

Our Contributors.

ADVICE PREACHERS SHOULD NOT TAKE.

BY KNOXONIAN.

"Throw away your sermon and talk to the people the way the politicians are talking to them." This is the piece of advice frequently given to the preachers of the United States during the Presidential election. If the press reports are correct, Mr. Moody dispensed this kind of medicine quite freely at one or two meetings of ministers. Of course all men of his school prescribe the same treatment. Judging from the way in which they sometimes speak one would think that a prepared sermon was the chief hindrance to the conversion of the world. Just throw away your manuscript and even Chicago might be converted. Well, Mr. Moody has thrown away his manuscript and a good many of his followers never had one to throw away. They have preached and worked in Chicago for a long time, and at last accounts the city was not quite converted. If all preachers could repeat their sermons as often as Mr. Moody has repeated that sermon of his on sowing and reaping they would not need a manuscript. They would not even need notes. We doubt very much if Mr. Moody has a single sermon that he has not preached at least fifty times. Probably that sermon on sowing and reaping, the best one he preaches, has been delivered hundreds of times. It is easy for a man who has a few sermons "well up," and who rarely preaches more than a few weeks in one place, to tell men who preach to the same congregation a hundred times a year to throw away their sermon.

But supposing it were a good thing to throw away one's sermons, would it be a good thing to speak to the people in church on Sunday in the way that McKinley and Bryan and their friends have been speaking to the citizens of the United States?

Campaign speeches bristle with half truths. Would it be a good thing to deliver half truths to the people on Sabbath? Half truths are often the most dangerous and deadly kind of untruths. They are more dangerous in the pulpit than in any other place because the issues dealt with in the pulpit are more important than any other issues. Half truths are often more popular than the whole truth. If McKinley and Bryan told the whole truth on any public question the enthusiasm would soon wane and the crowds soon scatter. An honest preacher will not deceive men with half truths about faith or sin, or future retribution, or any other important matter, even though the half truths would draw.

Campaign appeals are often made to the selfish side of human nature. McKinley says in effect elect me and my prohibitory tariff will make you rich. Bryan says in substance—so we read—elect me and you can pay your debts with 53 cents on the dollar. Any man who stands up before a mixed audience and tells the people how they can make 53 cents into a dollar can get a good audience and a good hearing in any part of the civilized world—even if he uses a manuscript.

Election speeches are for the most part made to men who want to hear and believe them. The Republicans who journey to McKinley's home in Ohio—railway fare perhaps paid—go there just because they want to hear McKinley on the Republican platform. Bryan's immense audiences want to hear Bryan tell them how to make their 53 cents have the paying power of a dollar. Both candidates for the most part tell their audiences what the audiences want to hear. An honest preacher must tell his audience a great many things they don't want to hear, and some things they hate to hear.

But, as a matter of fact, do the politicians always talk to the people? Is there an intelligent man in America who does not

know that politicians of the first or even second rank in the United States nearly always read their important speeches from a manuscript? Why even Bryan himself, the great orator of this campaign, tried to read his first speech in New York on a hot night in July. He didn't read again because he was not a good enough reader to hold his audience. There is grim humour in telling a lot of preachers to talk to the people as the politicians do, when everybody knows that many of the leading politicians of the United States read their best speeches.

Even when a first-class man delivers his speech without manuscript or notes, it is always carefully arranged and often arranged very much in the form of a good sermon. Rosebery's great speech in Edinburgh, the other evening, is a good illustration. That fine effort has its firstly and secondly and thirdly as distinctly as any Scotch sermon ever had them. Then there is a subdivision of three reasons why his lordship wished public meetings to be held on the Armenia question, and all through the speech one can see the framework quite clearly. Rosebery did not read his splendid effort, because he can deliver a high-class speech without a manuscript. Still he did not indulge in the kind of "talk" that preachers are exhorted to use instead of a prepared discourse.

High-class men in other professions always arrange their matter on occasions of importance. Examine the best efforts of any lawyer of the first or second class, examine any judgment of any high-class judge, examine any statement made by a statesman of high rank, and you invariably find that the matter is well arranged and often our old friends firstly, secondly and thirdly are used without any apology. Clerical dudes barely one remove from mental imbecility may glory in their little essay because it has no old fashioned divisions; young men with lots of vacant room in the upper story, appropriately covered with a soft felt hat, may ridicule sermons, but the fact remains that every man of eminence in any profession arranges the matter he wishes to bring before his fellow men in the most orderly and powerful way he can, and very often the form of arrangement resembles very much the form of a good sermon.

The politicians who speak extempore to the people are usually the "ward bosses," the "healers," the "bummers," the unclean fellows who fire the blood on the back streets and humbug the rural voter in the back townships. Is it proposed that preachers should imitate them?

Another point would stand discussion. Politicians usually address the people for a brief time, and at a time when the people are not only interested but excited. Preachers have to keep on addressing the same people two or three times a week for years. How long could McKinley or Bryan keep their audiences together? How long could our own Laurier, a much better orator than either, keep together the audience he addressed in Toronto last June? Every decent man in the United States was thankful that the speech-making was ended last Tuesday evening. The fact is, there is no man who keeps his audience together as long or as well as a good gospel preacher. Comparisons between him and a campaign orator are for the most part—well, to be plain about it, they are for the most part *rubbish*.

PRINCETON'S SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.

BY REV. WILLIAM MOORE, D.D.

On Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, October the 20th, 21st, and 22nd, Princeton put on her holiday attire and held open door to welcome the visitors from every part of the continent and from Europe who came to take part in the celebration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the friends of the college of New Jersey.

Two great arches had been built on the

main street, one bearing the old, and one the new style of the institution. The whole town and even trains which brought visitors from New York and Philadelphia were gay with flags and with streamers and festoons of orange and black, the college colors.

The professors, graduates and visitors assembled first in Marquand Chapel and marched in procession to Alexander Hall. As all who took part in the procession wore the academic costume indicative of rank, in the university they represented, there was a great variety of color which lighted up and gave an attractive appearance to the scene. The exercises of the first day were under the presidency of Mr. C. E. Green, the chairman of the Board of Trustees. After the usual devotional exercises the president of the college, Rev. Francis L. Patton, D.D., LL.D., delivered an impressive and powerful sermon on the relation of religion to the university. It is impossible to do justice to this magnificent discourse in any mere summary or outline and yet a sentence or two culled at random may perhaps exhibit something of its spirit:

"Universities are, in a general way, the offspring of Christianity. There are universities (and Princeton is one of them) that may be regarded as distinctly Christian rather in the conditions of their origin, than in the contents of their curricula. Their object is not so much to teach religion as to teach science in a religious spirit. It was more in the way they teach than in what they teach that they deserve to be called Christian schools. Hence a Christian college is not to be judged by the amount of religion that it teaches, or the place it assigns to the Scriptures in its curriculum. In the colleges and universities of which I speak Christianity underlies, informs, unifies, and is the unexpressed postulate of all instruction. And this Christian spirit, that practically affects teaching without announcing itself, which presupposes Christianity without any irritating self-assertion is on the whole most effective."

"There is another work which the university ought to perform. It should contribute to the formation of a sound public opinion. In a broad and far-reaching sense it should teach patriotism. The essential morality of the people of our land, as it finds expression in the pulpit and the press is a great source of comfort in a time of national peril. And yet, when fundamental authority is assailed, when revolutionary views of government are publicly expounded, when socialistic theories find plausible advocates, it will not do to rely altogether upon popular sentiment, or the native common sense of the American people. We must do something to keep the common sense from being corrupted, and this must consist of something more than popular harangues and the florid iterations of the commonplaces of morality."

"There must be deep philosophical discussion of great public questions by men of acknowledged authority in political, social and economic science. This work can be done better in the university than anywhere else. This is what I mean when I say that the University should be a school of patriotism."

After expressing the hope that the universities would soon be the centre for a great religious movement, President Patton went on to say: "I do not know what part Princeton will have in this movement, but it would be strange if she should have none. Whatever be our place in the sphere of intellectualism, may Princeton be at the head in the sphere of religious activity. Christianity is more than a collection of precepts, it is a way of salvation. This message has been proclaimed in the pulpit of the college of New Jersey for 150 years, and may it never be said of those who hold a high place in Princeton University that they are ashamed of the gospel of Christ."

If it were possible we would like to see the whole of this masterly exposition of the place and functions of the University reprinted in your columns.

In the afternoon of Tuesday the reception of delegates was held in Alexander Hall which was again filled to overflowing. Dr. Howard Duffield, of New York, delivered the address of welcome. President Eliot of Harvard responded on behalf of the American Universities and Learned Societies, and Prof. J. J. Thomson, of Cambridge, replied on behalf of the Universities and Learned Societies of Europe. The speeches of both these gentlemen were brief and in exceedingly good taste. For clear, chaste and appropriate expression the speech of President Eliot left nothing to be desired.

Wednesday forenoon was devoted to the commemoration side of the festivities. The

chief speakers were the Rev. Henry Vandyke, D.D., who read a poem entitled, "The Builders."

Dr. Vandyke was followed by Prof. Woodrow Wilson, who delivered an oration entitled: "Princeton in the Nation's Service," in which he recounted the services rendered the nation by the sons of Princeton in the various departments of public life, and in the great crises of the nation's history.

Thursday was in some respects the great day of the feast. After the usual opening exercises, President Patton, in a very graceful speech, announced the change of title and told of the additions recently made to the Endowment Fund.

The first charter of the College of New Jersey was signed by John Hamilton, President of His Majesty's Council, on the 22nd day of October, 1746. On the 22nd day of October, 1896, the College became a University. In making the announcement President Patton said: "It is now my pleasure to say that from this moment what has heretofore been known as the College of New Jersey, shall in all future time be known as Princeton University. May God bless Princeton University and make us faithful in her service."

As regards the endowment the statement was somewhat as follows: The result of twenty months' persistent effort is that \$1,353,291 has been added to the funds of the College; \$600,000 for the erection of a library, \$250,000 for purposes unannounced, and another sum for the erection of Blair Hall; the income from the latter going to the support of professorships, and the rest or aggregate sum for the foundation of the McCosh professorship; and several university fellowships. The wealthy people of the United States are certainly munificent patrons of learning.

Honorary degrees were then given to those who had been selected to be the recipients of them. Among the distinguished men whom Princeton honored were Principal Caven of Knox College, President Ludon of Toronto University, President Petersen of McGill University, and Mr. Goldwin Smith. Thus Canada came in for a full share of recognition.

After the ceremonies connected with the conferring of degrees were concluded Dr. Patton introduced President Cleveland. As the President stepped forward, the whole immense audience rose and received him with prolonged and enthusiastic cheers.

The President delivered a powerful and touching speech upon the relations of the University to the nation and the services which educated men should render to their country.

This speech was probably one of the greatest the President of the United States has ever made. It is not too much to say that many sentences deserve to be written in letters of gold. Though President Cleveland had himself in perfect control and spoke with calmness and precision, there were moments when it was manifest to every listener that he was the subject of intense feeling. Especially was this the case when he uttered the following words:

"It is exceedingly unfortunate that politics should be regarded in any quarter as an unclean thing to be avoided by those claiming to be educated or respectable. It would be strange, indeed, if anything related to the administration of our government, or the welfare of our nation should be essentially degrading. I believe it is not a superstitious sentiment that leads to the conviction that God has watched over our national life from its beginning. Who will say that the things worthy of God's regard and fostering care are unworthy of the touch of the wisest and best of men? I would have those sent out by our colleges and universities, not only the counsellors of their fellow countrymen, but the tribunes of the people, fully appreciating every condition that presses upon their daily life, sympathetic in every untoward situation, quick and earnest in every effort to advance their happiness and welfare, and prompt and steady in the defence of all their rights."

At this point the audience gave vent to their pent-up feelings in loud and enthusiastic cheers, and it was some minutes before silence was sufficiently restored to permit the President to conclude a speech which