

## Our Contributors.

### SUPPLEMENTARY OPENING LECTURE TO THE STUDENTS OF KNOX COLLEGE.

BY KNOXIAN.

GENTLEMEN,—Knox receives you with open arms, and KNOXIAN bids you welcome. I hope you may, one and all, have a pleasant and profitable session. Those of you who have come for the first time may feel a little homesick for a few days, but that will soon wear off. Those who have been here before will soon make themselves at home. I hope you have secured good, comfortable rooms. Your natural philosophy will tell you that all the students cannot have the best room in the building. None of the rooms are bad. The worst of them is very much better than the best that the students of former days had in the dusty old rookery that used to stand half-way between your elegant building and Yonge Street. The kitchen was so near the Divinity Hall in that old building that the odour produced by cooking cabbage used to enter the Hall during the lecture hour. One of the Faculty declared that the odour was not academic. I don't know what the Faculty of the present day might say on that point. I do know, however, that you have a very comfortable college building, and I hope you will thoroughly enjoy it this session. Welcome, gentlemen all.

Many of you have been doing excellent work in the mission field during the past summer. When you meet in your rooms for an hour's pleasant chat, I dare say you can tell some rare stories about your experiences in the field. Some of the fields, I have no doubt, were rather rough, and you had some hard work to do. On the whole I am certain that you did your work well. Some of you may have seen rather hard times, and possibly some of you suffered from soft ones. Those who suffered from soft times will be pretty certain to visit their fields at Christmas. You understand what I mean, gentlemen. It is all right. Many a manse is brightened and blessed by a life-partner first met in or near the mission field.

I would like to say a few practical, friendly words to those of you who are not too intellectual to listen to anybody less than a professor. If there are any young men among you who toy with the Absolute and Infinite, who soar among the stars and are on familiar terms with thunder, I cannot be of any use to them. Such young men are far beyond my humble reach.

Gentlemen, take good care of your health. You may win scholarships in the university and bursaries in college; but if you enter the ministry with a cracked, feeble voice, with shaky nerves, with a dyspeptic stomach and a liver that goes on strike with painful regularity, you are doomed to failure. Remember that sound sleep is tired Nature's best restorer, and that exercise in the open air is the best tonic. Put a solid wall of good sleep between every two days, and take a good, long walk every day.

Be kind enough to remember that you have come to college to study—not to reform the institution. Reading some of the lines, and between some of the lines in your excellent *College Monthly* I think I can see a slight inclination to re-organize the college curriculum. Might it not be as well to leave the curriculum in the hands of the College Senate? The Senate is composed of learned and excellent men appointed by the Supreme Court of the Church. Quite likely they do their work as well as an equal number of students could do it. At all events they do their best, and as they are responsible for the trust committed to them, it might perhaps be as well to leave the work in their hands. By-and-bye you may be members of Senate and then you can try your hands at re-organizing the curriculum and making such other reforms in the college course as may be deemed necessary. Meantime, study. That is the special business of the student.

I congratulate you on the fact that you do not need to re-organize the boarding department every session. There was a time when students gave much attention to this department. I never learned that the students who led in "stomach rebellions" ever led in anything else. It is always best to leave these matters with the College Board. The Board would, no doubt, consider very carefully anything you might lay before them; but of late years they have been very much pleased to know you have nothing to lay. I assume that you are fairly comfortable, and heartily congratulate you

on the fact that peace reigns in the *cuisine*. It was not always so and it is not so now in many colleges.

Let me remind you, gentlemen, that you are in college for the special purpose of learning how to preach. If the college does not make you preachers it does nothing for you. A preacher that cannot preach is made in vain. Never for one moment allow yourself to forget that your sole business in college is to learn how to bring Gospel truth to bear on the hearts and wills and consciences of your fellow-men. A man may be a scholar and not be a preacher. He may be a good sermonizer and a miserable preacher. He may know how to put a good sermon on paper and not know how to preach. We have any number of good sermon-makers, but not too many who know how to make truth strike and stick.

In this connection, gentlemen, allow me to urge you to cultivate the power of utterance. Paul asked the Ephesian Church to pray that utterance might be given to him so that he might preach the Gospel boldly. The power of utterance is needed by some other men a good deal more than Paul needed it. It is a sad spectacle to see a well-meaning young man in the pulpit or on the platform—a young man who took the highest honors in the university and in college—who has an M.A., and nobody knows what more in the way of academic certificates; but who cannot speak with half as much point and power as some local business man who never saw the inside of a college. Such spectacles are seen every day. Does any young gentleman say that he despises such a small business as learning him to speak effectively? Young man, the people will soon learn to pity if not to despise you. The people have no sort of use for a preacher that cannot preach.

Use every legitimate means to make yourselves effective speakers. Never miss an opportunity to hear men who have the power of moving their fellow-men. Don't by any means confine your attention to ministers. Go down to Osgoode Hall when the leaders of the Bar are exerting themselves under the stimulus of a \$500 brief. Take an evening in Parliament occasionally when there is a good debate going on. There are three or four capital speakers in the Local House. Study the methods of these men. Watch how they put their points. See how they marshal their facts and make their illustrations ring on the point. Study the direct style in which a first-class lawyer addresses a jury. See how he talks it right into the twelve men. He does not speak before the jury, he speaks to them. Notice how he repeats again and again the main points without seeming to repeat them. In short, hear every speaker that has power over his fellow-men, and as you listen always say to yourself: "Now, what is the secret of his power?" Find it out if you can. And, gentlemen, please remember that there is as much to be learned from watching the methods of first-class secular orators as from listening to preachers—perhaps more.

My hour has passed. Allow me to pack in a few more things that may be useful to some of you. Don't shorten your college course and try to get into the ministry by a near cut. Before you are long in the actual work you will find your course at its longest was too short. Don't lose your individuality and sink the man in the student. Let the man be always greater than the student. Don't try to preach or pray like anybody. Be yourself against an angel. Don't cultivate a college air. Sharp Presbyterians on the other side can tell whether a student comes from Princeton or Union or some other college by his air. I have heard the same remark made about colleges and students nearer home. Have no college airs. Be men. Never speak disrespectfully of ministers. That used to be the besetting sin of some students even in Knox College. Some gentlemen who used to be very hard on the clergy in those times have had rather hard lines themselves since their college days. When you have been ten years in the ministry you may not be one whit better or abler men than the ministers you thoughtlessly criticise. Remember, one-twelfth part of the cost of the fine building you occupy was paid by ministers. Always speak respectfully of your professors. Perhaps there are no young men among you now who think a session at Princeton or Union would turn them into Guthries and Chalmerses. It didn't have that happy effect on all who went there. Give special attention to English classics, especially the British orators. Keep a few good books on the English language on your table all the time. Don't despise such small works

as the "Verballst," by Ayres. His "Orthoepist" is good. Richard Grant White has a book on the same subject well worth careful study. There are half-a-dozen small works of this class that every student should have on his table all the time. Some students are too far advanced to read such books. That is the reason why so many of them say: "In our midst." When you feel like using this barbarism just think of its equivalent, "in our middle," and then you won't like "in our midst" so well.

Hoping you may have a pleasant and prosperous session, gentlemen, and wishing you great success in your life-work, I resume my seat.

### BARNES ON 1 COR. vii. 14.

BY REV. ALEX. HENDERSON, HYDE PARK.

For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.

It is perhaps pretty well known that this text is one of those adduced by the Westminster Divines in support of the doctrine laid down in Chap. xxviii. Sect. iv. of the Confession of Faith, that "not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized." Were there not another word in the New Testament on the subject, this passage, taken as it stands, would itself constitute warrant for the practice of infant baptism sufficient to put it beyond any reasonable doubt. But the theory having been adopted that none but those who themselves can and do actually profess faith are to be baptized, another interpretation has to be found that will appear to remove this fatal text out of the way. The passage is made to read: "Else were your children illegitimate (*bastards*); but now are they legitimate." I venture to say that no unbiassed reader of the Scriptures coming across this passage would at the first blush think of such an interpretation. It is the offspring of bias. The Commentary of Dr. Albert Barnes is on the whole a good practical one for popular use. It was written for Sabbath school teachers, and is in the hands of many teachers, exhorters and others. He was a Presbyterian, and we know, whenever a Presbyterian happens to say anything that seems to favour a Baptist view, how readily the fact is seized by that sect and on all possible occasions flaunted in the face of public audiences to persuade the unwary that Pædobaptists are wrong, stupid and inconsistent. What bias could Barnes have against the orthodox interpretation? This: It interfered with his views on Imputation and Federal Headship. Every reader of Barnes knows that he must have had strong feelings on these subjects, and that he never allows an opportunity to pass without ventilating his opinions concerning them. It may do no harm to look at his reasoning (similar to that of the Baptists), by which he rejects the interpretation that children are understood to be "federally holy," and the consequent proof that "they are entitled to the privilege of baptism on the ground of the faith of one of the parents."

He objects, first, that the phrase, "federally holy," is unintelligible, and occurs nowhere in the Scriptures. One cannot help expressing surprise that Barnes should have allowed himself to condescend to an argument like this last. And yet it has weight with some. "Show us," say the Baptists, "a text in the New Testament where we are commanded to baptize infants." The text is not forthcoming, and of course that settles Pædobaptism forever! "Where," says an Arminian, "do you find such an expression as 'effectual calling' in the Bible?" Of course the Westminster Divines themselves could never answer that. With equal plausibility a Unitarian tells us there is no such word as "Trinity" in the Bible. The objection is answered: The merest novice knows that if the thing itself is in the Scriptures, it matters little whether or not the particular name we may have adopted for convenience's sake is there.

The second objection is a thoroughly Baptist one: "It does not accord with the scope and design of the argument. There is not one word about baptism here; not one allusion to it," etc. I answer that the ordinary interpretation does not necessarily assume that there is any allusion directly to baptism either in the text or context. This does not affect its applicability to the doctrine in question. It is contended, however, that the passage does make such an allusion to the ecclesiastical standing of the infants of parents, one of whom at least is a believer, as necessarily to entitle