

The Christian Messenger.

A RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

NEW SERIES.
Vol. XXI., No. 44.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Wednesday, November 1, 1876.

WHOLE SERIES.
Vol. XL., No. 44.

POETRY.

The Breaking of Bread.

They journeyed with Jesus, but knew not
his name;
They knew not his voice in all that he
said;
They journeyed like men who walk in a
dream,
Till he made himself known in the
breaking of bread.
They told of their sadness, they told of
their fears,
They told him how Jesus had risen from
the dead;
They talked like a child without wisdom
of years,
Till he made himself known in the
breaking of bread.
They heard his sweet doctrine, their
hearts burned within,
As he taught them why Christ had
suffered and died;
But their eyes were all holden, as if by
some sin,
Till he made himself known in the
breaking of bread.
They asked him to tarry because the night
fell,
They asked him to wait while their
table they spread;
But whom they invited no soul could they
tell,
Till he made himself known in the
breaking of bread.
Dear friends of life's journey, how often
we walk
With Jesus, who died and who rose
from the dead;
But we know not his presence, and idly
we talk,
Till he makes himself known in the
breaking of bread.
Let us watch for this Traveller who comes
to our way;
Let us keep our hearts open to all that
he said;
Let us set him a table, and fervently pray,
"Lord, make thyself known in the
breaking of bread."

RELIGIOUS.

Voluntaryism in Higher Education.

BY PRESIDENT MARTIN B. ANDERSON,
L. L. D.

STATE PATRONAGE.

It is obvious that if the State undertakes the work of high education at all, its patronage should be distributed among existing institutions on principles which shall approach, at least, proportion and fairness taking into view the excellence of their work, and the constituency which they represent. But since that State has withdrawn its support from colleges considered as a part of the State Church system, government patronage has been distributed with little or no regard to any system or law. Where special appropriations have been made by the several States, they have been distributed with little or no regard to the service which institutions have rendered to the cause of education, or to any law or principle whatever. The State, or municipalities under the sanction of the State, has given large sums to a very few colleges; while others, with equal claims in every particular, have been entirely neglected. There has been a gradual approach, of late, to the policy of withdrawing State patronage from higher institutions of learning altogether. This tendency is in recognition of the principle that high education should be, like religion, left to the control of the voluntary principle. If this principle shall be thoroughly adopted by the general government, it will preclude any future appropriations of public lands for the benefit of institutions of higher learning in the new States and Territories. It will set aside the project, so warmly entertained by many, of establishing a great national university in the city of Washington. In fact, the discussions that have arisen out of this plan have drawn special attention to the whole policy of establishing and maintaining State universities. The result of such discussions can hardly be doubtful in its bearing upon the establishment of any new State institutions.

A distinction should here be made between institutions for educational purposes, and appropriations made by government for the advancement of science and for purposes of general public utility—such as the coast survey, the geological exploration of States, and scientific experiments and

investigations which are of universal utility, but of such magnitude as to be beyond the capacity of private institutions.

DANGERS OF STATE INSTITUTIONS.

A special argument in favor of the control of high education by the State is drawn from the great number of colleges established and endowed on the voluntary principle, and the alleged imperfection of the instruction which they impart. Regarding this objection, we have to remark that there is something besides State endowment necessary to the success of an institution of learning. We are not aware that the institutions established in the new States, and endowed by the States or the general government, have been especially conspicuous for their services to high education, either with reference to the numbers that they have educated or the breadth and solidity of the instruction imparted. The University of Michigan is generally cited as an example of the success of State institutions in contrast with those founded on the voluntary principle. But this institution is an exception to the general rule, and stands out alone from the great number of comparative failures. Every one familiar with its early history knows that its early growth was slow, and its very existence has been frequently brought into jeopardy by quarrels over its administration by parties, sects and systems of opinion. One of its most successful Presidents informed the writer, a few years since, that he was under the necessity of spending a large portion of each winter as a lobbyist for the purpose of saving off legislation interfering with its internal working, or in some way inimical to its interests. Much of its large patronage is due to the fact that it gives professional education to lawyers, doctors, miners and engineers gratuitously at the public expense. This course cannot be defended upon any sound principles of constitutional law or political philosophy. As a general rule throughout our country, the literary management of State institutions have been in a state of chronic trepidation lest their best efforts should be rendered nugatory by the caprices of unintelligent legislation. We see no reason to suppose that the Congress of the United States would be any more successful in the administration of a great university than they have been in the government of the District of Columbia, or the management of Indian Agencies or the Freedmen's Bureau.

Looking over the numerous State institutions in our country, we believe that, taking them as a whole, they show no better educational results than those colleges which have owed their origin to the voluntary principle. It is obviously impossible, under a government in which religious and political parties make themselves felt in every department, to secure instruction as broad, as free, as untrammelled as in institutions under the control of the voluntary principle. Before the rebellion, Moral Philosophy could not have been taught in an institution controlled by the general government; nor could a Political Philosophy founded upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence have been taught. Nothing is clearer than the fact, that government control over institutions of higher education in Europe has been constantly made use of to accomplish or maintain the ascendancy of political and religious parties. Many of the results which we deprecate in an established church have shown themselves in State control of high education.

ABOUT "SECTARIAN COLLEGES."

I am aware of the persistent ridicule—not to say, misrepresentation—which has been expended upon what the opponents of the voluntary system have been pleased to call "sectarian colleges." They forget that there may be a sectarianism of skepticism and irreligion as positive and as bitter as any which exists within the limits of religious denominations. As a general rule, it is not true that the colleges of our country have been used as instruments for pro-

pagating the tenets of religious sects among their students. No thoughtful man can ignore the work which such "sectarian colleges" as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Columbia and Brown have done for the country. These have all been predominantly controlled by some denomination of Christians, and they represent to-day the highest types of our intellectual growth. They have saved us from educational barbarism. They have adopted into their curriculum every new science which has established any just claim to recognition. They have been nurseries of public morality and of an exalted patriotism. They have given tone and elevation to our literature.

MORE CENTRALIZING.

But we are told that our institutions of higher learning ought to be centralized. We answer: A country like ours, in which local self-government so predominates, never can and never ought to be brought under the control of a single type of culture. Our country's intellectual life ought not to be shaped from any State or national intellectual centre. Such a state of things would inevitably destroy the freedom, the variety, the manifoldness which is one of the happiest characteristics of American society as contrasted with France and England. We should bear in mind that even the English University—the accepted type of centralization—is but a congeries of separate colleges, each having its own endowment, its own type of culture, and even its local associations with different parts of the United Kingdom.

But we are told that there are too many colleges; and that this results in a waste of the voluntary system. In a free country, how can this be helped? There are too many banks, too many railroads, too many ships, too much iron; but the law of supply and demand is the only possible corrective for the difficulty. If a college attracts to itself patronage and endowment, it has a right to live; if it does not, it will die. A college that does good work creates its own patronage by its elevating influence over the community around it. Time alone can determine whether a college has a right to live. All permanent institutions are of slow growth. The healthiest institutions of our country have sprung from the smallest beginnings.

A COLLEGE NOT A "UNIVERSITY."

It should always be borne in mind that a discrimination should be made between institutions—like the German gymnasia and the typical American college—which contemplate a certain degree of liberal culture preparatory to professional study, and institutions—like the University of Berlin—which are a mere aggregation of professional schools, presupposing a liberal education on the part of all those who are admitted to their lectures. Our American college is an indigenous growth, adapted to our population and wants, which cannot be replaced by any exotic system unadapted to our intellectual soil and climate. Its best results are secured with a comparatively small number of pupils under a discipline which is personal and paternal.

We believe that in the future development of the wealth and intelligence of our country the voluntary system which has been so satisfactory and successful in the maintenance of religion will be abundantly able to meet all the demands of higher liberal and professional education. We would then confine State provision for education to the common school, and to institutions that may be found necessary to train teachers for the common school. We have the most implicit faith that the individual benevolence of the country will in the future give to those institutions of higher learning which show themselves worthy of it an endowment beyond anything that the present century has seen. Men of wealth will soon learn that he only can secure a place in the memory and affections of coming generations who links his name and fortune to institutions for the moral and intellectual elevation of his fellow-men.

Presentation in Wales.

The *South Wales Daily News* gives us a full report of a very interesting meeting held at Cardiff for the purpose of presenting a testimonial to the Rev. Dr. Thomas, on his retirement from the office of principal of the Welsh Baptist College at Pontypool, which he had occupied for a number of years. The Hon. Sir Robert Lush presided on the occasion. One of the speakers Rev. J. J. Brown of Birmingham, in giving some facts respecting the honored recipient of the testimonial said:

Dr. Thomas was a native of the town in which they were assembled, he was a Baptist minister in that church, he went forth with the sanction of that church to preach the Gospel of Christ, he had visited the great metropolis, and after forty years of faithful and noble service in the land of his birth he had come back to this his native town—to his native church—and to them, his fellow-townpeople, under circumstances which appeared the happiest which could befall a human being. (Applause.) Many places contended for the honour of possessing the birth-place of a man who sang ballads or strung them together and formed them into one song, and several towns had contended for the honour of that day's proceedings, and for each of those places something might be said. It was thought that Pontypool, the place where Dr. Thomas had rendered his great services, should claim the honour; it was thought that Newport, being more central, was the fittest place for that meeting; but Mr. Todd and those who acted with him had fixed upon Cardiff as the most proper place for these expressions of esteem. One of the prime characteristics of their friend Dr. Thomas was his capacity for not keeping in the rut, and of retaining all the inspiration of the times through which he was passing and handing it down. In the course of some further observations the speaker said the general opinion in some parts of the kingdom seemed to be that the Welsh were a rude sort of tribe, who bordered upon a civilized nation called England. (Laughter.) If they had time to go into antiquarian researches, they might possibly show that they were a nation of teachers whilst the Saxons were dwelling on the banks of the Elbe. (Applause.) The Saxons always prided themselves upon their English Bible, and well they might, but the Welsh had a translation of the Bible second in no way to the English translation, and he was told superior in many respects to that grand old Saxon version of which the English were so justly proud. (Applause.)

Dr. Todd, in making the presentation, read an address, which was engrossed upon vellum, in beautifully illuminated characters, of which the following are portions:—

"An address presented to the Rev. Thomas Thomas, D. D., Principal of Pontypool College (together with a purse containing 2,000 guineas), at a public meeting duly convened at Cardiff and presided over by Sir Robert Lush—Sept. 20th, 1875.

"You have inspired and moulded the characters of hundreds who have accounted it their joy to sit at your feet; elevated the character and tone of the Baptist ministry in Wales; and placed the churches of our denomination in wider regions under lasting indebtedness for the pastors you have educated and matured. In the name of the thousands whom we are here to represent we devoutly and lovingly thank the great Father of all, who has given you and spared you so long to us as a section of the Saviour's one Church. It has been contributed by those in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Africa, and both Indies, who have longest known you, as well as by hundreds more who have never seen your face or listened to your eloquent utterances, but have heard your name and love you for your work's sake."

The Rev. Dr. Thomas, who was much affected, replied at some length, referring to the principal events of his past life, and heartily thanking the subscribers and all present for the generosity and sympathy displayed towards him.

The proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to Sir Robert Lush for presiding, and also to Lady Lush for her presence at the presentation.

A large party subsequently sat down to luncheon at the Town Hall, the Mayor of Cardiff presiding.

Communion in Its Relation to Church Discipline.

BY REV. W. H. PORTER.

"What profit is it that we have kept his ordinances?" MAL. iii. 4.

To commune with members of our own churches, and of churches practising like discipline, is, I conceive the only practical rule for admitting to the Lord's table, that is consistent with church discipline. The church, of course, and not the individual applying, has the right to decide who shall be admitted to church membership and privileges. But would it be consistent, or scriptural, for the church to admit to the Lord's table, those whom it would exclude, or preclude from church membership? This would be to admit those that are without to privileges from which we would exclude our own members. Yet this applies not only to the unbaptized, but to baptized Christians living outside of our own churches.

Suppose, for instance, that even the minister of a Baptist church should imbibe, preach, and practice the doctrine or dogma of infant sprinkling. Believing, as we do, however pious and respected, otherwise, such a minister might be, if he persisted in his course, I suppose that every Baptist and every Pedo-baptist too would say that the church could do nothing less than exclude him. But suppose that having been excluded, and the illustration might apply equally to other errors, he unites with a Pedo-baptist church for which his error only qualifies him. Being a regular, consistent, pious and baptized member of the Pedo-baptist body, what shall the Baptist church do now, in regard to communing with him? Act in accordance with its previous discipline? or by a false charity, stultify itself, and offer a premium to error, by admitting to privileges those that are without, from which it would exclude its own members? And yet if we open the door to baptized Christians who are beyond the pale of our own control and discipline, upon what ground can we close it against the brother specified. In what different position does he stand from others? Are they consistent, pious, devoted, baptized Christians, &c. So is he. Ah! but you say, we have excluded him. Yes, but let it be remembered that if others were members with us and did as they do, we would be under the necessity, however painful, of excluding them also.

The only rule then, as it seems to me, for admitting to the Lord's table, that is not actually in conflict with the proper administration of church discipline, is, to admit our own members and the members of sister churches or of those holding the same faith and practising the same discipline. By any other rule, so far as I am able to perceive, a church will be repeatedly receiving, or at least liable to receive at any time to the Lord's table, those whom it would preclude or exclude from its own membership. This is a quiet but sure method of sapping the foundations of Baptist churches by offering a premium to remain without.

"For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? 1 Cor. xv. 12.

"Now we commend you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which ye received of us." 2 Thess. iii. 6.

"Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember us in all things, and keep the ordinances (traditions) as I delivered them to you." 1 Cor. xi. 2.