

## Our Contributors.

### AN ADDRESS TO A YOUNG MINISTER AT HIS INDUCTION.

BY KNOXIAN.

If the following address has never been delivered to a young minister at his induction it should have been:

My Dear Brother, You are now about to enter upon the active work of the ministry. You have finished your university work, completed your course of study in the theological seminary, and we are now inducting you into this pastoral charge. Doubtless you have heard and read a good deal about the arduous nature of some of the duties that will now devolve upon you as a pastor. Allow me for your special encouragement to point out some of the *easy* situations that you may find yourself in before you have gone very far in your ministerial work. Perhaps your congregation may be composed of two or more stations. Two of these stations may desire to have services at the same hour on Sabbath. There is a "sweet reasonableness" about such a desire that must at once commend itself to your youthful mind. You must, of course, help both parties. If you side with one, the other will be sure to blame you. If you try to be neutral, both stations will denounce you. Your studies in Natural Philosophy will have shown you how to occupy two pulpits, several miles apart, at one and the same time. Bring your Natural Philosophy to bear on the situation, my brother, and preach in both stations at the same time. That is the proper and easy way to get out of the difficulty.

In the course of your ministry, a part of your congregation may wish to build a new church. The other part may think the old church good enough until the roof falls in. Just when a new church is needed is a more interesting question than any you tried to solve at college. A Presbyterian church in one of our western Ontario towns was old, dingy, dilapidated, and awfully dirty. The rain came in through the roof on wet Sabbaths and fell on the minister's head as he preached. He had to stand to one side while he preached. Neither the sermon nor the minister was *dry*. A wicked newspaper published in the town suggested that one of the elders should go into the pulpit and hold an umbrella over the minister's head during service on wet Sabbaths. Some of the people in that congregation strenuously contended that the old church was quite good enough. The same question may arise in your congregation, my young brother, but you need have no difficulty in the matter. The party in favour of building may blame you if you don't help them, and the party opposed to building may denounce you if you don't help them, and both may go for you if you are neutral, but you need give yourself no trouble in the matter.

Then supposing the majority decide on erecting a new church, the question of site is very likely to come up. Half the people may wish to build on one site and half on another. Your Natural Philosophy will again come to your rescue, and you will at once see that the proper position for the minister to take is to build the church on both sites.

My young brother, other and still more interesting questions may meet you in the course of your ministry. Part of your flock may be strongly in favour of using an instrument in public worship, and part of them may begin to speak about "Popery and Jenny Geddes' stool" and "the Claymores of the Covenanters," and make several other historical allusions, the moment a melodeon is named. Now, my young brother, you are about to enter upon one of the most delightful experiences of a Canadian minister. Get ready. Buy a lot in the cemetery and secure a room in the nearest lunatic asylum. You are not quite sure what your *terminus ad quem* may be before this question is settled. Take the side of the organ men and the anti-organ men will denounce you. Side with the *antis* and the organ men will be down on you. Try to be neutral, and both will threaten you. Now you are having a good time. Now you see how easy it is to be a minister, and please everybody. Be careful how you act while the people are displaying their Christian graces on this question. If you are heard whistling a little air in your yard, the anti-organ men will declare you are in favour of instrumental music. Don't whistle. If you tell your small boy not to use his mouth-organ or jew's harp on Sabbath, the organ

men may suspect that you are opposed to the use of the organ in public worship. The situation is delightful, especially when it lasts long. If you are alive and sane when the question is settled, don't be the least surprised if you see some of the anti-organ men who led in the fight unite with a congregation in which they use two or three organs. That is a way some of them have of relieving their consciences and showing their consistency.

My young brother, there is another very interesting question that may meet you in the course of your ministry. Some of your flock may wish to sing hymns, and some may be very much opposed to hymn singing. Some of those who are opposed to hymns make very refined distinctions on questions of Psalmody. They quite joyfully sing "When to the sacred font we came," but they cannot bear "Jesus, Lover of my Soul." They take quite kindly to such soul-stirring sentiments as "Ye Indolent and Slothful, Rise," but they won't rise to sing "Nearer, My God, to Thee." They have no objection to that verse which tells of poising "the steady pole" (whatever that was) on the "boundless void of space" (wherever that may have been), but their conscience won't let them sing "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name." You may not be able to grapple with these fine distinctions, but you are a young man yet. Now, when the question, "Hymns or no hymns," is being discussed, you are sure to have some delightful experiences. You will be frequently reminded of the good time you had when the organ question was under discussion. The points are exactly similar. Side with one party, the other will blame you. Be neutral and both will fire on you.

There are other delightful experiences, my brother, which possibly may be yours. Your salary may be small and your family large. Your dear people will insist that you and yours shall be well dressed. You must not wear an old coat on the street and you have no money to get a new one. Your coat sleeve may be glazy enough to use for a looking-glass, but you must keep the glass in the house. You must not display it on the street. On no account must you go in debt. If you go in debt "your usefulness is gone," as Sir John said on a memorable occasion. Your dearly beloved flock pay you \$500 or \$600 a year. On this amount you must keep your family, and dress well and keep out of debt. There is a "sweet reasonableness" about the thing that must move your heart.

In the course of your ministry, my young brother, a part of your congregation may wish you to resign. Another part may wish you to remain. Both threaten to leave the church unless their wishes are carried out. The party that wishes the resignation resort to all sorts of measures—some of them, perhaps, vile enough to make old Satan ashamed—in order to bring the resignation about. The other party fight hard, too, when they take in the situation. Now you are having a good time again. There is no difficulty in a position of that kind. Just what is best to do, you don't know, your friends don't know either, and the Presbytery does not know. Now you are finding out the truth of what people say that it is easy to be a minister in this country.

But I must leave the remainder of this address until the next induction.

### AN EPISCOPALIAN ON PRESBY- TERIANISM.

BY THE REV. OLIVER J. BOOTH, ST. CATHERINES.

(Concluded.)

Mr. Wallace's second letter brings us to the question of Presbyterian Ordination—and at this point we come to something more serious. He mentions two passages of Holy Scripture as specially proving that the power of ordination rests with the Presbytery:

1. Acts xiii. 1-3.—"Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers—Barnabas, Simeon, Lucius, Manaen and Saul. And as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said: Separate Me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. Then when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

As this is one of the passages always cited by Presbyterians as proving Presbyterian Ordination, we shall briefly examine it. The passage speaks of five persons, and among these we find Barnabas and Saul. These five were *all* "prophets and teachers." If then

the passage proves that Simeon, Lucius and Manaen were presbyters, it proves as much certainly for Barnabas and Saul, and so the "laying-on of hands" (whatever it meant) could not have been to make them what they already were—presbyters. But if, on the other hand, as indeed he seems to assert, Barnabas and Saul were only laymen, then the others were only laymen, and so we have the account, not, as he supposes, of an ordination by *presbyters*, but of an ordination by *laymen*! The alternative is awkward in either case for the Presbyterian view, and puts him in a serious dilemma. But the Episcopal view, I humbly submit, makes all plain. Barnabas and Saul were commended, in a special manner, to a special missionary work—and when they were about to return to Antioch, having finished *that* work, we find it written of them: "They sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God for the work which they fulfilled."—Acts xiv. 26.

This boasted ordination was then no ordination at all. St. Paul's own words disprove his ordination at the hands of men. "An Apostle, *not of men, neither by man*, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father." Indeed, before the incident recorded in Acts xiii., St. Paul had *founded* those Churches (Acts ix. 30 and Gal. i. 21) which he afterwards (Acts xv. 41) re-visited in company with Barnabas.

2. 1 Tim. iv. 14.—"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

This, he says, proves Presbyterian Ordination. In reply, even if the passage does refer to persons (Jerome, Calvin and others thought the word "presbytery" referred to the office to which Timothy was elevated), it is no proof as against Episcopacy, for St. Paul expressly states that *he* had ordained Timothy: "Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of *my* hands."—2 Tim. i. 6.

Nor is there any conflict between these passages—though at first sight it may appear that there is. It has always been the custom in the Church that while the highest of the three Orders could alone ordain, the presbyters present should also place their hands upon the head of the person about to pass from the order of deacon to that of presbyter—their act being one, *not of ordination*, but of *concurrence*. Such is the custom in the Church of England to-day, in which I, a presbyter, have sometimes joined. And so with the ordination of Timothy, which was by St. Paul, the Presbyters concurring. This the two passages when put together show. He was ordained, St. Paul says: "By (*dia*) the putting on of *MY* hands"—"*with* (*meta*) the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

This account, then, so far from proving Presbyterian Ordination, is quite in harmony with the universal practice of the Church of England.

There are certain statements in the latter part of his second letter which call for brief notice:

1. "The minister of the Church of England is *obliged* to administer baptism to every man's child, be he drunkard or what he may." This is not so. I assure him he has been misinformed.

2. "They *must* also administer the Lord's Supper to every comer, whatever his character." This is not so. Again I assure him he has been misinformed.

3. "The Episcopal Church of England is tied down by a formal routine, and the ministers are unable to make any important reform." In reply, I may say that we of the Church of England do not feel the necessity of this "important reform" to which he alludes. True, he may put this down to spiritual blindness on our part; but, really, we do not believe that "the faith once for all delivered" (Jude 3) requires ecclesiastical tampering with; and we are satisfied to make belief in the Apostle's Creed the only condition of membership, and if a man truly believes in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost—in the God whom that ancient symbol confesses, we do not greatly care if he pause to question the *universality* of the Deluge, or the *authorship* of the last chapters of Isaiah.

4. He speaks as though he believes the Bishop to be with us the final Court of Appeal. This is not so. I assure him he has been misinformed. We too, like him, have courts of discipline. The good nature of the Editor must not be imposed upon, else I should explain our system—but brevity compels the bare assertion that he has been misinformed in this particular.

5. Again, he says that a Church of England clergyman, in officiating at the grave, must "thank God for