

Canadian Baptist Ministerial Education.

Dr. Fyfe, in his fourth article on this subject, proceeds:— "How the burning of the Institute still throws its lurid glare over the horizon of the past! Some thought it was a judgment upon us, which would quiet Baptist ambition for ever. Had the Baptists not failed twice, and this was the third and last time; but God meant for us good, and not evil. On the evening of the day on which the Institute edifice was burned, eighty students came in to join the School. They were billeted in Woodstock families, (who showed much sympathy with us) till the Committee should be able to decide what to do. Hamilton offered us the use of a building, and so did Brantford if we would move. After long and earnest effort, "Woodstock Hotel," (rent free for two years) with all its furniture, was procured for us by citizens of Woodstock, though we had to pay part of the price at which the hotel furniture was valued. It was proposed to assess the town for \$600, for our benefit, but this we refused, and paid the money ourselves. The Institute building was burned on Tuesday, and classes were reciting on Friday in the old Hotel!

Still there was not a ray of light showing us where we were to get another building. After paying out the whole insurance we had on the building, we were more than \$6,000 in debt!

Before the end of the week on which the fire occurred, the Hon. W. McMaster wrote, saying that he would contribute \$4,000 toward a new building. This clearly pointed out to the Trustees that they should make a vigorous effort to build again. From all quarters expressions of sympathy poured in. One minister, now in a better world, rode upon the day after the calamity, and told us, "To be of good cheer; he was sure we were destined to have a good school here, else the Devil would not be so mad at us!" The Trustees met, and resolved to raise \$20,000, in the form of promissory notes, the notes to be binding only on condition that the whole \$20,000 were actually pledged before July following. I was appointed chief solicitor, along the main thoroughfares, (for I could not be spared from my classes) and Mr., now Dr. Peddie, who was then a student in Madison University was engaged to canvass the churches off the chief lines of travel. For the love he bore to his native land, (and I think he still loves Canada) he was willing to undertake this arduous, and not over pleasant work. And most efficiently did he do his part. He raised about \$4,000 in the country churches. The rest of the canvassing was done by myself and volunteers. In about fourteen weeks from the commencement of our agitation, we had \$21,600 pledged. The fire had warmed up the whole country! Canadian Baptists before the fire, and Canadian Baptists after the fire, were entirely different people! While the new building, larger and better than the one which was consumed is in process of erection, it may be proper to mention some other features in our educational plan.

When we commenced in Woodstock, we not only had no endowment, but the Institute was in debt. We not only had scarcely any books, but we had scarcely any educational facilities of any kind. Everything had to be procured—the most essential books of reference, black boards, maps, &c., &c. In the Theological department, my own library was the constant and almost only resource of the students. This being our condition, we could scarcely ask for money to procure such necessary implements of our work, and money to pay the salary of the Theological teacher, and to aid poor students besides. Again, we did not expect that for the first three or four years, before the school became known and appreciated, that the mere tuition fees would pay the salaries of the teachers. To tide over this somewhat unpromising period, a scheme of scholarships, which was adopted with the first plan of the school, was carried into effect. Over one hundred and twenty-five scholarships, at \$80 each, which promised four years instruction in the Institute, and which were payable in four annual instalments, of \$20, were sold. This gave us about \$10,000 to use for teachers salaries and the like.

During the last twelve or thirteen

years, our students for the ministry, in all stages of preparation, have averaged from fifty to eighty. At the present time we have seventy three.

Since the Institute was opened, we think fully four hundred have been hopefully converted within its walls, and several of them are now preaching the gospel. Besides the many hundreds who have been educated by us for business pursuits, and the many trained to be school teachers, we have graduated from the theological department fifty-five, and in a few weeks six others will be added to this number. In addition to these, about forty have settled as ministers, who have not completed our course of study. That is, nearly one hundred labourers are in the Lord's vineyard to-day, who have been more or less trained by us for their work. Fourteen of our students have graduated from Toronto University, and ten are there as undergraduates. Two have graduated in the arts department of American colleges, sixteen have studied medicine, six have studied law, and ten ladies have taken our full course, which entitles them to our diploma. This exhibit, we know, is far from perfect, but it approximates toward a fair statement of what we have done, so far as figures can state it."

In the next and last paper, Dr. Fyfe describes the buildings owned by the Institute and the arrangement of them. He says:—

"Our main edifice in its first form 142 feet over the wings and 73 feet deep in the centre, four stories high, was completed and taken possession of at the opening of the school in September, 1863. The teachers went on vigorously with their work, furnishing the value of our scholarships in teaching the pupils with others as fast as they presented themselves. I believe all but two or three of the 125 scholarships, were taken up long ago. It soon became necessary to enlarge our premises; but we had not the means to put up a large building—Hence, the Western Edifice (erected 1867-8) which is a building two stories high, but minus wings, which may grow out some day! It would require six or seven thousand dollars to finish that building, in symmetry with our other buildings. Our Theological students with two professors' class rooms now occupy the building. It was not occupied by Theological students at first.

The Hon. Wm. McMaster, and T. James Claxton, Esq., made a very generous offer, provided the denomination would add ten thousand dollars to it. They wished, that our mode of using the money should furnish free tuition to twenty students for the ministry who might require it. The Trustees resolved to carry out the suggestion and appealed to the denomination to contribute on this condition. The Trustees decided to purchase the whole of Mr. H. T. Burch's farm, (except the homestead), 64 acres in all. The central part, about 36 acres, with a good broad street all around, was set apart as the Institute grounds. The remainder was cut up into park and building lots and sold. Then we made an addition of thirty feet to the rear of central part of the main building. The under part was for kitchen purposes, and the upper part for class rooms. We next erected a separate building, about one hundred and fifty feet to the east of the central edifice. It is 90 feet over the wings, and three stories high, and one wing is 73 feet deep. In this wing, there are a suite of rooms, and kitchen fitted up for Prof. Wells and his family. All the remainder of the building is given up to lady teachers and female pupils.

The land, the buildings, furniture, library, etc., are well worth \$75,000, on which there is no incumbrance. I need scarcely say, that the theological department was still further benefited by the Institute, through the free tuition furnished by the literary department, to students for the ministry. I may add, however, that so anxious are our students to provide for themselves, that we have never had so many as twenty apply for free tuition in any one year."

The great aim of our brethren is to secure an adequate endowment. Dr. Fyfe says:—

"Our School must be endowed. If it remain here it must have at least \$120,000."

Some have desired that the Institute should be removed to Toronto. This, however, is shown to be altogether impracticable.

Correspondence.

For the Christian Messenger. United States Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 12, 1878.

The best representation our Republic will have at the Paris Exposition was shipped from this city on Saturday last from the Treasury Department. It consists of two specimens of work done in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; one, a *passé partout*, framed in black walnut and bearing portraits and vignettes of America's great men and the principal Government buildings here, and the other showing specimens of bank-notes, bonds, and other Government securities. The latter was exhibited at our Centennial, but the former is just completed, having been executed expressly for the Paris Fair, and is, indeed, a marvel of nicety and beauty. The ground is of French grey color, and in the centre is a raised shield filled with portraits of Cabinet Ministers, and the 19 Presidents the United States have seen. On either side of the shield are portraits of Senators, Representatives, Army and Navy heroes, and other distinguished Americans; in its centre is a tiny representation of the signing of the Declaration of Independence; and at its apex is the seal of the Treasury Department. The whole is 60x60 inches, and the frame is heavy and handsome. Each corner is ornamented by an eagle, eighteen inches in height, so finely carved that each feather is distinct.

Dr. Mary Walker—the woman who has made herself so conspicuous so long by wearing semi-masculine garments—is before the public again, making application for an appointment on the Capital police force. She declares herself eligible for the office, stating that she was honorably discharged from the army, which is a fact well known. This woman, although peculiar in some of her notions (as who is not?) and although dress-reform is her hobby, did undoubtedly do good service in those savage years of war now past by more than a decade of years. In hospital and on the battle-field she was among the foremost in giving help to our wounded and dying sons, brothers and fathers. So, although we can but disagree with her on some points, we cannot scoff at her and we are sorry whenever we hear her ridiculed or imposed upon.

One of the prettiest entertainments our city has seen this winter was a *bal masque*, given just before Lent came in, for "sweet Charity's sake!"

Perhaps no city in the Union has so many unemployed people as the National Capital. I clip the following, which is apt and hardly exaggerated, from a Buffalo journal:—

"The city of Washington is full of half-starved idlers. The men are driven into crime, and courts are crowded with criminal business; the women are driven to begging, or what is worse, so that the city this winter is a vast colony of indigent people, and in a population of 100,000 nearly 10 per cent. are without employment and without means. One cannot walk three blocks here at night without meeting at least one, and often several, respectable looking white people who ask for a penny, as they say, to buy bread. They are generally women well dressed and good-looking, who have been driven to this pitiable condition by loss of employment. You seldom see a white person on the street begging in the day time, but colored beggars are numerous, and Washington is fast approaching Rome in numbers of its *lazzaroni*."

MERRILL.

For the Christian Messenger. Our Young Ladies' College.

Mr. Editor,—

I, for one, gladly welcome the announcement that comes to us through the *Messenger* of last week. The Board of Governors have entered upon the work of erecting new buildings in connexion with our Educational Institutions at Wolfville with an energy that promises the best possible result. While, of course, a College building is the first necessity, I am especially interested in the establishment of a well equipped Ladies' Seminary. The arrangements already made at Wolfville for the accommodation and instruction of young ladies, are entirely inadequate and unsuitable, and have been borne with patiently by the denomination, with the understanding that they are of

a temporary character only. Repeatedly, at Convention and elsewhere, the assurance has been given that, as soon as practicable, a change would be made—that a suitable building would be erected and set apart, with play-grounds and surroundings ample to secure all needful recreation and retirement. A first-class Ladies' Seminary, in fact, conducted on the most approved principles, has been promised, and less than this will satisfy no one. The denomination will have learned with some surprise, I think, that "the Board entertained the idea of placing a building for the young ladies in some obscure corner in the shadow of the College buildings" In the first place, there is no proper site on the "Hill" on which a Ladies' Seminary could be erected, and were it necessary to build there, suitable grounds must needs be purchased for the purpose. Happily, there is no such necessity. The only plea that can be urged in favor of building on "College Hill" is that of convenience in mixing classes, but the practical experience of the best and most thoughtful educationists among us all teaches the same lesson. Mixed classes, though presenting some beauties in theory, are condemned as unsound in principle, and unsatisfactory in practice. As a matter of fact, too, separate classes are, to a large extent, already established, as I am told, in connexion with our Wolfville Institutions.

There need be no question, then, it seems to me about the site of the Ladies' College. Ample grounds, in every way suitable, are already owned and at the disposal of the Governors. These are situated opposite the College, on the north side of the main street leading through Wolfville, and afford a site that has this overwhelming advantage that it has already been pronounced upon by the denomination. We want a Ladies' Seminary that shall command the respect of our people and meet their educational requirements. The location has been selected already. If the funds are insufficient to secure a suitable building, these surely will be forthcoming. Better far to delay than to offend the ideals of the denomination.

Yours, &c., NOT A "GOVERNOR."

For the Christian Messenger.

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.

Mr. Editor,—

If memory serves me, you stated in a late number of your paper, that the venerable African Missionary, Moffat, has given it as his decided opinion that the Scriptures are not against a man's marrying a sister of a deceased wife. Providentially we have the Book in our own hands, and can examine the matter for ourselves. This, with your good leave, I purpose here briefly to do. Two questions are to be raised: First, Do the Scriptures forbid it? Second, Does the law of the land forbid it? Eminent lawyers of this Province, two of whom, as they are dead, may be mentioned, have given written opinions, when consulted on the subject, that there is no law in Nova Scotia prohibiting a man from marrying a sister of his deceased wife. One of these lawyers was the late Judge Johnstone, and the other, the late Hiram Blanchard, Esq.

But let us turn to the Bible. Not a hint is there in the New Testament from Mat. i. to Rev. xxii., the end of the book, that can by any process of torture be made to say, "A man may not marry his deceased wife's sister." Leviticus xviii and xx. are the only portions of the whole Bible that require to be examined. This wonderfully shortens the labor. These are the portions of the Bible referred to in an Act passed in the 32nd year of Henry VIII. as containing all the lawful barriers henceforth to the British nation, to the contraction of marriage, so far as "consanguinity" and "affinity," "relationship by blood," and "relationship by marriage" are concerned.

Now then, let us see what is the general law, and what are the particular details. Lev. xviii. 6, lays down the general principle, a man must not marry a woman who is "near of kin to him." He must not marry a near relative. But nothing is left in matters so solemn to human inference or human opinion; the details, where any doubt or difficulty might arise, are all given; the near of kin are mentioned. Mark that! And mark

another thing, a principle often conjoined in the Bible, in both Testaments, and thus expressed by God Himself: "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. xxx. 6. Particular cases of prohibition are specified, and the *sister of a deceased wife is not among them*. Nay, there is positive implied permission to marry a deceased wife's sister; vs. 18, chap. xviii. reads thus: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her. . . beside the other in her lifetime." Now, clearly we must believe the important clause, "IN HER LIFETIME," to be utterly meaningless, a very serious charge to make against God, the Author, or the words clearly imply that after a wife is dead, her sister may be taken by the widower.

And here I might rest the case. I am prepared to affirm in the most positive manner that the Scriptures do not, either directly or by implication, prohibit a man from marrying a sister of his deceased wife. Nothing could be plainer.

But it is stated that several cases are mentioned where the relationship is only by affinity, and not by blood. And this is true; and the cases all confirm me in the position I take. And it is just here where uninspired wisdom and human legislation have broken down. As usual, what God has made perfect and plain, man has marred and muddled in his profane attempts to mend and make plainer. Let us see.

1st. A man may not marry his *step-mother* (vs. 8), his *daughter-in-law* (vs. 15), his *uncle's wife* (vs. 14), his *brother's wife* (vs. 16). In all these cases it is said there is no *blood relationship*. This is true. *Neither is there any relationship to the deceased wife*; and, what is more to the point, the reason for the prohibition is in every case given. The woman is not related by blood, but her husband was; and "that is why" a man may not marry a woman who has been the wife of his father, an uncle, a brother or a son.

But we have several cases of "affinity," that is, of the wife's relatives, mentioned (chap. xviii. 17). They are the four following, viz: The wife's *mother*; her *daughter*; her *son's daughter*; her *daughter's daughter*. How sad is the thought that men, good men, are not content to take the Word of God as complete and perfect, but must add a little here, and diminish a little there, and then denounce their fellow Christians because they will not put those human "amendments" on a par with the Word itself! If the divine Lawgiver had intended it, how easy it was to add to the above four cases, vs. 17, "Her sister, nor her sister's daughter;" and to have omitted a part of vs. 18.

But it is replied: "Some of the cases of near blood relationship are not stated and are left to inference. A man's 'grandmother,' for instance, is not mentioned, nor his daughter." But it may be replied, that these cases fall so directly under the phrase "near of kin," as to need no special specification. And then there are neither in the Hebrew language, nor in the Chaldee, any such terms as *grandfather* or *grandmother*. The terms *father* and *mother* take in all the preceding generations. So Paul, writing to the Hebrews (chap. vii. 10), very properly says that Abraham was Levi's *father*, though he was his "great grandfather," and in Dan. v. Nebuchadnezzar is called Belshazzar's *father*, when it is well known that he was, as we say, his *grandfather*. See vs. 2, 11, and 18. (See also Gen. xxxii. 9, "O God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac.") Thus the ridicule heaped upon the Church Prayer Book for gravely telling us, "A man may not marry his grandmother," is misplaced. In vs. 7, chap. xviii. a man is forbidden to marry his *grandmother*, and his *great-grandmother*, so far as the obvious meaning of the word "mother" is concerned.

The cases mentioned in detail, where the woman is simply related by "affinity," are very plain, and the reason for the prohibition clear enough. Their violation would be sufficient to shock any sensitive mind, to say nothing of conscientiousness and moral purity. But let us not dare to add to the Word of God.

But what about the matter of *civil law*? Two questions arise. *Is it the law of the land?* Eminent lawyers declare, and, when paid for an opinion, give it in writing—which I have seen with my