

THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN.

VOL. 3.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 16th, 1880.

No. 24.

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

A DETACHMENT of the "Salvation Army" from England has made its appearance in New York. And, of course, its members have got into trouble. They have been forbidden to hold their services in the streets of the city. The leaders pronounce woes on New York City.

THE triumph of the Liberals in Britain is complete. They will not be dependent on the Home Rulers, for they outnumber the united forces of the Conservatives and the whole of the Irish brigade. They are consequently in a position to do justice to Ireland without being tempted, in the way all weak Governments are in danger of being, to stretch a point in order to satisfy the unscrupulous holders of the balance of power.

A PROPOSAL for united prayer on behalf of the ensuing General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland is being adopted in Glasgow. A circular signed by ministers representing different shades of opinion has been issued, calling upon members of Presbytery "to join in common supplication for very special grace and wisdom to be given to the approaching Assembly, and for all needed blessings to our Church in the circumstances of trial through which it has been made to pass."

JOSEPH COOK is going to Europe for a few years. He insists, however, on the continuance of the Boston Monday Lecture, and affirms that there are several gentlemen available who are competent to fill the lectureship. We hope that his entreaties will be heeded. A work similar to that in which Mr. Cook has been engaged is needed in these days. It would not be a bad thing if every city of any magnitude had a weekly lectureship devoted to the consideration of religious matters, and especially of their connection with science, and political and social life.

OUR correspondents will find in the following sentences from a contemporary, a clear and concise explanation which we ask them to kindly consider. It will help them to make all due allowance for us when we are unable to insert their communications, and have not time to write to each the reason for our decision: "A paper receiving such a multitude of communications as the 'Congregationalist' cannot always explain by private correspondence why it does not use certain articles. The editors would be glad to shew all contributors this courtesy, but it would be an unreasonable burden. We receive comparatively few articles that would not be worth using, if we had the space, but it is impossible to crowd a bushel into a peck measure, and we endeavour to select that which on the whole is best adapted to the needs of our readers."

COL. INGERSOLL was airing his peculiar views in Toronto last week. He made little or no sensation, and, we fear, did not pocket the anticipated amount of cash. The Col. lays claim to little learning, less science and absolutely no knowledge of spiritual matters. He does not *know* that there is no God, he merely thinks so. And so on through the whole course of his so-called revelations, discoveries, and exposures. There is besides a ring of insincerity about every word this man utters. He speaks with a leer in his eye, and as if he had his tongue continually in his cheek. He has no depth of conviction, not a particle of genius, and not the faintest approach to eloquence. We are bad enough in Toronto without anybody coming to teach us that morality is a delusion, that right and wrong are mere conventionalisms, with all the other nice little conclusions which necessarily flow from the conviction that man lives in a Godless world, and has nothing before him but a dog-like end. We are not sure that Dr. Johnson's advice about "counting the spoons" upon the visits of such unsavoury dispensers of "intellectual treats" was, after all, so far amiss. The Colonel himself may be to be

trusted, though we don't know. We should be sorry at any rate to say as much for a good many of his admirers.

DR. FRASER, Bishop of Manchester, lately delivered an ordination sermon on preaching, which is considerably talked about. The theological epoch, he said, the epoch of oecumenical councils for framing dogmas and theological formulas, did not arrive till long after the days of the apostles. In the time of St. Paul men were content to be religious, rather than theological; to be experts in godliness, rather than in controversy; and to believe simple truths which they found to help them to lead Christian lives. For himself, he confessed, and he was not ashamed to confess it from that pulpit, that he could not, do what he would—he had not tried, it was true, but he could not get up an interest in many matters which were sorely disturbing the Church just now, and which even threatened to rend the Church in pieces. Somehow or other, he could not bring himself to care much about the colour or the shape of a vestment, or about the posture of a minister, or as to the number of candles lighted or unlighted, or as to whether the bread used in the holy communion was leavened or unleavened, or as to whether the wine in the chalice was mixed or unmixed; those things did not seem to him to concern the weightier matters of the Gospel. He had yet to learn that they were more important than righteousness and mercy toward our fellow-men, and love and faith in God, and peace from God. We cannot see but the periods preceding the creed-making councils were quite as Christian as those that accompanied and have followed them.

WE have a great respect for the "Christian at Work" and for all its words and ways—at least for the most of them. We cannot, however, we must acknowledge, see how it finds out that the proposal to tax church property and theological colleges when above the value of \$10,000 is "immoral," and ought to be opposed *vi et armis* by all good citizens. It seems, according to the "Christian at Work," that such a tax "would be a burden on religion and education, and prejudicial to the highest public good." If so, the non-endowment of such institutions must be equally to be condemned, for if it is a sin for the community not to supply all such institutions with well lighted and well-paved streets, protection from fire, robbery, vandalism and all possible municipal evils and inconveniences (all which require money from somebody), *free, gratis, and for nothing*, it must be equally a sin not to supply the wherewithal to build these churches, pay their clergymen, and make even the beadle comfortable. Of course we in these northern regions are very ignorant and we shall therefore be the more pleased if our big brother tell us how to consistently advocate class exemptions from municipal and general civil burthens and yet not be committed to the principle of the State endowing the Church or at least some particular section of it, with all the unpleasant Erastian and compromising consequences inevitably flowing from such a principle. If the "Christian at Work" is in favour of the State endowing the Church, and of Cæsar sitting in judgment and deciding what is truth and what is error, the way is plain enough. But short of this, we cannot see why the owners of a church should not pay their share of the expense incurred in support of the fire and police brigades as they pay their door-keeper's salary and their plumber's bill.

ON the 19th of last month the students of the Free Church College, Glasgow, amid great enthusiasm, presented the following address to the Principal and Professors of the College: "We, the undersigned students at present in attendance at the classes of the Glasgow Free Church College, desire to give expression to our view of the circumstances in which we have been placed by proceedings that have recently occupied public attention in the Church, and particularly by current rumours of a want of harmony between you and us as professors and students. The uneasiness that is prevalent, and which has given rise to

vague suspicions with regard to the character of the teaching given in this college seems to justify our desire to make some statement of what our experience here has been. While this state of matters in general has led to our addressing you, we have been further impelled to do so by the fact that, in the case of one of your number, those suspicions have taken the form of a distinct charge of teaching doctrine that is inconsistent with the dogmatic history of the Church. To those of us who have had opportunities of understanding the spirit and tendency of Professor Candlish's teaching, that charge has appeared as unfounded as it is startling. We feel also that the manner in which it has in various quarters been preferred has been marked by a want of such consideration as has hitherto characterized all intercourse between the members of our Church and her professors. We are well aware that any testimony of ours to the orthodoxy of our teachers would carry with it little weight. At the same time, we feel that while especially expressing our sympathy with Professor Candlish in the painful position in which he has been placed, we are entitled by the intimacy of our acquaintance with the spirit and tendency of the teaching given in this college, to testify to its consistency with the best traditions of the Church. The experience of many of us has led us to feel profoundly grateful that, in the present general unsettling of religious belief, we have come under the influence of teaching so well fitted to confirm our sympathy with evangelical Christianity, as that which is given from the chairs of this college. As members of the Free Church who have her interests at heart, we do not know how we could wish her better than by hoping that, while you continue to discharge the difficult and delicate duties that have been laid upon you, the relations between professors and students here may be marked by such a spirit of mutual confidence and of earnest work as characterizes them now." This address was signed by eighty-nine out of ninety-one students and was responded to by the Professors in eloquent and earnest terms. Among other things Principal Douglas said that ministers and elders had a right at any time to come into any class and see what was doing. If any minister had any suspicion, he would have reason now, more than ever, to come and see, and they would welcome him. They felt it important that he should come as soon as possible. He would conclude by saying that though there were hard things spoken, he felt proud in regard to his country and his Church that such suspicions created such general alarm. In no country but Scotland would such have been the case. He was thankful there was that state of sensitiveness in the Church, and that the Free Church was not a Church in which ministers and students might hold what views they liked. They wished only true liberty, not license. They were thankful that they had a constituency so jealous for God's glory. Professor Candlish whose orthodoxy has been specially under suspicion, said it was of the utmost importance that the theology of the Church should be in cordial sympathy with the religious life of the Christian people—though, of course, their work in the Hall must be thorough and exact, and scholarly, and to some extent technical. The theology, and the spiritual life and practical work of the Church should be carried on together. He might say that he would never have accepted the position of a teacher of systematic theology if he had not thought it possible to combine thorough soundness with perfect openness to receive new light, and if he had not thought that theology had still room for progress and advance, though such an advance could not be an easy matter, and could only be reached after thoroughly mastering what had been already attained. He thought the general principle of the Reformation theology—the testimony of the Spirit, and the self-evidencing character of the Word of God—afforded the only basis on which such a way of carrying on theological study could be prosecuted. What was desirable was not merely to be acquainted with the orthodox modes of expression, but to understand the real essence of the various doctrines, and the principles upon which they rest—the vital facts of spiritual life.