

144.113  
DEC 22 1906

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. 1.

---

JANUARY, MDCCCLXXXIII.

---

ARTICLE I.

## WHAT IS INDUCTIVE DEMONSTRATION?

The terms deduction, induction, are very currently used, and they seem to be regarded as signifying two contrasted methods of ascertaining truths. The description usually given in popular statements is, that, while deduction is the drawing down of an inference from a more general truth, induction is the leading in of a general truth from individual facts. There has doubtless been much bandying of the terms, which was not more intelligent than the word-play with that other pair of ambiguous terms, "analysis and synthesis." It is customary to say that Aristotle first examined and formulated the deductive logic or syllogism, and Bacon the inductive method. While almost entire barrenness is imputed to the syllogism, the glory of great fruit and utility is claimed for the induction. Some, indeed, are perspicacious enough to see that neither Aristotle nor Bacon was the inventor of the one or the other method of reasoning, any more than the first anatomists of human limbs were the inventors of walking. Nature has enabled men to walk, and ensured their doing so, with at least imperfect accuracy, by fashioning the parts of their limbs, nerves, bones, tendons, and muscles. The anatomist has only described what he found in the limbs by his dissecting knife. Men virtually syllogised before

the Sabbath, but also strict meditation in the law—a state of discipleship: but the Christian system requires the teaching of the gospel—a state of apostleship. Herein consists the great difference between the two days; hence the Christian Church cannot be too strict in the observance of the Lord's day, "spending the whole time in the public and private exercise of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy." We repeat, then, that we cannot be too strict in its observance. It is better for us to err on the right side, if we err at all, doing too much than too little; and when our summons comes to call us into the next period of rest—the rest in the New Jerusalem—may we hear with it the welcome reception, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

---

ARTICLE IV.

THE EVANGELIST AND CHURCH WORK.

In the present circumstances of our Church there are few matters of more interest, and which deserve to be more prayerfully considered, than those indicated in the title of this article. Doubtless, each one has some general idea as to what "the evangelist" is, and what his work should be. But have we the right idea? The writer does not pretend to be better informed nor more capable of correct judgment than others. Here is simply an expression of belief that in many cases wrong ideas are held as to evangelistic work; or if the *theory* is right, that the *practice* is wrong. Thank God for every conviction that the time has come when the evangelist is a much needed, if not an essential, factor in Church work. We are realising that we cannot keep pace with the work as it opens rapidly and widely on every side of us. The means used hitherto do not, as we are finding, suffice for meeting the demands made upon us. Our destitute regions seem to be enlarging rather than growing less. And now we are awaking to see that some extraordinary efforts and plans must be

made in order to keep the world from outrunning Christianity. For this purpose there is a hope which will not make us ashamed in the evangelist. He is a scriptural officer (Acts xxi. 8; Eph. iv. 11), and his work is scriptural (2 Tim. iv. 5). It is well, therefore, that the mind of the Church is turning so fully in this direction. But who is the evangelist? What is his work? Our Form of Government says (Chap. IV., Sec. II., Par. VI.): "When a minister is appointed to the work of an evangelist, he is commissioned to preach the word and administer the sacraments in foreign countries, frontier settlements, or the destitute parts of the Church; and to him may be intrusted power to organise churches and ordain ruling elders and deacons therein."

Webster says: "2. A preacher or publisher of the gospel of Jesus Christ, licensed to preach, but not having charge of a particular church." Our doctrine, as expressed above, is more nearly right; but our *practice* is, generally, more in accordance with Webster's definition. We practically regard the evangelist, not so much as a worker in *really destitute fields*, as a worker among the feeble and destitute *churches*. Now, it is true that we do need such a worker as the latter. Great results would be gained if we could so arrange as to have a few men, with the proper gifts for the work, licensed to preach but having charge of no particular church, who can go freely among the churches and hold special protracted services. Very great good and larger progress would undoubtedly result from such work rightly conducted. The fact should be recognised and utilised, that some are gifted of God for reaping the harvests which others have sowed. The holding of protracted services is beneficial. Experience says so. The Church needs them. When we ask, Why do other denominations grow and spread through the land more rapidly than our own?—the answer is found just here. The wisdom of protracted services is that the church is revived, and souls are converted to God by, as it were, *compelling* men to listen to and think upon the great gospel matters day after day without the undoing influences of the world working to dissipate religious thought, as when the services are held only Sabbath after Sabbath, leaving a week between each. "My people doth not consider," said God. But

the protracted service *compels* them to think, by holding them down to the subject through a series of days. The people also must and will love the Church which thus works to win them. Our policy has been too much confined to the simple work of sowing and cultivating the seed (and none sow purer or better seed), and too little attention is given to the *gathering work*. We sow faithfully, and then allow others to enter into our labors by gathering the harvests, while we keep on sowing. In agriculture the harvesting is a *special work*, and a time of activity, full of enthusiasm and joy. Does not God preach sermons in nature? Would not our Church do well to hear what others hear, and thus share in the profits?

God's money, held in trust by his people, would be well spent if some of it were consecrated to this end. Let it not be thought that here is a wandering from our subject. For the object in this seeming digression is to call attention to the fact that the evangelist is supposed, often, to be the man for such work; and to protest against this idea. This worker, of whom mention has thus been made, would be a helper of pastors and visitor to destitute churches. He would work with pastors as needful, and especially among organised, but destitute, churches. *This is not the sphere for the evangelist.* True, our Book sends him to "destitute parts of the Church." But would it not be better to say, "destitute districts or *sections* of our land," thereby meaning the places where we have not, but should have, organised churches? This would exactly indicate the true and proper field for evangelistic labor, and express the character of the work. Perhaps there would be no objection, but rather advantage, should he assist pastors and help destitute churches, when he could find time from his special occupation. This, however, would rarely occur, for the fields are wide, and white for the harvest, where there are no reapers. But to confine himself to that helping work, or even give it any large part of his attention, would be to miss and leave undone his own peculiar work. His mission should be where we have no pastors and no organised churches; but some of our scattered sheep, and many others who need to be gathered into the fold. There let him call people to hear the gospel, organise churches,

and do pastoral and ministerial work, until the things thus built can stand and be regularly possessed by the Church. This is to "do the work of an evangelist." In one sense, every preacher of the gospel is an evangelist. But the worker contemplated in our Book and here, should go to points not reached by the ordinary ministry and work of the Church. Were this recognised as the true doctrine as to the evangelist, there would be a new state of things, and a better history for our Church, as a part of the great army of Jesus the King. But if we regard the evangelist as a mere visitor to the churches already organised, or as chiefly this, we shall have only a second or third-rate place in the work of reclaiming the wilderness.

From what has now been said, it is evident that the doctrine advocated contemplates the evangelist as a *missionary*. If we send him to foreign fields, we say his work is *there*, and not among our organised churches. Should he forsake that sphere, it would be a breach of duty. Is it less so when the missionary to the home fields confines his labors chiefly to the places where churches are already organised? The Presbytery should send him out to open and prepare the way for regular church work. When he has gained and established a good footing in any neighborhood, planted churches, etc., it is not his duty to settle there, unless he means to abandon evangelistic work. Let him push on, therefore, after committing the results of his work to the care of his Presbytery. Can it be right to fill even a scriptural office, and then fetter the incumbent so that he cannot perform his duties? This is done by regarding the evangelist as, let us say, a sort of *extra* minister to churches already established. In order that he may be *literally* a "home missionary," if employed within our own land, it is absolutely necessary that we provide for holding and cultivating the fields which he clears and plants with churches. Surely there is a felt need, great and urgent, calling for evangelistic work. Our response should be,

- (1) To appoint men to this work.
- (2) To assure to them freedom of time and effort in discharging their mission.
- (3) To hold faithfully and fully the points which they gain for us.

The matter is growing serious. Destitute fields are crying loudly to us from all directions. There is no time for trifling or "red-tape."

And now, in order to a full discussion of our subject, certain matters must be touched of very grave importance. In venturing the remarks which follow, it is not with more than a very faint hope that they will be entirely acceptable to the Church. But while speaking earnest opinions without fear, nothing more is asked than a sincere examination of what may be said, followed by action which, putting self aside, may be for the greatest good to souls, and most conducive to God's glory in the advance of his kingdom. Questions must arise as we seek to prosecute our work; and these questions must be met.

(1) How can we properly care for our destitute churches, if the evangelist may not dwell among them?

Let the Presbytery, observing the needy points, direct its settled pastors to take from their own charges some time for such churches. In many cases a whole or a part of a Sabbath monthly, can be devoted thus. By this plan there are few, if any, of our destitute churches which will not be reached and cared for. Just here, a suggestion: ought not the *churches* which have pastors to consider the wants of their less privileged brethren, and send them assistance, though at the price of self-denial? It would be a grand thing should these, without waiting the action of Presbytery calling for the temporary use of their pastors, proceed, out of their own thoughtfulness, to contribute a part of their time to the relief of the needy—sending their pastors to them now and then. Is there one of our churches which does this? How many have ever thought of it? Aside from the hope of praise, *is not this duty?*

It is not essential to the life of any church that it shall have a sermon or sermons *every* Sabbath. Else had many of our country churches perished long since. But it is selfishness to demand all of a minister's time at one point, because (and is there other reason?) the people there are able to pay him a living salary. Here is a matter to be well weighed; for not the minister alone, but the churches also, are to see that the gospel is preached to every creature.

Further, an organised church, though it have no pastor, is in a position of great advantage, as compared with people who are churchless, scattered, and having no bonds drawing them together. There is somewhat here that should not be cast away without serious thought. The organised church *has a ministry* which God has provided for its necessities, and which we recognise, but do not use. There may not be an "ordained minister," as we usually understand that term. But there *is the eldership*. With this power in hand, it is robbery to take the evangelist for organised churches. We have much *unused material*—dead power. Can it not be utilised? No disparagement of others is intended in the assertion that, in most cases, our eldership is able to give as good service as the majority of ministers ordained in other denominations, and accepted by the people. This is no boast, but thanksgiving before God. Now, our need here is, not the evangelist, but a recognition of the elders on the part of the people; of the people on the part of the elders; and of our repressed powers on the part of Presbytery. Why not call and appoint our elders for our unsupplied wants? Why not make special appointments where elders shall be more positively required to hold the helm which there is no other hand to take. Has not the Holy Spirit made these elders "overseers of the flock"? Having them, the want of "ordained ministers" should never cause the cessation of services in God's house. Instead of sending the evangelist to "destitute churches," it were better to license an elder, where other arrangements cannot be made. Paul said to Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." Is it true that no such men are possible until we have carried them through our course? They are to "be able to teach others"—what? The gospel. And we have unused men in abundance, who can fill this requirement. A house is not built of only one kind of timber. Let us utilise the rough, as well as the "dressed" pieces. But under present circumstances the elder stands aloof. For he and the people both feel that he is not really an authorised teacher. Let this be corrected by the voice of our courts, calling them authoritatively to this work, which we

have none others to do, yet which ought to be done. We have men in and out of our eldership who would "adorn the gospel" by their ministration, as fully, to say the least, as many whom we now recognise as "ordained ministers" in other denominations. Are any of our rules so much cast iron as to be in danger of breaking, by this plan?

We may think of our law in Chap. VI., Sec. VI., Par. IV.; but why not also give thought to Par. VI?

Let the inquiry also be raised, whether this exceptional service need be limited to elders. Some of our congregations embrace intelligent and zealous laymen, who might be found to have the "gift of utterance." Why may not a Session use its pastoral authority to call such a layman, for the nonce, to edify the brethren by religious discourse in the presence of and under the inspection and restraint, as by the authority, of the Session? We do not mean that a Session should assume to license a lay preacher, or that this layman should presume, by virtue of such authority, to speak habitually and of his own appointment; least of all, that he should minister generally, outside of that Session's jurisdiction. But only that where a Session perceives such gift, it may employ it, in its own presence, as its own channel of expression, holding itself responsible for the orthodoxy of the things uttered, and withdrawing its sanction whenever that was uttered which does not edify.

In favor of such resorts may be pleaded: 1. Such was evidently the usage of the synagogue, on whose model our congregational order is framed. Thus, when Jesus spoke in the synagogue of Nazareth, he was invited *as a layman*, supposed to have a gift, and under the sanction of the bench of elders. 2. Such seems to have been the usage of the primitive presbyters in the Church of the apostles. 3. Such public speech of laymen would be free from the main objection to the kind of lay preaching abroad, pursued by Mr. Moody, viz., that no church court having ordained him, he goes to the church abroad without any sufficient guarantee of his soundness or character. For this lay-speaker would not go abroad, but speak only in the presence and by the sanction of that pastoral church court which knows him and can



endorse him. 4. The question of what a call to the ministry is, would be wonderfully simplified to young inquiring Christians; for as young men were thus summoned to make actual trial of their gifts, both they and the people would find out experimentally whether they were "apt to teach."

When we have "extraordinary" demands, then is the time for acting as in "extraordinary cases." The *demands* of law ought not to prevail to the exclusion of its *permissions*. The evangelist is not what we want in these destitute churches, but the use of the material given us of God and recognised in our Constitution.

We talk of thin and thinning ministerial ranks, and with good reason. We fall back upon the evangelist as our remedy for the present distress, while we pray and wait for more laborers. May we hope for help while we refuse to use the material we actually have? Let us look more closely about us, and see if we have not some unapplied power which can be adapted to our wants. If we insist upon the evangelist to fill the breach, we insist that one shall be as many. True, "one shall chase a thousand." But here the chase is too slow, and over too much ground. Before the evangelist catches up with the dispersing flocks, they will find shelter in other folds. His will may be good, but the work far outstrips his best efforts. So our flocks get discouraged and hungry; become and remain scattered—then we lose them! And note this: *habits are governors!* Our people need to be prevented from forming wandering habits. They form habits apart from our "faith and manners." Next, they *forsake* our "faith and manners." Not only so, but we remember what comes from the "bent twig"—a tree grown crooked, or out of line. The children of our people in destitute churches are getting more church-training from other denominations than from our own. Is it any marvel that other denominations get so many of them? See the mixed families—parents Presbyterian, children something else. Now and then, whole families are lost to us. Parents cannot always be faithfully kept, nor keep their "lambs" from flocking with the "sheep" in whose fold they get food and attention most plentifully and regularly. For nature is nature, whether in people or

sheep. We cannot dethrone it. We may control and guide it. We may say, Elders ought to hold religious services. A chapter read; a sermon read; a hymn sung; a prayer offered. Yes, but nature is nature. It is not the nature of people to give contented attendance upon "lay services" in one place, when in another place, near by, they may attend services conducted by an authorised minister of the gospel. Will any "pooh, pooh!" at this as folly? So be it; but the people go elsewhere, all the same. Our policy should be to meet their wants and reasonable desires—yea, and the *unreasonable* desires, if we cannot better them. This, rather than lose ground. We cannot bring people (unreasonable beings that they are, having so much human nature) to accept with satisfaction any substitute for the authorised preaching of the word. Point to former days we may, when laymen gathered to worship God. But ere long one of those laymen grows out from and stands above the others as the "preacher."

*We cannot*, as the hard fact stands, find enough men, in the ordinary way, for our work. Shall our flocks go unfed, wander elsewhere, and be lost to us? What is wisdom? If we cannot do as we would, let us do as we best can. This will be well-pleasing to God always. If we have prejudices, it is time that they were crucified for the sake of dying churches and perishing souls. As extraordinary provision, we can give to our people as good as others give them (to say no more), who are not of our "household of faith." And what if, after a while, some destitute church "falls in love" with its *improvised* minister, then demands him to be given to them as pastor and preacher in full orders? Let it be done. It will be of the Lord. When a man, under watch of Presbytery, has proved faithful and apt to teach, let him be accepted. Better deed will not be done by all our wisdom.

The physician may not always shun "heroic practice." In a desperate case, inaction or refusal to act out of the usual way, from fear of doing harm, may prevent the doing of saving good. As the matter now is, many of our destitute churches are cold and dead in waiting for the evangelist or some one else. Waiting and dying, instead of stirring up the gifts in themselves! If a "spark" is laid upon God's altar, will he not make up a fire

from it? If we have only "sparks" here and there, let us use them so far as they will go. The use will be the increase. But if we sit idle and ask for the "flame," God may say, "Why do you not use the spark?" Do we not read that a little fire kindleth a great matter? Here is the way in which the evangelist may be freed for his proper work, and our destitute churches cared for. So, too—

(2) We meet the objection of inability to care for the churches planted by the evangelist. We may not keep them supplied with the "regulation pastor." But may we not do as well as our Methodist and other brethren? Is not our duty to the Master and souls as clear and full as theirs? One may be pardoned for a little impatient feeling at the idea that any others may or can obey the Lord's command better than ourselves, when he says, "Preach the gospel to every creature." And no marvel if, when our system fails under testing at such points, a doubt assails a most loyal heart as to whether this system is right, or is being rightly worked.

If there is anything to be learned in this matter, are we too proud to be pupils? Better, if needs be, adopt the "circuit rider," and send out men who must "study in the saddle," instead of in colleges and seminaries, rather than fail to occupy and hold territory which ought to be won for Jesus. It is true that, if we accept and send the evangelist in the right idea of his mission, we shall not be able to furnish ministers rapidly enough by the present working of our system. So the question must be met: Shall we gain, but abandon our gains? We may not do this *actively*. But *passive* loss is as bad. We may throw results away by simply refusing to occupy ground with any men, because we cannot occupy with the fully trained preachers. The writer of these lines does not and never can believe that such a course is really duty to God and to our Church. But not for one moment let any one suppose that this is a plea for lowering our standard of education. It is a plea for the *permissions* of our law, while holding that its *demands* must also be respected. Act as we may, there will always be applicants seeking admission to our ministry with diplomas in their hands. It has been so in other Churches,

and will be so in ours. None dare say that in other Churches there are no scholars, or not enough to keep the streams of learning clear. The devil never was beaten with worldly wisdom, but it is his weapon. Dare we adopt it as our chief defence? Is there not a better? And may not many who never had "*alma mater*" on earth, be graduates in that wisdom which cometh down from above? Must one always hold a *straight stick* in order to strike a straight blow? If so, is the Holy Spirit or are we to bring every stick to due straightness? Again: What is wisdom? If we see work needed, and cannot put a perfect instrument to its doing, let us quickly and gladly accept and use the best within reach. It is not sound spiritual policy to be too fastidious while hell is yawning for the souls which can be saved by an *earnest*, if it be not a *polished* effort.

HERBERT H. HAWES.

---

ARTICLE V.

THE FOREIGN EVANGELIST AS VIEWED BY ONE  
IN THE FOREIGN FIELD.<sup>1</sup>

- I. *Editorial in the Missionary*, May, 1874.
- II. *The Ecclesiastical Status of Foreign Missionaries*. A pamphlet. Anon. Republished in the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, April, 1876.
- III. *Report of the Assembly's Special Committee on the Evangelist*. Appendix to the Minutes of the Assembly of 1876.
- IV. *The Evangelist and the Presbytery*, Anon. SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, April, 1877.
- V. *A Manual for the use of Missionaries, etc.* Pamphlet, published by the Executive Committee in April, 1877. Republished in the *Missionary*, January, 1880.

---

<sup>1</sup>This article, to be followed by another in April (discussing the *Home Relations* of the Foreign Evangelist), comes to us from the Rev. John Boyle of our Mission in Brazil. As being in the foreign field, he is, for every reason, entitled to be heard.—EDITORS SO. PRES. REVIEW.