

## Contributors and Correspondents

### EVANGELISTIC WORK, No. 2

In my last communication on the subject of this work, I had occasion to refer to its popularity in some quarters. It were all also to notice

**ITS GROWING POPULARITY,**  
which is at present very striking. When was first spoken of in the Courts of the Free Church, about twenty years ago, it was with great and prolonged difficulty they could be induced to consider the subject at all. Mark the contrast now, when last May its importance was fully recognized, and strongly commended to the attention of Presbyteries and congregations by the Assemblies of the Free and Established Churches of Scotland, and of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, also by the Synods of the U. P. Church of Scotland and the English Presbyterian Church. Let us hope, and indications encourage the hope, that the time is not far distant when it will receive the endorsement and the practical consideration from our own Church Courts which it so well deserves. Let me add a few thoughts in regard to the nature of the work and the great essentials to success in it, and first—

**THE WORKERS.**  
The time may come when we shall have our Church, and under the direction of our Presbyteries, men set apart for this work, and wholly given to it, who have a special aptitude for it; but in the meantime, why should not our pastors "do the work of an evangelist," as Paul desired Timothy to do, and also make full proof of his ministry? It may be somewhat "out of season" to the regular "pastor," and may require him for a time to "spend and be spent" in unusual manner and degree; but all this Paul seems to have thought desirable for the minister in his day, and why not in ours? I do not undervalue the services of others not in the ministry. All who have tried the work know how the desire arises, "Let us have all the suitable help we can obtain." But, meantime, I say, let us help ourselves, and I believe, with Dr. McVicar, the thing is quite feasible, as recent experience shows. In listening to the most noted evangelist in Great Britain, and many others, I have ever been impressed with the thought that their work might be done quite as well, if not better, by our trained ministry, if they would just lay aside prejudice, and appreciate the importance and the value of the special means employed; study them and give them a fair trial. Mr. W. Varley, for example, I honour and revere as a faithful and efficient worker in our Master's service, and one from whom I have learned some precious things, yet it must strike many of his hearers in Toronto at present that his exegesis of Scripture and arrangement of matter, hence his efficiency as a teacher and preacher, might have been much improved by college training. It becomes an interesting question as to wherein lies the secret of the success of these men. We can hardly hesitate to acknowledge as its most important element their

### SPIRITUAL POWER.

Is not this the same "unction from the Holy One" promised of old, and enjoyed by Peter and Paul, Stephen and Barnabas, and every eminent preacher of the Gospel and winner of souls since their time. By this we understand something quite independent of the intellectual power so highly prized by the churches at the present day. Not that they err in this so much as in overlooking the relatively far greater value of that other power, without which they are taught (Acts i., 4 and 8) not to dare venture into conflict with the world. Well will it be for them when they go back to first instructions, and act upon them, as did the little band in Jerusalem. It does not follow that we despise great gifts. Let us rejoice in them when combined with fervid spirituality, as in Luther and Calvin, Knox and Chalmers. But these are few and far between, and it is a fact that God often uses the weak things of the world to do His great works, that the glory may be more evidently His own. There are thousands of preachers whose names are but little known beyond their own horizon, whose ministry, as far as man can judge, has been far more fruitful in what will appear most glorious in the light of eternity—the salvation of souls, than that of such men as Norman McLeod and Dr. Guthrie, not to speak of poor Beecher. There are scores of men in Edinburgh and Toronto of equal or superior intellect, and far more learning, than Moody and Varley, who have never approached them in the results they have achieved. Why is it so is worthy of careful study. I would venture to suggest that often these very talents are fruitful in a self-confidence which hinders their possessors being used of the Spirit as they might otherwise be. Class prejudice against what seem unprofessional methods of work is probably another reason. Command us rather to Spurgeon's disregard of pulpit-conventionalism. "I would not," he says, "hesitate to stand on my head in the pulpit, if it would only help to impress upon the hearts of the people the truth. Or to his greater prototype, who was willing to be all things to all men, if by any means he might save some."

Let none, then, shrink from evangelistic work because they do not possess popular gifts—McCheyne had little acceptance in Edinburgh, and W. O. Evans little in many towns and cities—but let them humbly seek, as the first essential to success, the teaching of God's Spirit, and His swelling and energizing power. Surely this is so clearly promised in God's Word, that even the weakest and most unworthy need not despond of its attainment. In fact, those who are most likely to succeed, are those who are most likely to succeed. The means of its practical application may form the subject of a future consideration.

W. M. R.  
Aylburn, Nov. 10.

## NEW YORK CORRESPONDENT.

BY A CANADIAN STUDENT.

Since our last inkings for your paper, the ever varying record of things at age and new in New York, has rolled up its usual diurnal quota, which can only be chronicled by the 14 page daily paper, such as the *Tribune* issues every morning. Just think—3 sheets like the *Globe*, closely printed in small type, at one edition. The literary and scientific section of the community has been entertained by instructive lectures on "Egypt," by Rev. Dr. Chambers, and the world-renowned Bayard Taylor. Both these gentlemen have recently returned after a somewhat protracted sojourn in that, now, doubly interesting land through the continual resuscitation of its primitive civilization, crystallized in its Mummies, Sarcophagi, Hieroglyphics, Pyramids, &c.

These lectures were racy and entertaining. Your readers will find the best report of Taylor's lecture in the *Times*, much fuller than that of the *Tribune*, which usually reports very fully scientific lectures, and publishes them in the form of "Extras." By the way, no more varied and interesting gleanings can be found than those extras, viz., Extra No. 23, containing the Tyndall-McCosh controversy, with lectures by Huxley, Owen, &c., can be got for 10 cts.

There are many lectures and literary meetings every night, but the above are noticed, being of general interest throughout civilization on account of the excavations going on in that land of the Pharaohs.

We hinted in our last the possibility of giving your readers an idea of the sermonizing of the far-famed Beecher. To describe the man, or analyze his doctrines, is given up as a hopeless enigma by the shrewdest critics, at ordinary times, not to speak of the extra complication of the present critical juncture. The weekly prayer-meetings give a decidedly more favorable impression of the audience and the discourses, than the Sabbath services, the former being more respectable than the latter.

The Sabbath audience is truly a "mixed multitude," to whom Plymouth chapel seems a substitute for the Sunday theatre, a place of amusement rather than worship, at least in the old fashioned sense of this term. No for the sermon or what passes for it—that melange of ethical maxims—or so—sentimental creations—dazzling flashes of oratory—unique illustrations gleaned from the whole universe, &c., &c., making up an address over an hour in delivery. Criticism is out of the question. A column of your paper would not suffice to give a correct idea of it.

Your readers will have a clearer notion of our impressions of both sermon and audience, conveyed by that illiterate but expressive adjective, "bosky." This epithet will apply more pertinently to Beecher's theology, which is served up in Homoeopathic quantities. Your correspondent heard Beecher last Sabbath morning, and Dr. Ormiston in the evening, both preaching on the same subject and text, "Learning Christ." The discourse of the former was an ethico-humanitarian prelection about learning and knowing Christ, from sources other than the creeds, church, &c. Such a disquisition as might have been given with slight variation of names, by Plato, or other Egan moralist. It ended with a sarcastic denunciation of creeds in general, and the Calvinistic in particular, in the characteristic style of the free thinker of this country and age. There is no backbone in Beecher's theology. It did us good in many ways to hear Dr. Ormiston after Beecher, restoring us to our original frame of mind. Space does not permit an outline of his able and stirring sermon, whose key-note was the very *antipos* in point of scriptural soundness—to that of the Plymouth oracle. In a word, those of your readers having heard the Dr. (who, in Canada has not?) have, in the writer's humble opinion, listened to a sadder, abler, safer preacher than the Brooklyn sensational orator, clever though he be. His great failing and forte too, is the persistent effort to cater or rather pander to the popular taste. The comparison may seem irreverent and unworthy, still it faced itself on us, in the similarity in the chief trait of another American whose name is a household word, P. T. Barnum, whose big show occupies a whole block on 6th Avenue. The most successful caterer to the public gratification—the preacher of all opinions, struck us as the Sunday-Barnum.

It would be as amusing as selections from *Punch*, or your *Grip*, to give some of his hits, puns, &c. Some other times I may

send a few specimens of the more clever ones, and there are some really "smart" things said by him. His admirers may think we handle him roughly, especially those aspiring young preachers in Canada who rebash (or some we heard) repeat his sermons.

New York, Oct. 21th, 1874.

## HOURS WITH A CHURCH COURT.

### VII. NOONTIDE.

"Now for the tug of war," one would have felt inclined to say, under other conditions than those existing at the stage in the proceedings at which we have arrived, but, as things have begun to take a turn in the direction of agreement, causing a breaking up of the darker clouds that cast around us their gloomy and bewildering shadows, and a flag of truce has been raised, anguring a drawing closer of the cords of brotherhood, we are all on the *qui vivo* with expectancy as to the negotiations for peace which may be set afoot. Platform and parlor sentiment about a common brotherhood among Christian men and women of every colour and degree may be very entertaining betimes, and is, no doubt, all as it should be in its own place; at the same time we own to a liking for everything like earnestness in seeking to have the living embodiment of such sacred sentiment, in preference to fruitless lip service about it, in the way of unmeaning conventional courtesy. It is not a matter of creed or no creed: to our mind the no creed cry, of which some writers are rather fond at present, is out of keeping with the genius of the age in which we live, which has some claim to be called a thinking one, and also has a proneness for casting its thoughts into a scientific mould, and can only be explained on the principal of a reaction against the opposite extreme, itself running to an extreme, which all reactions are ever apt to do; but it is the matter of a creed into which has been breathed the breath of a living humanity, rather than one which is nothing but dry bones. The world has had enough of dry bones. Adieu to the John, who, under a laudable impulsion on it, "Peace on earth, good will to men," have as their watchword, "What is to be done with peace." All hail to the setting in of peace and earnestness. The meeting has now fully entered on its weighty work. It has been the subject of many prayers, we cannot doubt, while looked forward to with bated breath. And, as if arising out of this, a general feeling is apparent all around, which strikes us as an index of a general desire to raise no stumbling block in a brother's way, but on the contrary to leave no stone unturned to remove all existing ones wherever seen. Never do we remember of attending any gathering where discordant elements of thought were to be harmonized, where there was a more vivid illustration of the harmonizing power of a living Christianity, which is said on the west of authority to make rough places smooth and crooked places straight. Could anything but the happiest results accrue from such a state of things as this? Most fitting means was it to gain the end desired by every lover of the good cause. Unity in action must ever lead to unity in the end, as it is love expressed in fitting forms that kindles love, and not the attitude more befitting enmity, whose visible form is bickering and uncharitable words. Besides, it is in this element that the mind not only conceives its divinest thoughts, and reaches its most trustworthy decisions, but also has its clearest resolutions of the thoughts of God. And as truth is one, though it has many sides, the clearer the vision the more of seeing eye to eye, and the more of harmony even where differences still remain. Turbid streams are apt to be shallow ones, and very muddy too. History has many a mischievous mistake to lay to the charge of an unpeaceful or unloving state of soul; many a heart-burning, many a tear and scene of desolation to lay to the door of ignorance. In this connexion we are reminded of certain lessons which we have learned, as of the nature of first truths, from that source which all Christians of every name acknowledge as their infallible guide. These at may not be amiss to notice briefly, to refresh our memory a little, and at the same time to bring into prominence in our mind the real meaning of the negotiations just referred to, and the ground on which they rest.

1. We have learned that there is essentially one common Christian brotherhood, involving a common fellowship in spirit and aim. The Christian life is essentially and substantially one, under all types and forms, and conditions, springing in all from one root, maintained by one and the same kind of nature, producing always and everywhere fruits that are one in kind though not in degree. "One is your Master, and all ye are brethren," is the Scripture watchword for the whole rank and file. "I am the vine, ye are the branches," brings all to a common meeting point, as all growing from the same tree. This is all true. Very well, since it is, there is not only some family likeness, which one may recognize in all, but also a certain union of sympathies, on which as a foundation it

is necessary to build, in the whole visible fabric of church life, if we would not mar that deeper fellowship with God and man which such common brotherhood implies—if schism in short is not to have a place with all its attendant inevitable evils.

2. We have learned that diversity is a law of life in this common brotherhood. Though revealed truth is one, it will present itself in different lights to different minds, even when these are all so many blinding lights, only bringing it out into fuller radiance and beauty by their very diversity. If each individual has convictions of his own, rather than such as are not his own, obtained by tradition or otherwise, which he holds to be great essentials as others may, without addition or diminution, just as they have come from a higher mind than man's, the applications which he makes of these essentials, by inference which he deduces from them will necessarily vary, according to his cast of mind, the state of his religion, knowledge, and experience, his general education and his circumstances. We see this verified in every-day experience, not in separate branches of the church alone, but in the same branch as well, among those who, notwithstanding in sum and substance, are identically one. What is this variety but a sign of life? Monotony is stagnation, and stagnation is death. Diversity, therefore, so long as it grows from the one living root, it is everything but a good ground for separation, or remaining so, when it happens from any cause to have taken place. Diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. Diversities of administration, but the same Lord. Diversities of operations, but it is the same God who worketh all in all. We are thus taught of a unity in difference.

3. We have learned that it is the part of all Christians, in whatever they may differ, to co-operate in whatever they stand on common ground. There they ever have a meeting point, as having at least a common end. And we venture to add, as a thing of everyday experience, that where there is such harmony in operation, this expressed sympathy at work individual convictions, though they differ, have more power than otherwise to serve the cause of truth. An opposite course is ever powerful to tender such convictions in their influence on those who differ from them null and void, something even worse than null and void. If men are thoroughly in earnest and love the truth, and welcome her queenly form wherever she be found, they can stand to look their differences in the face, and shake hands over them without compromise, hailing with pleasure their many agreements, and going forward in these in one great phalanx against all that is inimical to the good of our Charity teaches all this.

4. We have still further and lastly learned that oneness already existing in principle makes incorporative an imperative thing. This we take to be one of the plainest lessons taught us from the sacred page. We can no more make churches than we can make the elements, or change the current of the winds, or the ebb and flow of the tides of ocean. When we say this we are simply saying that the laws of the Christian church are not of our formation, and that the relations in which any number of people belonging to it are to stand to each other, are determined by principles immutable as the eternal God himself. If the elements are existing adapted to form in their very nature one organic body, it must ever be regarded as an arbitrary proceeding for any number of Christian people to remain in two or more. Sentiment, tradition, anything else to which the human mind may cling very fondly, is cherished to excess, when it even whispers, "no, it cannot be," in such a case. In this respect we would say, "What God hath joined, let not man put asunder." The Christian is wanting to his creed a little if he does train his sympathies to flow where God in his providence direct.

MEXICANA.

### Title Reverend.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR.—Allow me a small space to review the article contained in your issue of the 6th inst., on the above subject, in response to certain questions propounded by me in a former number.

You say, "The matter in itself is too insignificant to deserve attention," permit me to differ with you in that respect. Did not the blasphemous assumption of the Pope and the hierarchy of the Church of Rome take their rise from small beginnings? History teaches us that the first step towards opening the prerogatives of God was the appropriating of His titles. You say "The Hebrews know nothing of the conventional use made of that name." Was it not that the Hebrews held His sacred name in two such a way to make a high use of it? Even in their most degenerate days, when they robbed God of His titles, His sacrifices, and His Sabbaths, yet they did not presume to rob Him of His name.

You say "No sensible man will be offended by finding that the prefix is wanting to his name." Why, Sir, was there not one sensible man in the whole Wesleyan Conference of England? The amount of indignation expressed by the whole Conference shows they value the place upon the profit, and it remains to be proven that Presbyterian ministers, if tried in the same way, profess more of the grace of humility than their Wesleyan brethren. To the second question (the most important of the three) your reply is quite besides the question. The question was not whether it was right according to legal or ecclesiastical law, but it was whether the party allowing himself to be called by titles of distinction implying superior holiness, was not violating the law given by Christ to His Church? Permit me to state it again, "Is not the giving or receiving any title of distinction implying superior holiness directly contrary to the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ as contained in Matt. xxiii. 8-10, and xix. 16 17?"

ing the law given by Christ to His Church? Permit me to state it again, "Is not the giving or receiving any title of distinction implying superior holiness directly contrary to the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ as contained in Matt. xxiii. 8-10, and xix. 16 17?"

If I understand these passages correctly, have both precept and example against the use of such titles, and any one allowing himself to be called by such titles violates a Divine command. If I am in error, please show it by an exposition of those passages. You say "It is foolish to make a fuss about its use, and to speak of a conventional usage as if it involved some Scriptural principle."

Is not the Saviour's command a Scriptural principle? And of one plain and positive command can be set aside, why not another. Unless you can show that the minister of the present has more liberty than the Apostles your words would imply (although you did not intend it) that the Saviour made an unnecessary "fuss" and "ado" when the man addressed by the common conventional title "good Master."

But we must believe that he who knew the secret working of the human heart, and the danger to be apprehended from spiritual pride, did not give this precept unnecessarily.

Such commentators as I have been able to consult, agree that such prefixes are here forbidden. For example Barnes says on the former passage, "The command here is an express command to his disciples not to receive such a title of distinction; they were not to covet it; they were not to seek it, that it should be appended to their name." "It tends to engender pride and a sense of superiority in those who obtain it, and envy and a sense of inferiority in those who do not; and the whole spirit and tendency of it is contrary to the simplicity that is in Christ."

SABBATH SCHOOL TEACHER.

Temperanceville, Nov. 10th, 1874.

## Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

SIR.—According to the minutes of the last meeting of the Presbytery of Guelph, the Session of Knox Church, Elora, asked advice of that Court regarding a case of marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

I am very much surprised that the above-mentioned Session should have had the least difficulty as to how it should act in the matter. Has not the General Assembly most

I have heard even ministers say, "I do not approve of such a decision, and, therefore, if I had to do with a case of the kind, I would treat it with contempt." Well, if they were to do so, I maintain that they would break their ordination vows.

The command, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers," is as applicable to the Church as to the State. Our rulers in the former often make laws of which we disapprove, but as we do not believe that it would be sinful to obey them, we obey. We ought to act in the same manner towards our rulers in the latter, in like circumstances. If any evil results follow, they who framed such laws, and not we, shall be held accountable. It would be of no use whatever to make laws, either in the Church or in the State, if the citizens of the one, or the members of the other, were at liberty to obey them or not, just as they pleased. It would be in effect the same as it was in "the good old times," when there was no king in Israel, and every man did what was right in his own eyes.

We justly condemn the dishonesty of the Ritualistic and infidel ministers in the Church of England, who teach in direct opposition to the articles which they have described. What better than they would those ministers of our Church be, who should marry men to their deceased wives' sisters? or those Sessions which should allow such as have entered into that relationship to continue to enjoy Church fellowship? If they think that it would be sinful in them to carry out the law of their Church, then, as honest men, they ought to leave her.

I know of a minister, a "D. D.," in another branch of the Presbyterian Church, but one which is as much opposed to marriage with a deceased wife's sister as ours. Well, one of his elders once asked him to marry him to his deceased wife's sister. He replied, "I cannot marry you, but if you get married, I will not interfere." The elder and his intended ran off to the States and were married. By and by, they came back. Well, that "D. D.," though he knew the law of his church on that subject, and has solemnly promised obedience to his laws, allows that elder to continue, not only a member of his congregation, but also an elder.

I cannot see, Mr. Editor, how a Presbytery can give any advice regarding a case of marriage of the kind referred to. The General Assembly was most distinctly called how those who contract such marriages are to be dealt with. It is the only court which can legislate on that subject. Yours truly, A READER.

CARDINAL Cullen and the entire Catholic Episcopate have issued pastoral letters denouncing the late address of Prof. Tynan at Belfast, before the British Association, as a revival of Paganism.

Our minds are like all-hung vehicles—when they have little to carry, they make a prodigious clatter; when heavily laden they neither creak nor rumble.—Growell.