

Our Contributors.

A GRAND PRESBYTERIAN RALLY

BY KNOXONIAN

Happily the time is passed in Canada when a minister or any other man can get a little sickly applause by making disparaging allusions to the American Presbyterian Church. We have always noticed that the men who indulge in these little stings were quite willing to take a call from the other side—if they got one. A few who professed to believe that the type of Presbyterianism over there is not sufficiently orthodox have gone over in search of calls, and never got anything more substantial than a nibble. Of course they did not like the American Church. A minister rarely cherishes feelings of undying affection for a Church that does not want him.

The Church of the Millers, the Alexanders and the Hodges needs no defence from anybody. It has done many noble things, and is now engaged in the noble work of raising \$1,000,000 for the comfortable support of its worn-out ministers. All honour, say we, to the men who will next May celebrate the centennial of their General Assembly by establishing a fund of nearly \$1,500,000 for the support of their aged and infirm ministers.

A few evenings ago there was a grand rally in one of the New York churches to give the Scheme a good send-off. Dr. Crosby, Dr. John Hall, Dr. Field, Dr. Paxton, Mr. William E. Dodge, Mr. Van Norden and other men of note were on the platform. A collection was taken up at the close, which it was distinctly understood was not to interfere with the amount given by the different congregations. This collection amounted to—How much do you think?—just \$1,000. One thousand dollars given as a sort of warming-up exercise before the real work began! We clip a few extracts from the speeches as reported in the *Evangelist*, and put them in here with the hope that their perusal may awaken interest in the question in our own Church. We propose to follow up this million-dollar movement, and by the time the last dollar of the million is paid in next May, Canadian Presbyterians will, we hope, be ready to begin a similar movement. The American Church is about ten times as large as ours. To have a fund as good as theirs, we would not need to raise more than \$100,000. Can it be done? Certainly it can. The tenth part of the exertion put forth during the last few years to raise money for colleges would raise more than \$100,000 for the Aged and Infirm Fund. (We did not mean to say that the fund is aged and infirm, but we will allow the sentence stand.) The friends of the colleges have not done too much, but the friends of the other Fund have done almost nothing at all.

The first speaker at the meeting was Dr. Howard Crosby, who is thus reported in the *Evangelist*:

The next speaker was Dr. Howard Crosby, who spoke forcibly of the poor pay given to ministers throughout the country, an average lower than that of good mechanics; that it was impossible for them to accumulate money, and in old age, if not supported by friends, must be cared for by the Church, or starve. He related instances of great destitution where men of high spirit preferred to suffer in silence rather than become a burden to others. He made an earnest appeal for greater liberality toward the Board, and ended as follows:

The other Boards must be supported, and they should live on the regular annual contributions of the churches. But the Board of Relief should have a support that is fixed and certain. If we believe, as we should, that the ministry is worthy of support, then this object is one that appeals with power to every Presbyterian heart.

Dr. John Hall was the next speaker, and sent home some wholesome truths in this way:

He expressed contempt for those Americans who had been in Europe, and could find nothing to praise in their own land, but much to admire abroad; and likewise for those Presbyterians who could not find opportunities for usefulness within their own denomination. He said that denominational work did not imply any want of catholicity. On the contrary, the Presbyterian Church had not only maintained her own agencies effectively, but has always been in the van in undenominational benevolence. Dr. Hall pleaded eloquently for the faithful minister, who after a life spent in the service of the Master, should be tenderly cared for by the Church. The poverty of ministers in the United States had been made an argument for Church Establishment in Europe. The speaker believed that when the people thoroughly understood what was needed, they would give generously, as Presbyterians always do, and he predicted that the difficulty would be to restrain the liberality of the people within the limits of a million dollars.

Then Dr. Paxton put the following queries:

What being in the world is so utterly helpless as an aged, worn-out, poverty-stricken minister? He can't steal, being a minister; he can't beg, and no one will hire him as a clerk, because they can't swear at him. Somewhere down East they told their new pastor, "We hope the Lord will make you humble; we will keep you poor." The only reason that I can see why they are not at once taken to heaven, is that our merciful Father leaves them here to cultivate justice, humanity and love among the people. The speaker showed how ministers were called upon by every class for services, and often without a word of thanks; and that while city ministers receive larger salaries, so much more was expected from them they could save nothing. He thought this cause a sacred one, and urged the largest liberality on the part of his hearers.

Mr. William E. Dodge argued that fear of semi-starvation in their old age kept excellent young men out of the ministry:

In the great work which the Church had undertaken in Home and Foreign Mission fields, she needed more ministers, but what inducement was there for a young man to enter the ministry unless the Church would care for him if disabled, or when too old to work? By entering the ministry, the young man abandoned every opportunity for worldly preferment or profit, and the salary paid to ministers precluded his saving anything. Let this million-dollar endowment be raised, and men entering the ministry guaranteed against absolute destitution in sickness and old age.

Yes, and the fear of absolute destitution injures the Church in another way. It is notorious that many ministers are compelled to remain at their posts after their working days are over, mainly because they die or half-starve the moment they resign. To say nothing about the brutality of compelling a weak old man to do work he is unable to do, we ask, Does it pay even as a matter of finance to keep aged and infirm ministers at work when their working days are over?

THE SECOND ADVENT.

MR. EDITOR,—Your correspondent "Faithful" affirms that there will be a first and a second resurrection, separated by the millennium: the one, the resurrection of the just, to take place at Christ's second coming; the other, the resurrection of the unjust, to take place a thousand years afterward. In support of his contention your correspondent has the courage to appeal to Dan. xii. 2, which reads as follows: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Were it not that I feel constrained to write with chastened sobriety upon so grave a subject as the one under discussion, I might make merry over your correspondent's conspicuous heroism. For if there be one text in the Scripture that more clearly and conclusively than another teaches the doctrine of but one simultaneous bodily resurrection, it is this very passage. On reading it carefully, one is tempted to ask how it is possible for any one to find in it nothing more than the resurrection of but one portion of the human race. Your correspondent is equal to the task. Hear what he says: "The prophet speaks here of a partial, not of a general resurrection." What? Can it be that the rising of some to everlasting life, and of others to everlasting contempt, is a partial and not a general resurrection? Your correspondent proceeds: "Many does not mean all. This will be conceded." Not so fast, Mr. "Faithful." First, you yourself refuse to make the concession. Adopting the rendering of the passage urged "by a number of Biblical scholars," whom you are pleased to ascribe as eminent, you affirm the very fact you have just denied. Here is the rendering: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth, these [i.e., those who awake] to everlasting life, and those [i.e., those who do not awaken at that time,] [but who yet do awake afterward, as you yourself acknowledge] to shame and everlasting contempt." What is this but to affirm that all—the many of the text—shall awake, though as you will have it, not at the same time. Second, the passage itself refuses to make the concession. In the most positive terms it declares that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," and it leaves us no room for doubt that by many, it means all, for it represents it as including the two separate classes into which the Scriptures so frequently divide the human family, which classes it designates, not by naming them expressly, but by pointing out the several issues that await them at the resurrection, the one class awaking to everlasting life, and the other to shame and everlasting contempt.

Nor should I omit to invite attention here to the fact that the passage affirms also the resurrection of all simultaneously. (Not the slightest hint does it give of a difference in the time at which the just and the unjust shall awake. On the contrary, if language is to be taken in its plain, obvious signification, it unequivocally states that at the very time at which the one class shall awake, at the very same time, the other class shall awake also. This great fact stands out so visibly and so distinctly on the face of the passage that no learning, however eminent, no ingenuity, however laboured, shall ever be able to set it aside. Many—as we have seen, the just and the unjust—shall awake, the former to everlasting life; the latter, to shame and everlasting contempt. Third, the Scriptures elsewhere refuse to make the concession. In Rom. v. 19, we are told that "as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners"—here many most certainly means all, the whole posterity of Adam—"so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous"—here, many no less certainly means all, all Christ's believing and justified people. Similarly, God is represented as saying to Abraham, in one part of Scripture: "I will make thee a father of many nations," and in another, "In thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed." Fourth, our Lord's interpretation of the passage refuses to make the concession. In evident allusion to it, our Lord says: "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice [the voice of the Son of man], and shall come forth: they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," John v. 28. In this exceedingly clear and conclusive passage our Lord furnishes a more minute account of the resurrection scene than the one given by Daniel. He pointedly affirms that by the "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth," in Daniel are to be understood "all that are in the graves." And, besides, describing the two separate classes embraced in the all of whom He speaks, by stating the several issues that await them in the resurrection hour, He not only expressly names these classes—they that have done good and they that have done evil—but also distinctly affirms the simultaneous resurrection of both. In the hour in which the one class hear the voice of the Son of man and come forth, in the self-same hour, the other class hear also, and come forth also. To evade the force of this clear and decisive announcement of the Great Teacher, we are told that the word hour in the twenty-fifth verse of the chapter "confessedly means the Gospel dispensation," covering the period from Christ's first to His second coming, and may in the twenty-eighth be regarded as bearing a similar signification, and in consequence containing nothing conflicting with "the belief of a first resurrection at the dawn of the millennium, and another at the close of the world's history." We cannot accept this interpretation of the word hour. When the Saviour mentions an hour, He means an hour. In the twenty-fifth verse He says: "The hour is coming and now is" it is the now-present hour—"when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. Behold, now is the acceptable time, behold now is the day of salvation." But it is not the present hour alone, it is the coming hour also. It is always an hour and nothing more, but it is also always an hour present and always an hour coming, running on in the continuance of an unceasing succession till time shall be no more. For the Gospel shall never cease to proclaim its message of life to the world till the world itself shall pass away. In the twenty-eighth verse the word obviously bears essentially the same signification. It means an hour, a short, fixed, limited, definite period of time. But, as in the former case, it is not an hour that goes on repeating itself throughout the long course of thousands of years, but an hour that, like every other hour, quickly springs up, and quickly passes away. In this hour, this self-same hour, if language is not to be wrested and twisted, and made to mean anything and everything that the exigencies of a false theory may demand, all that are in the graves, without exception, shall hear the voice of the Son of man, and come forth. According to the Saviour's teachings, the hour for this great event, is *one* The hour, the hour for which all other hours were made, the hour appointed and definitely fixed by God Himself. According to your correspondent, the hour is more than one. It is duplicated. There is one hour for "a first resurre-