

THE CHAIR OF HUGH MILLER.

In the last days of 1839 Hugh Miller left Orkney for Edinburgh to edit the *Witness*. He tells us that it was in weakness and fear he entered an arena in which he knew he would have to wrestle with "well-to-do" the whole newspaper press of the kingdom." The *Witness* started with a circulation of about 600. As Erasmus said of his edition of the Greek Testament, Miller might say of his *Witness*: "No one can believe how much sweat it cost me." He wrote one or two editorials for each half-weekly issue, and did along with this the work that usually falls on the sub-editors. The series of events that ended in the disruption of Scotland's national Church was a great and impressive spectacle, and for a time one might say without exaggeration, that the whole world looked on and took sides in the struggle. Hugh Miller felt the influence of the many eyes that looked the approval, and also that looked the opposite, and rose to his task with all the might that was in him, until the *Edinburgh Witness* became a household word in Scotland, and in those foreign parts where Scotchmen are found. "He drank delight of battle with his peers." In controversy, he was sometimes unmercifully severe, "not merely," as Professor Masson expresses it, "slaying, but battering, bruising, and beating out of shape" his antagonist; but this was only a passing mood for which he often felt deep sorrow. As a journalist he stood foremost in his day. Hugh Miller, as was acknowledged by friend and foe, (and 31 years has not changed the verdict) ranked next to Dr. Chalmers in rousing the people of Scotland at a critical time, in moulding the views of the Evangelical party, giving them a tongue, and in shaping the course of the Free Church, till in 1848 he fell out with Dr. Candlish, and like Achilles, retired in sullen mood from meddling much with Church matters. For sixteen years he conducted the *Witness*, writing for it no fewer, it is calculated, than a thousand articles, each the result of laborious study, and not dashed off at one sitting, as is commonly the way in these things. But the overwrought brain at length gave way; and that pistol shot—which every one deplored that reads the English language—on one dark night in the house at Sherub Muir, made vacant the editorial chair of the *Witness*.

There was studying in ———— University, and the Free Church Theological Hall at this time, a young man, a nephew of the late Dr. Bayne, of Galt, who inherited a considerable share of the genius of his grandfather, the late Dr. Kenneth Bayne, of Galt, which we find also in his daughter, Mrs. Wilson, first wife of Dr. Wilson of Bonny, and her sons Andrew and John. This young student took early to letters, and cultivated, while attending college, a series of articles to the periodical literature of the day that could bear to be since republished. Mr. Peter Bayne—it is to him we refer—was a visitor with Hugh Miller, and a favorite with him for his grandfather's sake and his own, and for the early promise he gave of eminence as a literary man. On Miller's death Mr. Bayne was appointed editor of the *Witness*. It detracts nothing from the fame of Mr. Bayne that he failed to keep up the *Witness*. It was not simply that it was impossible to find a second Hugh Miller, and that people were prejudiced because it was impossible, but one day of penny dailies had come, and the *Witness* must become a penny daily, or become merged into a paper of that kind.

The *Daily Review* had been started by Mr. David Guthrie, long and favorably known as the publisher of the *North British Agriculturist*, and an office-bearer in the Free High Church of Edinburgh, to do as a daily paper the work the *Witness* was started to do as a semi-weekly. Into this *Daily Review* the *Witness* was merged, and thenceforward in a very full and complete sense the *Review* became the *Witness* of Scotland, and organ of the Free and United Presbyterian Churches, which are now in all public questions essentially one.

The *Daily Review* has had a succession of able editors. Mr. Masson was found dead in his study with the ink scarcely dry on his pen. Mr. David Guthrie also died suddenly. Mr. Kingsley, (brother of the English Churchman so well known for his radical views in theology and politics) resigned the editorial chair, and others who understand Scotch questions better, have filled the chair ably since his departure.

It is felt, however, that a crisis is fast coming in the church affairs of Scotland, and that the very last man of our day was needed to stand where Hugh Miller stood thirty years ago. The occupier of Miller's chair is called to different work from that to which Miller was called. The wisest of men has told us "that there is a time to plant and a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up." The time on which Hugh Miller fell was a time to pluck up, to kill, to break down. He was born to be a man of strife; and those who felt the keenness of his blows that are now ready to acknowledge that

unfortunately his work of strife and demolition was needed, and that it has prepared the way for the Presbyterians of Scotland to say now one to another, let us arise and build. What is needed in Hugh Miller's chair now, is a man that can be skilful to heal, to plant and to build up, a man of broad views in the good sense of that name, a man who will hold the ground already gained and conceded to the Presbyterianism of Scotland by Disraeli's Bill, and help to push forward the conquests till all the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland are united into one church on the platform of Knox and Melville, recognizing two sovereigns in Britain, Queen Victoria and King Jesus.

The best man that could be got for such work as this has been found we believe, in the new editor of the *Daily Review*, and we gladly welcome him to his honoured chair, and wish him much joy thereof, and long continuance therein.

Dr. George Smith, the new editor-in-chief, received his early education in Edinburgh High School and University. He then went to Calcutta as classical Professor in Docton College. In twelve months he was promoted to the Principal of that College. After holding the office of Principal for five years he resigned it to edit a weekly paper of high standing in India—*The Friend of India*. He has been for several years editor of that paper, and the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times*.

A gentleman who knows about his work in India, thus writes of him to Anderson Kirkwood, L.L.D., chairman of the public dinner given to Mr. Smith on entering on his editorial duties:

"I know something of the work which he has done in India. As editor of the *Friend of India* he was quite a power there. By his statesman-like breadth of view, conscientious labour in mastering the details as well as principles of every question which he treated, and clear, firm exposition and maintenance of his own ground, while treating with perfect courtesy those who differed from him, he did service to India, the value of which it would be difficult to estimate—service to the supreme Government, whose authority he jealously supported—service to the natives whose true interests he had at heart—and service to the cause of a Catholic Christianity, which he loyally and manfully maintained."

We anticipate important results from this appointment at this juncture in Scottish ecclesiastical affairs. If there must be further pulling down before building up is begun, and with is prepared, no doubt, to set his shoulder to the work, we hope that his destructive mission will be short and quick, and his constructive work wise and durable.

Instrumental Music in Churches.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—“Yet another Reader” asks five questions in your paper of the 4th of December, and graciously gives “Another Reader” permission to make intelligent reply. The answers can be intelligent only in so far as the questions are intelligible.

(1.) All those Presbyterian ministers who have organs in their churches, or who are willing to have them, may be quoted as authorities unless theirs is the questionable position of enduring what they cannot cure.

(2.) Every Scripture argument for instrumental music, and there are many, is presumable in harmony with and worthy of Presbyterian doctrine.

(3.) An irrelevant question. There is no proved practical connection between the form of praise and the spiritual life of a church. If “Yet Another Reader” knows any churches in which the spiritual life has been promoted or hindered by the introduction of the organ, we should be glad to study such cases very minutely.

(4.) The difference between an object lesson from a wax candle and an organ is simply this:—The one is an object lesson and the other is not; and however, as a matter of taste, we object to conundrums in a “Religious Weekly.”

(5.) Is an involved sentence, and partly unintelligible. We do not know that the Erskine Church, Montreal, asked for a constitution making the non-introduction of instrumental music a term of communion, as the question seems to imply. As a matter of Christian courtesy, we cannot enter into the “strength,” or “weakness” of our superior courts. If your correspondent is anxious to prove them weak, why does he not say so. It might prove to the edification of the said courts, and they might reconsider their action on the organ question. Should they do so, their next decision will be dutifully accepted by

ANOTHER READER.

Instrumental Music,

Editor, BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—With your permission I shall endeavor to make a few remarks in answer to a letter which appeared in the last issue of your paper, over the signature of “W. C. W.” He finds fault with me in objecting to a previous writer giving quotations from the writings of men in support of Anti-Organism; then justifies said writer in doing so, by saying “It is universally acknowledged to be a legal way of supporting asserted to refer to men who, from their avidity and worth, are entitled to profound respect for their opinions on matters that have had their thoughtful consideration.” But this universal acknowledgment is as applicable to Pro-Organists, as it is to Anti-Organists, and if any support can be got

from the two writings of such men, what use is it? One man's opinion is condemn another's, then what better are we of them; not a bit. It is useless therefore in giving them, for the matter can never be settled by them. No doubt he thinks he has forever settled this subject by saying “God does not make commands, and then consent to the breaking of them, for all His commands are absolute and must be obeyed,” and then admits that the use of instruments was a command of God in Old Testament times, hence in Old Testament times, according to his own reasoning, God had to be praised always with them, for he could not consent to the breaking of that command; that is what “W. C. W.” says. Now admit that to be true for the sake of argument. Then what shall he make of the synagogue worship? God must have been praised there with them, for He could not consent to the breaking of His command even there; and if the Christian Church should be modelled after the form of the Synagogue worship, how can he or any one else object to the use of instrumental music in it? Perhaps he may say it was only commanded and appointed as a constituent part of the temple worship, and to be associated with sacrifice, for he speaks about the keeping of the passover, the slaying of bulls and goats, &c., &c., but that could not have been the object of its appointment or it would have been included in the ceremonial law, and only used in the temple, and at times when sacrifices were offered. Now we know that sacrifices were offered without it, and that sacrifices were offered with it. Also, it was used when sacrifices were not offered, thereby proving its appointment could not have been made in connection with sacrifices, neither a constituent part of the temple worship; or it would never have been used outside the temple, as we know it was. I believe its use was commanded by God in connection with the service of praise, it never being used unless accompanied with praise, and to show this command to be different from the rest, can give instances where God was praised without them, even in the Old Testament times, and if acceptable praise was rendered to God both with and without them then, the same can be done now, for the manner of praise now should be the same as the manner of praise then, with the exception of abolishing what was practised then, as being typical of Christ and included in the ceremonial law, hence, I repeat it is discretionary whether they are used or not. He says, in the absence of a direct command from Christ on the subject, we must take his example as well as the example of the Apostles. But Christ and the Apostles did not require to say anything in reference to the mode of using instruments, such mode being authorized and commanded by God ages before; and in the absence of a direct command to abolish it, how can we abolish it? He says, “follow their example.” Well, if his mode of reasoning is worth anything it can also be applied to the Christian Church in other respects. For instance, take the present position of many of her ministers. Had Christ and the Apostles fine churches to preach in, with regular organs, and fine houses in which to dwell at their ease? No, they had not. Then in the absence of a direct command from Christ on this subject, why do ministers not follow their example, and go about from place to place preaching and teaching the people, not even taking two cents with them and no money in their purse? In this respect we see they do not follow their example, and when their use was appointed only in connection with the service of praise, and that service still binding on the Christian Church, how can we forever abolish their use? For it is a distinctive principle of Presbyterianism that we are not at liberty to introduce into God's worship anything He has not appointed. It must of necessity be applied in the same, that we are not at liberty to abolish anything He has appointed without His command. And instead of “Another Reader,” I shall now subscribe myself,

Truly yours,
PRO ORGANIST.

Presbytery of Simcoe.

ORDINATION SERVICES.

A meeting of this Presbytery was held at Nottawa, on Wednesday, 16th inst., at 2.30 p. m., for the purpose of ordaining Mr. John R. S. Burnett, probationer, and inducting him into the charge of the United Congregation of Duntroon and Nottawa. On account of Mr. Burnett having recently undergone trials and examinations for license, it had been resolved by the Presbytery to dispense with the usual trials for ordination with the exception of one discourse. This discourse, a popular lecture on Mark, viii., 34-38, Mr. Burnett delivered to the satisfaction of the Presbytery, and it was agreed to proceed with the services for ordination and induction. No objectors appeared in response to the intimation made to the congregation that the Presbytery were prepared to proceed. A sermon was preached by Mr. Moodie on Ezekiel iii. 27. Mr. Rogers, who presided, gave a narrative of the steps previously taken, and did, by prayer, and imposition of hands in which the brethren present joined, ordain Mr. Burnett to the office of the holy ministry. Thereafter the right hand of fellowship was given to the newly ordained minister, and he was inducted to the pastoral charge of Duntroon and Nottawa. The usual addresses to the minister and the people were then delivered, the former by Mr. Wm. Fraser, and the latter by Mr. Knowles. A short address was also given to the people in Gaelic by Mr. Cameron. Mr. Burnett was conducted to the door of the Church, and then acknowledged as the minister of the congregation by the members, by taking his right hand. Mr. Burnett having agreed to sign the formula when required, his name was added to the roll, and he took his seat as a member of the Court. Mr. Rogers was appointed to introduce the newly inducted pastor to the session of the Congregation. A quarter's salary in advance was paid by the managers. The meeting was closed with the benediction.—R. Moodie, Clerk of Pres.

Sabbath School Teacher.

LESSON I.

January 2. JOSHUA ENCOURAGED. Joshua 1.

CONSENT TO MEMORY, v. 8, 9. SCHIFFMUELLER ILLUSTRATIVE OF v. 1, Deut. i. 38; of v. 2, Deut. xxiv. 6, 8, of v. 3, Deut. xi. 24; of v. 4, Deut. iii. 8, 9; of v. 5, Josh. xiii. 5; of v. 6, Deut. xxv. 23; of v. 7, Deut. xxviii. 14; of v. 8, Ps. 1. 2; of v. 9, Matt. xxviii. 20.

GOLDEN TEXT.—Then therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus.—2 Tim. ii. 1.

CENTRAL TRUTH.—The Lord's presence to the strength of his servants. For the general character and memorable features of this Book see article in this No. entitled “Book of Joshua.” Teachers it is hoped will study it, or some similar, if possible, fuller account. It is of great importance in teaching to be in intelligent sympathy with the author, whose thoughts we seek to impart to others.

The verses of our lesson fittingly introduce the history of (a) the conquest, and (b) the division of the land. They are described concisely as “Joshua Encouraged,” and two questions occur to the mind: Why did he need encouragement? What was given him? Every important truth in the passage comes under one or other of these; and in whatever order a teacher may put the ideas before the class, the mind is helped by having them arranged in some such way as this.

I. WHY DID JOSHUA NEED ENCOURAGEMENT? The unreflecting, light-minded and weak are commonly self-satisfied and feel no anxiety. “Never fear” is their language regarding their own career. It is different with the thoughtful and really strong. They know the solemn issues of life and are afraid. See Moses (Ex. iii. 11; Jer. 6).

Joshua was of the latter class. See his character displayed in Numb. xiv. 6, and described in Numb. xxvii. 18. He needed encouragement, for

(1) Moses was dead (v. 1), his experience and weight of character lost to the people. (This links the book of the account of his death in Deut. xxxiv.) To succeed such a leader was itself a great responsibility under which any man might falter. Joshua had been his “minister,” confidential helper (not servant), adjutant, deputy, friend, see his appointment (Numb. xxi. 15-23), trusted by him from an early period (see Ex. xvii. 9), and kept near him (see Ex. xxiv. 13, compared with Ex. xxiii. 11, and Ex. xxiii. 17). How tenderly the Lord speaks of “Moses, my servant” v. 2).

(2) A great war of subjugation was to be waged against nations strong, trained to war, with fortified towns, and sensible that their struggle was for life. The people knew their strength from the spies and from experiences. (See Numb. xiv. 40-45).

The boundaries of the land are again defined, and a map will be a help in understanding them. “This Lebanon” could be seen all around, made the northern border as the wilderness did the southern, with all the land lying between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean on the east and west (see Gen. xv. 18-21), and now held by the Hittites, a general name for the tribes of Canaan, particularly in the north (see Jud. i. 26 and 1 Kings xi. 1-3).

(3) The invaders were raw, untrained, unused to war, feeble, encumbered with women and children, with no base of supplies, no country to fall back upon, no strong cities in which to recruit, in a word every thing in appearance against them. Joshua knew this well. He needed encouragement, and blessed be God! “He knoweth the way that I take” (Job xxiii. 10).

II. WHAT ARE THE ENCOURAGEMENTS? There is one main, and indeed sufficient assurance, but there are other considerations in the passage that deserve notice, as

(1) Joshua had a definite work to do. He could not mistake it (vs. 2, 3). His path was clear. This is a great gain. It is a hard trial to faith to have a mind to work but no way to open it, or to have various fields and not to see which we should take.

(2) Great as was the work, it was not his choosing. “Arise, go” (v. 2). Not ambition, greed, pride, love of conquest, or vanity drove him on. The Lord sent him (v. 5).

(3) Personally he had suitable preparation. God furnishes his servants a certain fitness. He was installed as Moses' successor, had been under his training, had seen his example, and knew all the way in which God had led Israel from the brick-kilns of Egypt until now.

(4) But the main thing, without which all else would be of little avail is the pledged presence of God. See vs. 5 and 9. “But,” one may say, “presence is vague, indefinite, a word of that class in which we put ‘countenance,’ ‘sympathy,’ ‘interest,’ that may mean much or little. How much is involved in this?”

Joshua could be in no doubt. It is well defined to him, “As I was with Moses” (v. 6).

Nor need we doubt, if we will examine how God was with Joshua.

(a) He gave Joshua strength—moral power. See Josh. vi. 27, and especially Josh. iv. 14.

(b) He gave him wisdom, direction (as in relation to Jericho, see Josh. vi. 3) as to the work. An attempt had been made unsuccessfully on the Canaanites in Moses' time (Numb. xiv. 40). Besides being in pride and unbelief, it was, as such attempts commonly are, most foolish. It was on the south, where nature by mountain ridges and art by strong fortifications defended the land. Now Joshua attacks on the defenceless side, takes the only strong place, Jericho, at a time when the overflowing Jordan was deemed defence enough, and has the way opened into the country, with no strong place behind him in the enemy's hand.

(c) He gave him assured protection. See Josh. v. 18-19.

(d) And he gave him success, both in ruling the people, preserving their purity (as in the matter of Achan), and in overcoming their foes. See Josh. xi. 23.

These things are involved in the Lord's presence then and now. This we ask when we say, “O Lord be with us,” and to us in our place, if we seek it in faith, God will give for Jesus' sake such “presence.”

“Now,” one may say, “if God's presence is to given us, we need not feel concern or make an effort.” Joshua's case shows the contrary, and should be studied. This “presence” promised does not put aside the use of all proper means. It makes means effectual. It does not throw us into a passive state. On the contrary it is accompanied with the demand that we rouse ourselves, “fix” our hearts (Ps. cxlii. 7), take firm hold, concentrate our energies on what we have to do. Read v. 7, in which the word “prosper” in the text is not so good as “do wisely” in the margin. Prosperity is promised in v. 8. No slack hand, or rash course or drowsy inactivity is justified by the Lord's presence.

There is a true sense in which a man must believe in himself, for any great work, and he does it through believing in God; “be strong and very courageous.” Men who do not know their ground, who are hating, uncertain where they may stand a week hence are unfit leaders. Positive convictions are needed for positive work. Wavering are weak. Strong men “turn not to the right,” &c. (v. 7), anymore than does a cannon-ball. There is a force behind them.

Nor does God's presence put aside enquiry at the word (see v. 8.). Joshua was to be a hard student of what Bible he had. In this way and the point is emphasized, he should “make his way prosperous and have good success.” He did so to the end (Josh. xxiv. 15, 26-28). Here is the secret of many a success, the want of it the reason for many a failure.

(No teacher should fail to apply these principles to his pupils, according to their age, and capacity and temptations. Nor should it be forgotten that in all this we have illustrated to us the Lord Jesus as God's “righteous servant,” doing the Father's will, speaking the words and doing the works given him to do, and leading the spiritual Israel through dangers to the heavenly inheritance.

SUGGESTIVE TOPICS.

Joshua—his character—position—previous service—new duties—need of encouragement—on what grounds—name them in order—what kind of men feel no fear—the encouragements given, secondary—name them—primary—moaning of God's “presence”—how Joshua enjoyed it—particulars—instances of direction—of success—needful caution—means to be used—of what kind—Joshua's fidelity—the promise thereon—how fulfilled to Joshua.—Dr. J. W. Hall, in S. S. World.

Presbyterian Union in New South Wales.

We have to thank a subscriber for the following interesting notes on Presbyterian Union at the Antipodes:

“The negotiations for Union in New South Wales had been more than once begun and broken off, chiefly, if not wholly, through the utter impracticability of one or two of the Free Church Synod. In 1862, however, the Synod in connection with the Established Church, again invited Conference on Union, and the result was Union, after a battle of three years duration. The Union was consummated on the 8th Sept. 1865. The parties to it were:

I. The Synod of Australia in connection with the Established Church of Scotland

II. The Synod of Eastern Australia, representing the Free Church.

III. The Rev. Adam Thomson, Minister of the United Presbyterian Congregation in Sydney, and so far, representing the U. P. Church in Scotland.

Of the Synod of Eastern Australia representing the Free Church, five ministers in all kept aloof. They formed themselves into a separate Synod, adopting the name of the body they had left. One of the five has since joined the United Church, three of them are dead, the other is hopelessly laid aside. This little body, however, keeps up an existence as a living protest against Union.

As the former attempts at Union were broken off by the obstinacy of certain persons, so the present Union was delayed by the tactics of the same individuals. Professing a desire for Union, they laboured incessantly to prevent it. They were willing to unite, if the Established Church party was prepared to adopt, substantially, a Free Church Basis.

The Union was very cordial, nor has anything occurred to disturb its working since. Human infirmity, of course, crops up occasionally, as it will always crop up, but in nothing whatever has the unity of the church been affected. We are one now, we have always been one, and we shall be one in the future more than ever.

The results have been most cheering. There is a new and spreading activity in the church. Ground is vigorously taken up everywhere. A feeling of strength is coming over us, and our people are no more ashamed of a divided church. Prior to the Union, our divisions were a source of shame to us all, and of triumph to our enemies. Now we grow up and are a power in the colony.

It may be added, that, in our Union we agreed that the voluntary question on the one hand, or the Establishment position on the other, should never be argued in our public assemblies, and the rule has been carefully observed, saving on one or two occasions, when persons who had joined us since our Union, ventilated their views. Nobody however, took any notice of them, and no harm was done beyond wasting time. Out of the Union has already emerged:

1st. St. Andrew's College, endowed by the Government with £500 a year, and helped by a grant of £20,000, besides 8 acres of land in the city of Sydney.

2nd. A Widow's and Orphan's fund.

3rd. New foundations occupied.

4th. Men coming forward as Students of Divinity, a thing before unknown.

5th. The fact that Presbyterianism is a power, and not a disgrace.”