

The Christian Messenger.

A RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

{ NEW SERIES. }
{ Vol. XVI., No. 9. }

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Wednesday, March 1st, 1871.

{ WHOLE SERIES. }
{ Vol. XXIV., No. 9. }

Poetry.

"WHEN I AWAKE."

"When I awake," it will be morning,
The night forever past,
With all its gloom and fearing,
With all its fever-dreaming:
Light, joyous light at last,
"When I awake"—then no more sleeping.

"When I awake," it will be morning,
The pathway blindly trod
With footsteps weak and failing,
Illumed and clear, revealing
The purpose of my God,
"When I awake"—then no more doubting.

"When I awake," it will be morning,
And no more crushing pain,
With all its tears and sighing,
With all its grief and crying,
No more the falling rain;
"When I awake"—then no more grieving.

"When I awake," it will be morning;
Then rest, ye, perfect rest,
And no more care-worn musing,
No mountain cliff sad climbing,
No looking to the West;
"When I awake"—no weary toiling.

"When I awake," it will be morning,
The loved ones gathered home,
With no more words of parting,
No trembling tear-drop starting,
In heaven's celestial dome;
"When I awake"—then blessed greeting.

"When I awake," it will be morning,
A Sabbath keeping time;
A seraph harp then turning?
An angel lyre then sweeping?
Ah, more than this be mine
"When I awake," the new song singing.

"When I awake," it will be morning;
"I shall be satisfied;"
No distant, far-off reaching
For something ever fleeting;
With Thee, the crucified,
I shall awake, and know no longing.

"When I awake," it will be morning;
It hath not been revealed,
No mortal eye is seeing,
No mortal ear is hearing
The bliss not e'en conceived:
"When I awake"—what glory beaming!

"When I awake," it will be morning;
Ah, then, why fear to sleep?
See, from the tomb uprising,
The Savior interceding;
My soul He'll safely keep
Till I awake—Oh! glorious waking!

N. Y. Observer.

Religious.

THE PEOPLE'S AMEN.

BY THE REV. T. L. CUYLER, D. D., OF
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

In the first book of the Chronicles we are told that when the ark of the Lord was brought back to Jerusalem a grand thanksgiving service was appointed by King David. Asaph led the choir with his cymbals, Jeiel struck the harp-strings, and Benaiah conducted the band of trumpeters. When the jubilant psalm of praise had been rehearsed by the Levites and the choir, then "all the people said Amen!" The popular heart spoke out in the popular voice, like the sound of many waters.

If my readers will turn to the fourth chapter of Nehemiah, they will observe that the ruined walls of desolate Jerusalem were rapidly rebuilt after the captivity. Why? simply because every man did his best. Each one brought his contribution of wood or stone to the right spot; the apothecaries helped the merchants, and the merchants helped the goldsmiths. "So built we the wall," says the sacred chronicler, "for the people had a mind to work."

In these two passages from the good old Book lies the secret of success for every church. And that secret is that all the people must worship and all the people work. In fact, there can be no genuine worship in God's house unless the heart of the whole assembly is enlisted in it. There can be no genuine growth in a Christian church unless the whole people have a mind to work. The popular heart must be alive the popular hand must be busy; the popular voice must say Amen! Paul himself

could not build up a church unless the people worshipped and unless the people worked.

What is "worship"? According to the actual practice of scores upon scores of congregations, it is the assemblage of a certain number of persons in a sanctuary on the Sunday, to be preached at, to be sung to, and to be prayed for. The aforesaid persons, in the meanwhile, sit as the mere passive recipients of the entertainment furnished from the pulpit and the music-gallery. They are spectators, they are auditors, or they are sleepers; but how many of them are active worshippers? The minister is expected to furnish the discourse, and they are to sit and listen and criticise. If the discourse is brilliant and popular, they worship him; if the sermon is stupid or scanty, they go to sleep or go home sulky. The minister is expected to pray; and the people listen and say to themselves, "That was a beautiful prayer," or, "That prayer was too long." While the pulpit is not engaged in interesting or instructing or entertaining them, or the contrary, they turn to the choir, who furnish them a few minutes of musical performance. Throughout they are a mere audience.

New, suppose that instead of this passive reciprocity, there were just as much activity of worship in the pew as in the pulpit. Suppose that every man and woman felt—"this is my hour for praising God and profiting my own soul. Accordingly, when the invocation for God's blessing is pronounced, the people join in it inwardly, and at its close all break out in a full, audible "Amen!" Then the word of God is read, and each one opens his Bible and follows the reader, instead of staring about at the "new bonnets," or at the new comers in a neighbouring pew. Then comes the service of song; not a scientific rendering of a sacred air by a paid choir, but the outburst of hundreds of voices, when "everything that hath breath praises the Lord." At the close of the next prayer there is another full, responsive "Amen"; or perhaps the whole assembly join in repeating with the pastor that exquisite model petition taught by our Saviour to his disciples. After such a preliminary service, the congregation would be prepared to give their ears and their hearts to the sermon. They would help their preacher to preach. They would sink the critic in the worshipper. They would listen as to God's ambassador, and not to a hired lecturer, who was giving them just so much preaching for so much pay. At the close of a discourse so delivered and so received there should be another united anthem of devotion, culminating in the doxology of a thousand voices and grateful hearts. Such a service would be worship—the worship of God, and not of a fellow-creature in the pulpit or the music-loft—the worship in which every heart should devoutly say "Amen."

A Sabbath service of this kind would be repeated in the prayer-meetings of the week. Those meetings would not be led by the minister but by the elders or the deacons, or some qualified member of the flock. The burden of giving freshness or interest to the services would not be laid on the pastor. In would be the people's meeting, for the people's profit; and they would be responsible for it. Such meetings are always possible during a revival. But God pity us! As soon as our churches have regaled themselves with the luxuries of a revival, they usually slide back into the old, listless, formal, stupid, dreary way again, and "straightway forget what manner of persons they were." God's spirit is grieved away, and the drought begins again.

This paragraph may be read in some congregations which are now in a declining or decaying condition. Everything drags, "Zion mourns!" This is the stereotyped complaint uttered in the dull, dreary meetings. "Zion mourns!" "No doubt she does," and so does the Spirit mourn over such sinful folly. But it is time you laid aside mourning, and put on the whole armour of God. Pray don't begin by asking

for a new minister. Ask for new hearts. I don't go about inquiring "where can we find a man that will draw!" or, "where is the man that will build us up?" Instead of looking abroad, look at home. "Look to yourselves." Look to God. How many a declining church has foolishly gone off searching for some pulpit Samson, who should fill God's temple with a crowd to behold him "make sport" for their gratification. If he is a true Samson and strong in the Lord, he will soon teach them that a living Church must do their own worshipping and their own work. Alas! if he be only a poor blind Samson, or a shorn Samson, both they and their helpless idol will soon perish together.

I honestly believe that the success or the failure of most of our churches for this year will mainly depend, under God, upon themselves. If they have a pastor who is at all worthy of his name and high calling, let them rally around him and strengthen his hands. Let them give themselves to prayer and to work. Let them come to the sanctuary on Sunday, not to carp, or criticise, or seek selfish enjoyments; but to worship God, and hear the truth, and grow in grace. Whatever holy request the pastor makes in prayer, let all the people cry, Amen! Whatever call of duty he proclaims, let the people say, Amen! Whatever proposal he makes for the upbuilding of the flock or the salvation of souls, let all the people second it and carry it out thoroughly. If he preaches boldly against popular sins, stand by him. If he calls for workers in the Sunday School, or the mission-room, or the tract distribution, or visitation among the poor and out-cast, let each willing heart respond, "Here am I!"

God forbid that we should excuse or shield the indolent, inefficient pastor! His punishment is to be what he is. But a minister who has a ten-men power in himself cannot move a church that has no heart to worship, and no "mind to work." It was not Von Moltke's genius that rolled back the invaders of the Rhine. It was German unity, and German bravery, and German self-sacrifice, when to the trumpet call of duty "all the people said Amen!" He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit now saith to the churches! *Evangelical Magazine.*

RELIGION AND SCIENCE.

In the course of last summer, Dr. Dawson, Principal of McGill College, Montreal, visited England. On his return he delivered a lecture, the subject of which was, "Impressions made on his mind on his recent visit to England." The following extract is taken from a report of his lecture in the *Montreal Witness*.

"He first glanced at the

STATE OF RELIGIOUS OPINION

in England, which he described as being in a state of active agitation, amounting to a chaotic condition. From this chaos or ferment of religious feeling and speculation, he presented several leading types of religious opinion, and first

THE RITUALIST

or mediæval man, who looked only backward, and was in truth a gigantic anachronism. A revival of mediæval religion in the nineteenth century, and in the heart of a Protestant Church, was a singular phenomenon. But, besides rampant ritualism in the established Church, there was a more modest revival of mediæval religion, which, to some extent, had invaded even churches of Puritan origin, that were beginning to attach a value to outward observances. And this latter was, perhaps, the most insidious and dangerous manifestation of mediæval Christianity, as there was no telling where it would stop. How does it happen, he asked, that this ornate mediævalism had cropped out in our practical age, so different, and, apparently, so unfriendly to its existence and growth? It had been said to be the natural reac-

tion of humbug against humdrum. Now, humdrum would not be tolerated in the present day. A tide of earnestness had risen within the Church, and one set within its pale had diverged to something more purely spiritual, whilst the other had reverted to the ancient and cast-off outward forms. Ritualism had originated in a revival of religious influences, and also in a revival of taste. The traditions of the evils of monkery had died away, and now only the beautiful and touching remains of the old monasteries remained, appealing silently to the eye; yet this ritualistic movement would not be permanent, for in addition to its inherent weakness, the Christians of the present day had more terrible work to do, in coping with the different forms of doubt and scepticism. Moreover, ritualism was not found in the New Testament, and Christianity has no order of priesthood. The haughty attitude, too, of the Church of Rome during the past year, in declaring the dogma of the Pope's infallibility, had been chilling and unfavorable to the advances of the ritualist towards Romanism. Another phase of English religious opinion was

RATIONALISM AND BROAD-CHURCHISM, and of these he gave their Confession of faith, and described it as being a type of religion, ostensibly liberal and philosophic, lacking to a large extent the great cardinal doctrines of Christianity, but being patronized and professed widely in high and influential quarters. There were also the philosophical heathens, or

PANTHEISTS.

They held that man himself is God; that the New Testament is not abreast of the present age. Not less than four-fifths of the literary and scientific men of England were of this creed. They have, in general, no religious service, beyond a general worship of God in nature, and of man as the highest manifestation of the Divine. They are very active in getting their nominees into influential appointments. These two, Rationalism and Broad Churchism, were more dangerous than Ritualism, since they were working with, and not against, the spirit of the age. They had already found their way into the neighboring United States, and they would yet find their way here.

He also observed that "in the popular science literature of the day there was much that was objectionable, owing to the presence of the already mentioned pantheistic teachers."

These were gloomy representations. But of their truth there can be no doubt. The indifference or hostility to revealed religion manifested by many men of science has been long regretted. Lord Bacon remarked, in his own quaint, pithy style, that "a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon second causes scattered, it may sometimes rest in them, and go no further; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate, and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity." It were much to be desired that "depth in philosophy" would always produce the effect here ascribed to it. Unfortunately, the world seems getting worse in that respect. The popular works of some of the leaders in the scientific world are deeply tinged with scepticism. Take such a book as Sir Charles Lyell's "Antiquity of Man":—it abounds in statements and insinuations serving to show that the writer rejoices in the supposed discovery of any facts that may throw doubt on the credibility of the divine record. These writers are perpetually talking of "development," "evolution," "nature," and "natural causes," but they studiously avoid all reference to creative power. The organic was produced or evolved from the inorganic; they do not care to say how or by whom; they "do not like to retain God in their knowledge"; they stumble at the word "Creation."

We have been led to make these observations by the perusal of a volume

recently issued by Professor Huxley, the title of which is given below.*

The Professor holds a place in the first rank among the philosophers of Great Britain. He was President of the British Association last year. When he speaks or writes upon science and sticks to his subject, abstaining from sneers at religion or misrepresentations of religious men, he commands respectful attention. We have read with much satisfaction many of his remarks on "the advisableness of improving natural knowledge," on "a liberal education," and on "the educational value of the Natural History sciences":—but we are bound to record our disapproval of expressions which betray a infidel turn of mind, and are pregnant with mischief.

Professor Huxley speaks of "the mad prayers of fanatics"—"the holy cursing of the Puritans"—"the cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew"—and "the mistaken zeal of Bibliolaters."

He says that "the man of science has learned to believe in justification, not by faith, but by verification." These are childish ravings, which will hurt no one but himself. Had he been wise and prudent, or even courteous, he would have suppressed them.

He is so determined to glorify science that he places it above revelation. He says that "Natural knowledge" "profoundly altered men's modes of thinking and their views of right and wrong"—has "found the ideas which can alone still spiritual cravings"—and "laid the foundations of a new morality." A Christian will reply, that "a new morality" must be false: the old morality, fixed in the sacred page, and enjoined by God himself, "is better."

"The theology of the present," the Professor asserts, "has become more scientific than that of the past; because it has not only renounced idols of wood and idols of stone, but begins to see the necessity of breaking in pieces the idols built up of books and traditions and fine-spun ecclesiastical cobwebs, and of cherishing the noblest and most human of man's emotions, by worship for the most part of the silent sort at the altar of the Unknown and Unknowable."—"The God of the Bible is evidently 'unknown' by him; but he is not 'unknowable,' for 'God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness' may yet 'shine in his heart, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ.'"

Again:—"The thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them, are the expression of molecular changes in that matter of life which is the source of our other vital phenomena." This is downright materialism: it is acknowledged afterwards that "the terms of the propositions are distinctly materialistic; and yet Professor Huxley says that he is 'no materialist.'" It is hard to give him credit for sincerity: perhaps he is deceiving himself.

"What is the history of every science," he asks, "but the history of the elimination of the notion of creative, or other interferences, with the natural order of the phenomena which are the subject-matter of that science?" If this be true, the scientific school must be a school of atheism, where the student will be taught "the natural course of events," and "the purely mechanical view of vital phenomena towards which modern physiology is striving," but will learn nothing respecting God. He will rather unlearn what the Bible has taught him. That holy Book represents God as repeatedly threatening to punish guilty nations with "the sword, the famine, and the pestilence," which are expressly called his "sore judgments"; but Professor Huxley affirms that "plague, pestilence and famine are admitted, by all but fools, to be the natural result of causes for the most part fully within human control, and not the unavoidable

* *Lay Sermons, Addresses, and Reviews.* By Thomas Henry Huxley, L. L. D., F. R. S.