every five members of the House of Commons, and one out of every four in the House of Lords has an interest in the traffic. The two fatal evils in the Bill are:—*First*, it takes away from the magistrates in each district, who are best fitted to know the circumstances, and who directly voice the wishes of the people, the right to close one public-house unless there has been a breach of certificate. A district may be overcrowded with public-houses, and the people, feeling the burden of misery and rates that they entail, may cry out against them, but the magistrates are to have their hands tied so that they can do nothing. For 400 years they have had the right, as the representatives of the people (for whose benefit these public-houses are supposed to be permitted), to say how many such houses are required. But by this Bill that power is taken from them, and the people are deprived of all power. Justices of the Peace, men not popularly elected, and who—most of them—live at a distance from the localities interested, have all the power of disposal put into their hands. *Second*, when the Quarter Sessions withdraw a license which is not required they must provide compensation. The purport of this is to give the trade, what it has never had, a vested right in every license. The liquor traffic is a monopoly, it is open to but a few select and favoured persons in the community, and its results in the past have been so dire that the governing powers have always felt that it must be held by a short grip. As a consequence, the rule has always been that a license is granted for but one year. The same authority that gives the license can, at the expiry of the year, withdraw it. If men choose to invest great sums in the liquor business it is because there are great profits in it, and they do it at their own risk. No publican ever opened a public-house out of deference to the wishes of the community; he goes into the trade for his own behoof, and with a clear understanding of the law. In such circumstances, for a Government to propose a Bill that, as soon as men get hold for a year of this monopoly—a monopoly that menaces every other trade, and means drunkenness, and crime, and misery wherever it prospers—the community shall then and there be saddled with it for ever, or else secure them compensation, is the most retrograde proposal that could possibly be made. As Mr.

Arthur Chamberlain said, "The traffic in drink is by every admission a perilous traffic, and the country cannot afford to relax a single part of its grasp upon it." It will be a standing shame to the nation if it accepts Mr. Balfour's measure.

The Jesuits in Germany.

The Jesuits have been expelled in turn from almost every country in Europe, and one of the political marvels of the new century is that the Federal Council of Germany, on the 8th of March last, consented to the repeal of the second paragraph of the Anti-Jesuit law of 1872. The law itself contains only three paragraphs. The first of these declares that the Order of the Jesuits and all related orders and congregations are excluded from German territory, and that the formation of Jesuit settlements is prohibited. The second paragraph, which is now repealed, gives the Government power to expel foreign Jesuits, and either prohibit or otherwise regulate, the settlement of individual German Jesuits in any way that the authorities thought fit. The third paragraph provides for the means of making the law effective. The enactment is so revolutionary that it has caused painful surprise in all the Protestant communities of the German nation. The centre or Romish party in the Reichstag several times prevailed on that body to ask the Bundesrath or Federal Council to repeal the Jesuit laws, but up till now in vain; and it was confidently believed that nothing could change the Anti-Jesuit feeling of the Council. From time to time, moreover, representative bodies in the Protestant Church—the Prussian Upper Church Convention, the Prussian General Synod, the German Protestant Church Convention, with many others, petitioned the Council not to listen to the Reichstag. But, in spite of all, and to the indignation of all, the Council has now completely reversed its policy, and passed an Act in favour of what the Evangelical "Bund" calls the "Notorious destroyers of ecclesiastical and national peace—the Fathers of the Society of Jesus." The protest issued by the "Bund" does not scruple to say that the Government has repealed the paragraph not because of mistaken ideas of religious liberty, but to purchase momentary political advantages. And this seems to be true. The Government needs the Romish parties in the Reichstag and in the Lower House of the Prussian Diet, in order to have a working majority, for the Romish sections can turn the scale on all questions—as often happens nearer home. And as the Imperial Government has Bills in hand which it is most desirous to pass, it bids heavily for the support of the Roman Catholics. The Government is most anxious to increase the army and extend the navy—objects which, on their own merits, the Romish members would have opposed, but the new legislation in favour of the Jesuits has bought off their opposition. Sad to say, this is only one of the many symptoms that Rome is successfully striving to "be on the

top" in Germany. Everywhere Romanists are vaulting into high places. They are obtaining positions in the universities, in the Army and Navy, and in close proximity to the Throne; the Emperor himself is too ready to cater to their demands. When in Rome not long ago he paid an official visit to the Pope, and he is always ready to ingratiate himself with the mitred servants of "his holiness." It certainly seems strange that the two countries in Europe that were the homes of the Reformation are now the two countries that are drifting away most rapidly from their own heroic and noble past. The land of Luther, the land of Wycliffe, and Latimer, and Ridley—these are the lands which the Church of Rome is most successfully exploiting, and that to their fatal hurt, to-day. It is beyond all reckoning sad. Let the faithful cry unto the Lord, that He deliver these lands from the fatal infatuation that is meanwhile carrying them forward to dishonour and ruin. Every nation in the past that nursed Popery was doomed.

The Musical Titles of the Psalms.

All lovers of the Psalms will hail with pleasure a book recently published that breaks new ground in dealing with the inspired manual of praise. It deals with the musical titles of the Psalms. These titles have all along had their place in the text, but for 2000 years they have been silent, as their meaning was a mystery no scholars could solve. Light has sprung up in the darkness at last, and Mr. Thirtle's new book is of great value. His contention is that there has been now for a long time a displacement of the "chief musician" line prefixed to the Psalms, and that when that displacement is corrected the meaning becomes at once intelligible, and the value of the Psalm is enhanced accordingly. But how has Mr. Thirtle made the discovery? In this way. In the prophecy of Habakkuk there is a Psalm standing by itself, without any other Psalm preceding or following. It has a musical title, and that title is placed, not at the beginning, but at the end of the Psalm. And this is the Oriental method. In that fact lay the hint. The musical titles in the Psalms belong properly not to the Psalms to which they are prefixed, but to the Psalms respectively that they follow. And when they are read in that connection, brought thereby into association with their proper Psalms, they impart fresh light and add new beauty to them. This contribution to the literature of the Psalms should enhance their value to those who love the songs of Zion.

Note.—The name of inquirer is not requested for publication.