

# British American Presbyterian.

VOL. 1.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1872.

## Contributors & Correspondents.

### NOVA SCOTIA.

INDUCTION OF REV. MR. SMITH—DEPARTURE OF MISSIONARY FOR THE NEW HEBRIDES—YOUNG MEN PREPARING FOR MISSION WORK—LECTURE OF PROF. MACKNIGHT—DALHOUSIE COLLEGE—PRESBYTERY OF HALIFAX—ACROSS THE CONTINENT—THANKSGIVING, &c.

We have had some very interesting meetings in Halifax during the past month. Mr. Smith's induction was at once interesting, and gratifying, not only to the congregation, but to our church generally, and indeed I may say to all among us who love the progress of Christ's kingdom, for we believe that he will be blessed here as he has been in the past in other places.

The farewell services in connection with the departure of Mr. Annand and his wife for the New Hebrides, were held in Fort Macey church. A number of the brethren from different parts of the Church were present, and addressed the meeting. The whole of the services were of a most impressive character. Annand is a most devoted young man. He finished his course of study at the last session of our hall, and has been since that time visiting the churches, endeavoring to stir the people to greater zeal in mission work. He is a most successful student, and seems to be in every way qualified for the great work to which he has given himself. Mrs. Annand is a young lady, loved and respected by all who know her. They carry with them the high recommendations, as well as the good wishes, and earnest prayers of the whole church.

The Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces has now six missionaries and their wives in the Foreign Field, and the Sister Church has two. If our brethren of other denominations were alive to duty with regard to the heathen, the Lower Provinces should have thirty or forty missionaries in the foreign field. Unfortunately, however, there are only two denominations at work; the Presbyterians and the Baptists. The Presbyterians have eight men, and the Baptists two or three. We have a number of young men preparing for mission work. But if more men are to go, the Church must contribute more, as our ordinary income is taxed to its utmost. Hitherto the treasury has been full, but the devotion of our young men seems likely to put the liberality of the Church to the test. Indeed there are some among us who think that in the present state of things we have as many Foreign Missionaries as can be sustained, in justice to the other branches of the Church work. Still, if the men offer and the Church supply the means, none will say "stop." The news from the New Hebrides by the last mail, has not been of the most encouraging character. Dr. Geddie has a stroke of paralysis, and serious fears are entertained with regard to his ability to continue his labors.

Our Theological Hall was opened a few weeks ago, by a lecture from Professor McKnight, on "The value of prayer." It was a most interesting and masterly production, or in other words, just what was expected of the professor. The attendance at our hall this winter is small. The roving spirit seems to have taken possession of our students, and some of them are in New York, some in Princeton, while some have crossed the ocean to study theology in the land in which it is supposed to be had in all its purity.

Dalhousie College has also opened. It has a good staff of professors, and a large number of students. It is supported partly by the interest of invested funds, and partly by such denominations and corporations as may appoint a professor or professors. As yet the Presbyterian Churches are the only ones that have taken advantage of the institution. They appoint and pay three professors, and nominate three governors. The other denominations still stand by their little rural colleges, normal academies, while they denounce Dalhousie as a Presbyterian Institution. But Dalhousie moves on, and bids fair to attract the great mass of students who really wish an education.

The Presbytery of Halifax at its last meeting, ordained Mr. I. G. MacNeil, and inducted him into the pastoral charge of Matland congregation. Mr. MacNeil is a young man of more than ordinary talent, and he has in Matland a fine field for work. Matland is one of our ship-building centres, and has always large numbers of young men at work in its yards. At the same meeting, the Presbytery divided the

Shubenacadie congregation into two. Rev. James McLean, who has ministered to the whole congregation for nearly twenty years, retains the charge of Shubenacadie. While Milford and Gay's River will require to turn their eyes to our small list of probationers, or else by a powerful course of reasoning, show some man that his present congregation is not a sphere suited to his talents. When the strong congregations become vacant, it is a bad thing for the weak ones to have popular preachers. These are apt to be temptations all round. The Presbytery of Halifax has five vacant congregations, and almost every Presbytery has about the same proportion. We will have six or seven of our young men to license next spring, and we hope to get a few more from Britain and elsewhere.

The Railway is now open from St. John's to Halifax, and perhaps by next summer we may have direct communication with the West. In that case, we can give brethren from Ontario a cooler and cheaper summer holiday than Maine can afford. Rev. Geo. M. Grant, of Halifax, has been away across the continent with the surveying party, and is now delivering a course of lectures on what he has seen, in aid of the various benevolent enterprises of this city. He is delighted with the Great West, and speaks in glowing terms of its future. He must have seen the best side of things, however. A big picnic in fine weather is very apt to leave a man delighted with any country.

We have had our Provincial Thanksgiving day, as usual, this month. The Province is, on the whole, in a very prosperous condition. Considerable dissatisfaction exist among the people of the Lower Provinces, with the action of the Dominion Government in this and like matters. The old anti-Union cry is dead, and all classes and parties are now studying Dominion policies in a way they never did before. Even the old Unionists now feel at liberty to criticize the present administration, and they do it pretty freely. The government has gained nothing in Nova Scotia since the elections, and very few of the people would have any objections to letting the opposition try their hands in running the machine.

N. S.

### SERMON BY A TORONTO CLERGYMAN.

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—I was surprised and grieved by the appearance in your paper of the 15th November, of the sermon on Rev. 7: 14 entitled "The Blood of Christ the Symbol of Victory." To many, as well as to me, it was afterwards a relief to find the discourse, which was admitted in your absence, was not written by any Presbyterian clergyman. As it has, however, appeared, and as its theology is so far Socinian as to deny the reality of the Atonement, as held by Methodists, Episcopalians, and other evangelical Christians, as well as Presbyterians, it is proper that its errors should be pointed out and refuted.

The sermon contains valuable truth. It is quite true, for example, that God contemplated "in the Gospel, the vindication and maintenance of law"—that the work of Christ "is a grand motive influence to be received by faith, and work out in us meekness for the glory of God;" that "to disconnect the whole work of Jesus here from the morals he commanded, is to lose the inspiration to do right;" that "to try to do good without Christ in the heart, is to try to please God in disobedience to His greatest command, that we believe on Him whom He hath sent." These are truths which cannot be too earnestly insisted on, and which are insisted on by none more earnestly than by those who believe that Christ suffered and died as a substitute for others.

But along with these precious truths there are found in this discourse serious errors. I do not stop to remark upon the explanation which is given of "the washing our robes and making them white in the blood of the Lamb," as "the doing right at all times, the suffering for it if need be, even as He resisted unto death, striving against sin." Nor do I deem it necessary to show, in opposition to the statement that Christ is the reason "of God's love to us," that the gift, the sufferings and death of Christ are not the reason but the result and expression of God's love to us.

The chief things in the sermon, to which it seems most necessary to advert, are those in which the doctrine of Substitution is virtually denied, and in which the sufferings and death of Christ are accounted for

as the expressive symbol of a life of holy obedience, to the exclusion of their being a satisfaction to the claims of law and justice. "There is (it is said) an eternal law in the removal of sin, which forbids any substitute in its place." It is asked, also, "Why is suffering so prominently named? By whose stripes ye are healed? Why is the death on the Cross, His bearing our sins in His body on the tree, and, as is said in another place, "ye are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ;" and again, "He hath washed us from our sins in His own blood; if the suffering and death were not the ransom price of forgiveness and eternal life; and if they were not, the consideration that prevails on God to be gracious and merciful. Perhaps, because suffering, and especially unto death, is the most expressive symbol of a life of holy obedience in a world of sin and sinners, and it may be, also, that inevitable as suffering is in doing well, it is likely to be the greatest hindrance in serving God." Again it is said in this sermon: "In denying to suffering any part in the price of our redemption, in its Godward aspect, there is freely admitted its use to man as a symbol of what really redeemed the world. Only let it be so understood. Let not the nature of God rest under the charge of a love of suffering, nor let the law of God be loaded with the infliction that the sufferings of another, however pure in himself or our own sufferings, can fulfil its demands, or discharge its eternal penalties."

These extracts indicate only too clearly that the author of the sermon rejects the great doctrine that Christ died as a substitute in the room of sinners, and that like Maurice, Young, and Bushnell he holds only that part of the truth, according to which the sufferings and death of Christ were designed to exert a moral influence on the minds of men. It seems also from these extracts that he has but an indistinct apprehension of the views of those who hold that Christ died, not merely to make men holy, but also to deliver them from condemnation, by a substitutionary satisfaction to the claims of law and justice. He seems to think, for example, that those who hold this view charge God with a love of suffering. They make no such charge. They believe that God is love, but at the same time they believe that God is just and true; and that his love is displayed in providing a sacrifice which satisfied the claims of justice and truth. I may add that if their holding that the death of Christ was designed for that end, as well as to make men holy, exposes them to the imputation of charging God with a love of suffering, this imputation rests double force upon those, who regard the death of Christ as merely designed to make men holy. What would be thought of a judge who would pronounce upon a man the sentence? "I inflict this penalty upon you, not because you are in any sense guilty, or liable to endure the penalty of the law; but merely to reform criminals or to prevent crime?" The heart and conscience of every man would revolt against such a sentence. How differently would we think of a judge, who, if he were pronouncing the sentence even upon his own son, would say to him, "I inflict this penalty upon you because you have voluntarily become surety for another, who has offended; and because your endurance of the penalty will serve to reform the offender, and to prevent crime in others." In this sentence love and justice can meet together. The former sentence is inconsistent with either. In like manner, we can best vindicate at once the love and justice of God, when in view of the fact that God "spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all," that "it pleased the Lord to bruise him," when we allege that Christ had willingly become our surety and representative, that on Him as a substitute were our transgressions laid, that he suffered in the room of sinners, so that it might be possible for God to be just while justifying the ungodly; and also to secure the sanctification of our natures.

The author of the sermon seems also to misapprehend the views of those who maintain the substitutionary character of Christ's sufferings and death, when he speaks of "an eternal law in the removal of sin, which forbids any substitute in its place." This strong language could scarcely have been used except on the supposition that those who hold the doctrine of substitution imagine that the criminality of one person can be transferred to another. This, however, is not the case. They believe in the imputation of guilt to an innocent person—understanding by guilt, simply liability to punishment. But they do not allege that the criminality of one man can be become the criminality of another. They do not

hold that Christ was made sin for us in the sense that our criminality became his, but only in the sense that while perfectly innocent, he was held guilty in law, that is, simply, liable to suffer the penalty incurred by those of whom he was the surety and substitute, and that he actually satisfied in our room the claims of law and justice.

But whether or not the writer of this sermon misapprehends the views of those who believe in substitution, it is evident that he rejects the doctrine that "the sufferings of another however pure in himself" can exempt from the penalties of the law. In rejecting this doctrine he virtually rejects our great central doctrine which in ancient times was taught in the law and the Prophets. For what could be the meaning of the act of the Jewish priest, the type of Christ, (Lev. xvi. 21.) laying both his hands upon the head of the live goat on the great day of atonement, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, putting them upon the head of the goat, unless it was to foreshadow what is said of Christ in Is. liii. 6. that "the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all?" In rejecting this doctrine he sets aside the plain meaning of our Lord's declaration (Matt. xx. 28.) that he came into the world "to give his life a ransom for many," (or in the room of many, according to the literal translation of the words.) In rejecting this doctrine he opposes also the teaching of the inspired Apostles. Thus Paul says (Gal. 3. 13.) "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." He says also (Rom. 5. 6-9.) that "Christ died for the ungodly," that we are "justified by his blood," and "saved from wrath through him;" and declares (2 Cor. 5. 21.) that God "made him to be sin for us who know no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;" and Peter speaking of Christ (1 Pet. 2. 24.) says "who has our self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins should live unto righteousness." The Apostles, indeed, again and again speak of the sanctifying effects intended by the sufferings and death of Christ; but they clearly teach that those follow as the result of his atonement as a work of substitution primarily intended to satisfy the claims of law and justice; as in the text last quoted; and in (Eph. 5. 25 and 26.) where it is said that "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word."

But I have already, I suppose, occupied space enough. Otherwise I might show more fully the unscriptural character of the doctrine taught in the sermon. I might show also that it contradicts the teachings of the great body of evangelical Christians not only of later times, but of the earlier centuries to which the author refers. But this I deem unnecessary at present. In the interests of truth and holiness, I sincerely regret that the writer of this sermon, as well as others, has adopted views so widely divergent from the truth once delivered to the saints, and which has been so clearly maintained in every age. Fondly would I hope that they may reconsider their opinions, which so far as I can judge, tend to the rejection of our Lord's Divinity, and ultimately to the rejection of all the grand fundamental doctrines of revealed religion.

I am, dear sir,

Yours very truly,

W. G.

Toronto, 2nd Dec., 1872.

### REPLY TO "ONE WHO DOES NOT KNOW."

Editor BRITISH AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.

DEAR SIR,—Being a Canadian by birth, and not specially versed in the intricacies and arguments, *pro or con*, of the much-to-be-lamented disruption in the Church of Scotland, I may not perhaps be qualified to be as tender with the difficulties and objections expressed in the letter of "One Who Does Not Know," in respect of the union movement, as he reminds us that we should be, even with what we may esteem the prejudices of our brethren.

I wish to take up just one point of this letter, leaving the others to those better fitted to enlighten him. He expresses anxiety to know what are the reasons which prompt the advocates of Union in that branch of the Presbyterian Church which has hitherto held to its connection with the Church of Scotland; to seek the union of Presbyterians in Canada as they do now. I think, had he been desirous of doing so, he might have found out these reasons before now, how

ever, I will try briefly to explain them.

Well, then, to seek union, because, standing in this young country as Scottish Presbyterian brethren, acknowledging "one Lord, one faith, one Baptism," holding the same creed, the same traditions of the Reformation and the Covenant, the same form of Church government, even the same routine of worship—we do not see why, in a land where there is not the shadow of a cause to divide us, we should stand opposed as antagonists, or even stand apart in unsympathetic coldness. Further, where there was no need for a division, we do not see why the historical complications and the legal intricacies of an older land—theoretical matters, on which the most devoted servants of Christ have not been able, and may not yet be able, to see alike—should perpetuate a division. Even though good men may not be able to see eye to eye on matters not essential, and not affecting practical action, the Christian course is, to "agree to differ," but still to walk together in Christian love and harmony. In perpetuating our invisible and, to most, incomprehensible wall of partition, we are bringing a reproach on the name of Christianity, injurious to its best interests, and affording a triumph to the sceptic and the Romanist. We earnestly desire that our young country should be thoroughly evangelical, and permeated by a vital Christianity, which we think of infinitely greater importance than the preservation of traditions of division, magnified through brooding over them, into prejudices. To the westward of our own Canadian missionary field, there stretches a vast, almost limitless field of missionary conquest, and we, as a United Church, should go in and possess the land. We cannot work as we should work, with the warmth and impetus that ought to be ours,—unless we work side by side, and shoulder to shoulder the compact phalanx of a United Church; and we believe that we shall best practically show our loyalty to the Lord and Master, whom we all equally own as the great Head of the Church, if we do all in our power to realize His Holy will, as expressed in His last most touching prayer,—"that they may be one, as we are!" We know that there must be mutual concessions, reciprocal sacrifices of traditional preferences, and deeply rooted prejudices. On our side we know that there must be a severance of outward connexion with a Church that we hold in honour, and with which the affectionate sympathies of our hearts have long been entwined. We know that there must be mutual forgetfulness of past animosities,—old sorenesses, old mistakes, old wrongs inflicted in the heat of conflict; but we think that to the earnest Christian man among us, love to Christ and zeal for His cause will make all such sacrifices possible in order to terminate a separation that must be so contrary to our Master's will. When the infidelity, professed or disguised,—Romanism, Rationalism, Materialism, vice, and iniquity of all kinds, are mustering their forces and making the advances which they are doing, does it become us, members of the Church of Christ, to be wasting our time and strength, and weakening our hands by reviving or perpetuating mere theoretical differences of opinion, instead of casting these aside in order to present a united front to the enemies of the Lord God of Hosts, in order to come "to the help of the Lord against the mighty!"

These, Mr. Editor, are our reasons for desiring union, and we think they are good ones. On those who do not think so, must rest the responsibility of prolonging a most injurious and unchristian separation!

I must add that it is scarcely the part of a generous Christian man to seek to fasten, even by hypothetical assumption, upon the advocates of union in either Church the suspicion of unworthy or interested motives. Is it so impossible a conception to your correspondent that Christian men and Christian laymen, even though on some points they may conscientiously differ from him, should yet, in such a desire be actuated by love to Christ, and zeal for His glory? I, for one, think it should not be so.

I remain, yours, &c.

CANADENSIS.

December 2nd, 1872.

Believers in their poorest condition when they have lost all are rich. The better they are, for he hath God for his portion—he is rich in his relations, in his possessions, in his expectations—in the things of this life, for he can live above them, and be content without them. He that is in Christ cannot be poor. Præger.