

British American Presbyterian.

Vol. 3.—No. 7.]

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY MARCH 27, 1874

[Whole No. 112]

Contributors and Correspondents.

THE LATE DR. WILLIAM ANDERSON, GLASGOW.

Thirteen years ago Glasgow was favoured with the ministrations of a brilliant galaxy of preachers,—Caird, MacLeod, Arnot, Hall, Gallan, Robertson, Buchanan, King, McDuff and Kerr; but of none of these were the citizens generally, no matter what religious denominations they belonged to, so proud than of Dr. Anderson, the redoubtable minister of the U. P. Church in St. John St., popularly known as "Daft Willie." It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that that sobriquet was designed to be depreciatory. On the contrary, it was a term of affection or endearment, at least to the very persons who employed it most frequently all but idolized the man whom they so designated. Scotland is perhaps the best arena in the world for the raising of preachers. At least the highest premium is put upon pulpit ability in that country; for it required no Scottish party on the part of a Canadian visiting the land of his sires, to force upon his mind the conviction that eminent speakers obtained surer passport to influence and power than in any other country; and of public speakers, ministers took by far most largely in the eye of the people of Scotland. And as far as Scotland excels other countries in this respect, Glasgow excels every other place in Scotland. Excepting Gillfillan, of Dundee, whose literary labours and eccentricities had been heard of on this side of the Atlantic, and Cairns of Berwick, who had already won for himself no mean place in the religious world as a scholar, critic and metaphysician, neither of whom I had the pleasure of hearing preach, although I heard both of them on the platform. Anderson was the most distinguished minister then in the U. P. Church. In answer to the inquiry what minister a stranger ought especially to hear while sojourning in Glasgow at that time, Anderson's name was sure to be mentioned among the first five. The church in which he ministered of itself repaid a visit to it. The walls were composed of round columns of limestone, about three feet apart, the intervals being filled up with glass, provided with green Venetian blinds for screening the worshippers from either glaring light or excessive heat. From the many anecdotes told of Dr. Anderson, and the reports current about his oddity, I expected indeed to hear strange statements and illustrations; but I was not prepared for the lucid though quaint exposition of truth which I heard—the shrewd observations on men and things, the biting sarcasm, the withering denunciations of vice, the scornful estimate of worldly pleasures and honors, followed in their turn pungent appeals to the consciences of his hearers; and all these uttered not, as I half expected, in broad Scotch, but in the most beautiful English—the speaker, moreover, seeming to clench every important remark with a pinch of snuff, the longer and more impassioned the sentiment spoken, the larger the pinch following. He was the man to move the masses of his fellow country men, combining as he did the pathetic and the humorous, the grave, the pathetic, gay, severe argument and bantering nonsense and all the great social and political triumphs achieved during the last twenty years, from West Indian emancipation to the extinction of slavery in the United States of America, and not a little of his efficient advocacy. Indeed he may be said to have been a man of war from his birth up. He threw himself with characteristic energy into all the controversies of the day: Millenarianism, Voluntaryism, the Free Question, Free Trade. But of all his performances in this role those which were selected by far the greatest attention, and which the memory in Glasgow is still strongly retained, were his lectures on Popery, in the City Hall. Considering the little influence Romanism has in Scotland it is surprising how great an interest masses in that country take in anything relating to the Pope. But Dr. Anderson's lectures must have had very strong effects, apart from the attractions with which they dealt, to have drawn four or five thousand people as often as they were held. I have heard a person who was present at these lectures, and one very competent to pronounce an opinion upon the subject, say that the eloquence of these was so powerful that the vast multitude composing his audience was occasionally rendered into a complete frenzy. It was not that he played great intellectual attractions, or a full mastery of the facts relating to the subject merely; his powerful imagination portrayed the errors of popery in a light as if it were an emanation from Hell itself; and then the wrath of his eyes were curling down before him,

while his logic hurled to pieces the arguments of his imaginary combatants, as with the sweep of a broad claymore. Many persons, doubtless, went to St. John Street Church expecting amusement, but sometimes got much more than they bargained for and returned with sadder and thoughtful minds. As he himself once said, "Many who came to scoff remained to pray." Beneath the oddities of his appearance and manner there lay a fund of excellent sense his penetration was as deep as a well; and although it was his eccentricities and headiness that were the cause of the most of us in Glasgow, stripped of them all he must have been famous as a preacher and thinker. His treatise on "Regeneration," and on the "Fiducial Honour of Zion," are remarkable books, and fully sustain the author's reputation as an eloquent thinker and writer. They are characterized by great boldness and originality as well as by fresh and vigorous style, and are enriched by felicitous quotations from Scripture, and by the unfolding of an enlarged personal Christian experience. And if these works testify that Dr. Anderson did not belong to the common herd, but struck out a path for himself, his individuality and independence were even more marked in the pulpit and still more on the platform. Even the most trivial incidents were sometimes made to do good service in the hands of this odd genius. It is related of him that on one occasion as he approached the church door where a crowd was pressing in he heard some one remarking "Here comes daft Willie." Fancy the surprise which must have been created in the audience that morning when he closed a most eloquent and effective appeal to their consciences by taking a pinch of snuff and asking "What think ye o' daft Willie noo?" Gillfillan in his Biography of Anderson relates how he took his revenge upon persons in the audience who protested against his statements by hissing. His manner was to take no notice of it at the time, but when he came to some triumphant point in his argument, to pause and in broad Scotch with an old-fashioned squeal to cry out "Hiss noo if ye daur." There are numberless anecdotes current in Glasgow society about his sayings and doings, many of them doubtless, apocryphal. Gillfillan mentions two of the most common bearing upon his inveterate habit of snuffing, but only to discredit them. The one was, that on one occasion as he quoted the words, "My soul cleaveth unto the dust," he took a heavy pinch of snuff; and the other that repeating the phrase, "All is vanity," he illustrated it by discharging into his nostrils a tremendous pinch, adding, "this is also vanity." His biographer gives as authentic one which is well known in the city. A stranger staying at an inn near John St., asked on a Sunday morning of a servant, "Have you any crack preachers in Glasgow?" "What's your will?" rejoined the man, rubbing his head; "crack what sir?" "Oh crack preachers!" replied the stranger, "in a large city like this there must be some crack preacher or other." "I dinna ken what ye mean, Sir, by crack preachers but if ye want to hear a crackit one, you have jist to step in yonder," pointing to the U. P. Church.—R. C. Montreal, March 7, 1874.

Mr. McTavish and Union.

DEAR SIR,—I am not acquainted with Mr. McTavish, of Woodstock, but from his effusions which have appeared in your columns, I have come to the conclusion that he is a man whose mental constitution is somewhat peculiar. He has evidently satisfied himself that the Church of Scotland is not true to the doctrine of Christ's Headship over his Church, or, in other words, that she practically denies it. That was the great Disruption cry of 1843. I was flattering myself that time and the absence of the Disruption excitement, had let men see, not the folly, but the injustice of that cry. I have been mistaken. Mr. McTavish and some more are shouting it as hotly in 1874 as others did in 1843. I shall not attempt to reason with Mr. McTavish, because from what I have seen upon his productions I consider that would be vain. I shall endeavour, however, to put the matter in as clear a light and as simple a form as I can, so that your readers may judge whether the venerable Church of Scotland can justly be charged with denying what is so essentially a Christian doctrine. You are well aware there is a form of speech much used by logicians, called a Syllogism. It is a most valuable instrument for detecting and laying bare the fallacy in a fallacious argument or statement. It consists, as you are aware, of three propositions, a Major, a Minor, and a Conclusion. Mr. McTavish supplies us with the Minor proposition of the Syllogism, which I shall use. It is a rule in logic that the Major proposition of the Syllogism must include the Minor. I shall myself supply the Major

proposition of my Syllogism, and it shall include Mr. McTavish's Minor. Mr. McTavish's Minor is "The Church of Scotland denies the Headship of Christ over His church." My Major proposition is, "All, whether individuals or churches, who deny the Headship of Christ over His church, are not Christians." No intelligent man, I think, not even Mr. McTavish, will doubt the soundness of that proposition. Let me now complete my syllogism by putting these propositions together in their proper order and deducing from them their conclusion. All, whether individuals or churches, who deny the Headship of Christ over His church are not Christians. The Church of Scotland denies the Headship of Christ over His Church. Therefore, the Church of Scotland is not Christian. I do not ask Mr. McTavish but I ask every intelligent reader of your paper is he prepared to accept that conclusion—the conclusion that the Church of Scotland is not a Christian church? If the conclusion cannot be accepted, and the soundness of the Major proposition cannot be doubted—then the fallacy of necessity rests in Mr. McTavish's proposition: "The Church of Scotland denies the Headship of Christ over His church." I shall say no more on that point. In Mr. McTavish's letter which appeared in your last issue, there occurs this remarkable sentence, "That church (the Church of Scotland) is in such a condition, that, while nominally holding the same doctrine, government and discipline as we (the Free Church) have, if the government (the State or Civil Government) would order it to deny the divinity of Jesus Christ or adopt the worship of the Virgin Mary, it is legally and morally bound to obey." According then to this statement of Mr. McTavish the Church of Scotland is legally bound to deny the divinity of Jesus Christ or to worship the Virgin Mary, wh. never she receives orders from the State to do so. That evidently agrees with the conclusion of my Syllogism and therefore Mr. McTavish accepts it. Let me refer to the legal obligation binding the Church of Scotland to deny the divinity of Jesus Christ or to worship the Virgin Mary at the bidding of the Civil power. Such a legal obligation as that could only take its rise in some outrageous act of Civil Legislation which will never be enacted. But suppose the Government of Great Britain should pass an enactment commanding the Church of Scotland to deny the fundamental doctrine of her Christian faith, the divinity of Jesus Christ, and commanding her to transfer her worship from the only object of worship to the Virgin Mary, would she accept the command? Would she come under the obligation? If an answer is wanted to that question it will be found at the graves of Scotland's martyrs. There is another obligation, a moral obligation, Mr. McTavish says, by which the Church of Scotland is bound to deny the divinity of Jesus Christ or to worship the Virgin Mary, as the State may bid her. I am afraid Mr. McTavish said that in his haste. He had not taken time sufficiently to consider the nature of a moral obligation. Moral obligations never bind us to do that which is wrong. I sincerely trust Mr. McTavish teaches sounder views of morality to the Free Church congregation of Woodstock. If not, I pity them. Instead of dealing with such loose and random statements as these of Mr. McTavish, let me ask your readers to look into the true nature of the connection between the State and an established church. There they will find, I think, no ground for the charges that are brought against the Church of Scotland by such men as Mr. McTavish. I feel confident that every reader of your paper admits and believes, on the authority of God's word, that the Church and State are both institutions of divine appointment. If so they are both appointed for good. Such institutions, co-operating together and mutually aiding each other, can accomplish more good than when acting separately, and, if that were possible, independently of each other. If that be admitted, it must next be granted that a connection between Church and State is desirable. That connection can be, and in the case of the Church of Scotland, is maintained without encroachment by the one upon that which belongs legitimately and exclusively to the other. The Church of Scotland claims no jurisdiction or authority in matters that are purely civil and secular. These she says belongs not to her. Another power takes cognizance of them—the civil power. On the other hand, the State claims no authority over those things which belong exclusively to the Church. The State does not interfere with the doctrines, ordinances, form of worship, government or discipline of the Church. These, she says, belong not to me but to the Church. The connection between the two allows no such mandates as Mr. McTavish supposes. I am afraid I have transgressed too much upon your space, and shall conclude by submitting two general principles that are recognized by the Church of Scotland and the State and upon which the connection between the two is based. They will enable your readers to understand the matter a little better than the loose and somewhat wild statements of Mr. McTavish. These principles are:—1st. The civil magistrate is entitled to know the opinions of the community of Christians to whom he imparts the benefit of an establishment. 2nd. The civil magistrate is entitled to take note that the established church does her duty and that none of her regulations disturb the peace of the land. These are the two general principles that lie at the foundation of that connection that exists between the State and the Church of Scotland. Whether Mr. McTavish likes it or not the authority of the

State implied in the last part of the second principle applies to the Free Church and every other. Your readers have simply to look across the Atlantic ocean to see the necessity existing at present in some of the nations in Europe for that authority being observed and enforced. Mr. McTavish and all who sympathize with him may calm their minds and quiet their fears about the Union at this time. The Church of Scotland in this country was quite willing for the sake of united action on the part of the Presbyterian Church, to forget the past, but I am much mistaken if she is not now beginning to realize the fact that she would not feel comfortable united to a body in which there is such a spirit. I am, dear sir, Yours truly, JAMES HERRALD. St. Andrew's Manse, Dundas, March 11, 1874.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM INDIA.

We take the following extracts from a letter of the female missionaries of the Canada Presbyterian Church, lately sent to India. The letter is dated Allahabad, January, 8th 1874, and is addressed to the Rev. T. Lowry, Brantford:— "You will be glad to know that we are still with Dr. and Mrs. Brodhead. We find them such thorough missionaries, so devoted to the work, and so faithful to all that makes a missionary's work so Christ-like. In company with Mr. B. (who is a Zenana teacher) we visited a few native houses. It seemed too bad that we could not speak to them. A great crowd came in to see us at the first house, that of a Hakim or native Doctor. "We have begun study with a Munshi or Mohammedan Doctor. We are studying Hindustani in the Roman character. We read every day for an hour in the Gospel of John. We commenced on the 2nd of January, and to-morrow we begin the 4th chapter. Dr. Brodhead says he fancies we will have very little trouble with the pronunciation, though really one has to strain the throat to an ugly extent. It is very much like the language of the Canadian Indian, as far as we can judge, only more guttural; a great deal of *are* and *on* sounds in it. The Munshi charges 5 rupees, or \$2.50 per month. Dr. B. has sent to Calcutta for a Dictionary and Grammar. Such books are expensive. After we get a good start in Hindustani, we are to take Hindi, and then we will have two Munshis (and more books), because a Mohammedan Munshi will not teach Hindi, it would defile him. "We are expected to take up house soon on our own account, as Mrs. B. is going home to America in the beginning of March. "We think after two months we will be able to speak enough to get on by ourselves. We think we will be able to live much cheaper. All the American ladies are house-keeping, and they advise us to do so also."

Sabbath Schools.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN. Sir,—At the risk of being thought both old fogy and irreligious, I cannot help expressing my sympathy with a great deal of what your correspondent the "Cobbler" said about Sabbath Schools. I will not for a moment deny that these have done and are doing a great deal of good, but the harm occasioned by them is not small. Many of the teachers are not fit for their work and take no pains to improve. In many cases they make no preparation for meeting their classes, and anything like intelligent instruction is therefore out of the question. In a vast number of cases I am convinced it would be far preferable for parents to keep their children at home and instruct them themselves. To do this, however, would be cried out against as showing a bad example, and not taking a due interest in the affairs of the church. It is quite true that the theory is not to supersede parental teaching but to supplement it. It is notorious, however, that very many parents feel themselves relieved from all care of the spiritual interests of their children, by the fact that they send them to the Sunday School. I am not opposed to Sabbath School teaching, but wherever it is at all possible I believe the parents ought to teach their children and teach them at home. I am quite sure that very many fathers could endorse to the letter the description given by "Cobbler" of the continued hurry of children to one thing or the other all the Sabbath, and the impossibility thereby of a father that is busy all the week having any opportunity even on the day of rest of spending some little time quietly with his children. Yours truly, A. B. C.

The Rev. David Mitchell, New York, who was called to be pastor of Calvin Church, St. John, N. B., has declined the call and remains in his present charge.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILROAD.

The following notes regarding the Intercolonial Railroad with which Mr. Hazlewood the engineer for the St. Lawrence District has very kindly furnished me, will—no doubt—be interesting to the readers of the PRESBYTERIAN.

A short distance west of the Engineers' house at the Tartigon river (Section 13), about 12 miles from Grand Metis, is a rock cutting nearly 2000 feet long, and in some parts 45 deep. A short distance east of it is an embankment 65 feet high, and nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ of a mile long. There are 8 tunnels in the whole section, all made to divert streams into new channels. The main one is near the house already referred to. It diverts the course of the Tartigon river through a rocky cliff, thereby saving the building of two bridges. The length is 454 feet, the height 18, and the width 20. Section 13 is the heaviest on the whole line. The highest embankment on the Intercolonial is at the "Big Gorge" in Metis. It is 80 feet high, and $\frac{1}{2}$ of a mile long, and containing 202,000 cubic yards of rock and earth. The heaviest grade on the whole line—58 feet to the mile—is in Metis. A short distance beyond the east end of Section 18 is the greatest height of the Intercolonial above high water at the Baie des Chaleurs—745 feet. In Metis there is a cutting termed the "Summit Cut," which is 4600 feet long, and 85 deep, 113,000 cubic yards of rock and earth were taken out of it. The railroad bridge over the Metis consists of 4 spans of 100 feet each, and contains about 28,000 cubic yards of masonry. In the centre it is 60 feet above the bottom of the river. Two steam drills were used on Section 18—the only place on the whole line where they were used.

The Riviere du Loup bridge is built on the "Howe Truss" principle, and consists of 8 spans of 100 feet each, with a roadway on the top. The depth of the Truss is 18 feet, and the height of the roadway above the bed of the river is 40 feet. It was designed by Mr. Sandford Fleming, lately Chief Engineer of the Intercolonial Railroad, and is supposed to be one of the strongest Howe Trusses at present in existence. The R. du Loup and Isle Verrie (Green Island) bridges, and the one over the Missisquoi river in Nova Scotia, are the only wooden ones along the whole length of the Intercolonial Railroad. They were built before the Commissioners at length so far complied with the suggestion of the Chief Engineer to have them all made of iron.

The work is how so far advanced that there appears to be no hindrance to the cars being able to go down by midsummer to Ste Flavie about 6 miles from Metis. The latter will, no doubt, soon be a popular watering-place. T. F. Metis, Que.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Mr. Editor,—I am very glad to tell our people through you something that is very cheering.

Some time ago an anonymous letter, from a lady, was handed to one of our probationers in a church in which he had been preaching. One hundred dollars was enclosed, with the request that he should dispose of it for missionary purposes as might seem best to him. Last Friday evening I met him and he handed me forty dollars to help in procuring my outfit.

I feel very thankful to the giver of all good. I feel very much encouraged. This is surely a token for good. May He who alone can bless, bless her who has rendered such material assistance to, and given such a tangible token of her interest in, the spread of the gospel!

Yours very sincerely, J. B. FRASER. Knox College, Toronto, March 23, 1874.

The annual meeting of St. Andrew's congregation, Peterboro', was held on Wednesday of last week. The financial statement of the managers showed a revenue of \$1,841.88 for ordinary purposes, being somewhat in advance upon that reported a year ago. Expenditure, \$1,651.76, leaving balance on hand of \$190.08. Mr. Walter Deal was re-elected a manager, and Mr. Arthur Rutherford was elected in the room of Mr. James F. Dennistoun, who declined re-election. It was reported that considerable progress has been made with a subscription to pay off \$800 of the debt on the property of the church. A coalition vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Frederick Bell, and to Mr. Joseph McCall and for their services last year, as organized and leaders of the choir, respectively. A committee was appointed to take up the subscription for the year, and to see that the same is properly increased in the next year.