

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXX.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCLXXIX.

ARTICLE I.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

In the remarks which we propose to make upon this subject, we have in our view the needs of the great body of private members of the Church rather than the needs of the ministers of the gospel; although we are not without hope of being able to say something which may serve to impart additional clearness to the views of some ministers who have not made the subject a matter of special study. Observation and experience have convinced us that there is not a little confusion, if not some error, in the notions entertained by many intelligent Presbyterians in regard to the nature and design of this ordinance, and to the mode in which it conduces to the sanctification of believers. Fatal errors in regard to it were taught in the Church for ages; and so inveterate have these errors become, so thoroughly had they poisoned the life of Christians, that even the great men who were raised up by Divine Providence and employed as its instruments in the work of reform in the sixteenth century, failed to reach any harmony of views among themselves concerning it; and an ordinance which had been established by the Saviour as the most impressive symbol of the union and communion of his people, became the occasion of bitter contentions and divisions. Its mission, like the mission of the Redeemer himself, seemed to be that of bringing a sword, not

ment in such a work! Whether we consider salvation as to its boundless wealth of blessing to a human being, and endeavor to take in its length and breadth and height and depth, or cast our eyes along its brilliant pathway through the future and try to form some conception of its limitless duration, the view is one which overwhelms with its grandeur and dazzles with its glory.

How then can one having this gift pine for earthly honors and pleasures? How can he sink with discouragement when, in answer to his cry, "Who is sufficient for these things?" he receives the assurance, "Our sufficiency is of God." How can a minister among perishing souls neglect the gift that is in him? Surely he who rows the life-boat with a careless hand, and is dilatory in laying hold on those that are sinking, is less to be blamed than he. How glorious the future of him who is faithful! What must heaven be to one, who, like another "Great Heart," has conducted many pilgrims thither! "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever."

P. P. FLOURNOY.

ARTICLE III.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE EVANGELIST.*

The Evangelist's *potestas jurisdictionis* is still a subject of discussion in the Presbyterian Church, and there is a loud call for a yet more exact definition than the Assembly's deliverance of 1876 has furnished. The justification of the writer's participation in the debate and of this present contribution towards the solution of the question, is the simple fact that it has pleased the Assembly's Committee of Foreign Missions, for some years past, to make him its chairman and thus bring him into official and responsible connexion with the practical application of the controlling principles of the work.

* This article was prepared before the meeting of the last General Assembly, but its publication was unavoidably postponed.—Eds. So. PRES. REVIEW.

At the outset it must be premised, that the whole question can find the materials of its solution only in the general principles that underlie and inform Presbyterianism. The Form of Government, in its distribution of ecclesiastical power and in the constitution of its courts, barely recognises (Chap. IV., Sec. II., Par. VII.) the evangelistic office, and then leaves it to be administered without the help of constitutional enactments. By common consent, however, we have for our guide the following *à priori laws*, which must give shape to every Presbyterian structure. (1) That the power of the whole is *in every part and over the power* of every part. (2) That whenever two or more parts, in each of which is the power of the whole, coexist in time and space, they become *joint possessors* of this one common power, and must provide, by courts and distribution of power, for the realisation of the Church's unity. (3) That this distribution must be made (1 Cor. xiv. 14) according to *Decency and Order, i. e.*, so as to exclude deformity and inefficiency and secure an "incorporation" of the Church's beauty and energy. (4) That the most unbecoming and paralysing disorder of all is the co-existence of two jurisdictions in the same matter at the same time over the same subjects. This last principle is most rigorously enforced in our existing Constitution. The Presbyterian Church must require her evangelists to conform to these general principles, or else her work through them will be, not a Presbyterian Church, but only an incoherent aggregation of individual Christians.

The evangelist may be defined as a temporary officer of the Church with an extraordinary mission and authority to wield ecclesiastical power in an extraordinary way. He is (1) a *temporary* officer: the office will not endure throughout the gospel age, but will cease (Is. xi. 9; Mal. i. 11) when the occasion shall cease. He is (2) an officer *of the Church*: he is not ordained into some abstract or super-ecclesiastical office existing outside of the visible Church, but into one that exists *only in the Church*: so that the Church goes with him, works through him, and is responsible for his evangelistic character and work: in short, like every other repository of ecclesiastical power, he is the representative of the Church whose office he bears. (3) The mission of

the evangelist is *extraordinary*: the "chief end" of his governmental power is to bring into being the regularly organised church *where* it does not exist *and cannot go* in its ordinary courts. The Church has her regular method of "increase and multiplication" for all places to which she *can go* in her complete and proper form; but her commission (Matt. xxviii. 18-20) requires her "to increase and multiply" also where she cannot go in her full organism, and this is the work that distinctively pertains to the evangelist. It may be said that he is appointed to a *quasi-creative* work, rather than the administration of an established order. This is the differentiating characteristic of the office, marking it out at once temporary and extraordinary. Hence (4) ecclesiastical power must reside in the evangelist in an *extraordinary mode* until the appropriate body is prepared for its permanent habitation.

Fields of evangelistic labor are of two kinds. They may be (a) either circumscribed destitute places within or adjoining the territory of the established Church, or (b) the distant and undefined regions beyond. Now, from the mere inspection of the case, one is irresistibly impelled to believe that the *measure* of the evangelist's power is the work which his field requires him to perform. Ordination to the work of an evangelist implies that the officer has all the power of an ordinary minister and *so much more* as is necessary to accomplish the extraordinary end of the office.

I.

In the case of the aforementioned "circumscribed" destitution, the necessary work to be done is the formal creation of a *particular church and no more*. In order to fulfil this mission the Presbyterial evangelist lawfully receives and exercises (a) the power of a Session in all respects: he examines applicants for church membership, accepts or rejects their profession of faith, admits them to the sealing ordinances, and administers discipline until a Session is formed. He also exercises (1) the power of a Presbytery *in one respect*: he organises such persons into a normal Presbyterian church and ordains over them qualified and acceptable men as ruling elders. Thus he brings into existence

the particular church with its parochial court; and just *here his extraordinary power is exhausted*. He has no power to ordain a pastor over the newly created church, or to ordain or license one of its members to labor in word and doctrine under his superintendence: because (a) the Presbytery is at hand to perform these acts according to the ordinary and regular operation of church power; and (b) the new church, by the fact of its organisation, instantly comes under the jurisdiction of the Presbytery within whose bounds and by whose evangelist it had been founded. The product of a Presbyterial evangelist's energy is precisely such a particular church as the existing Constitution defines; and the moment the organisation is completed the organic product is, *ipso facto*, a member of the Presbytery, as completely as the child of Christian parents, by the fact of its birth, is a member of the Church. The enrolment of the new church on the evangelist's report, like the baptism of the child on the parents' presentation, is but the regular recognition of a preëxisting fact, and its omission does not alter the *status* of the new member. Any further exercise of extraordinary power by the evangelist over that particular church, would be *confusion*—two jurisdictions at the same time in the same matter over the same subject. The power to produce such an ecclesiastical absurdity does not exist in the Presbyterian Church in its ordinary form, and of course cannot be delegated for exercise in any provisional and extraordinary form.

II.

The Presbyterial evangelist appears to be the only one that our Book immediately contemplates in its incidental notice of the office, and has been passed under review only to clear the way for the chief subject of this paper, which is *the power of jurisdiction of the Foreign Missionary*, or the evangelist in the "undefined" regions (*in partibus infidelium*) beyond the boundaries and reach of the organic Church as such. The analysis of the Home Missionary's official power has been given, as conceded substantially on all hands, because the more complex case must be governed by the same principle, *i. e.*, that the extent of the destination is the measure of the extraordinary power which the

Church must delegate to her evangelist in order to remove it. It appears to be self-evident that no other principle is practicable or conceivable. Now, in the foreign field, the Presbytery as well as the parish church is wanting, and the general evangelist must be endued with power of corresponding extent. Besides (a) the extraordinary power of the Presbyterial evangelist, the foreign missionary must have additionally (b) the full power of a Presbytery. He may ordain qualified and acceptable men as native pastors over the churches which he has gathered and organised; he may ordain native evangelists, who shall stand to him in the same relation that the Presbyterial evangelist sustains to his Presbytery; and he may exercise the power of discipline over these ordained officers, and decide appeals from the Sessions, until a Presbytery is created. He also has (c) the power of a Synod *in one respect*: he may organise the native churches and ministers into a regular Presbytery, ordering the Sessions to elect, in due time, ruling elders as commissioners to the proposed Presbytery; convoking, at an appointed time and place, the ministers and elders who are to compose the body; and presiding at the first meeting until a moderator is elected. But just *here his extraordinary power is exhausted*; because the new Presbytery, by the fact of its organisation, becomes immediately a *member and constituent of the General Assembly whose evangelist brought it into existence*. It has and must have the same precise ecclesiastical status that it would have if it had been constituted by the Church according to the distribution of power made by our Constitution. There remains nothing but the *ordinary* recognition of the fact, which of course cannot be done *extraordinarily*. The "chief end" of the general evangelist's office is, such a particular Presbytery as our Book defines. Most certainly the missionary may sit in the native Presbytery and give counsel as a corresponding member, and may reasonably expect his counsel to have great weight; but his authority and its executive energies have passed over, as a cause into its effect, from their temporary and provisional seat to their permanent and proper home. The foreign, like the domestic missionary, can only repeat his acts in another field. He cannot assign the new Pres

bytery to a Synod, or approve or censure its minutes, or, when it becomes sufficiently large, divide it into two or more Presbyteries, or unite two native Presbyteries into one, or out of three Presbyteries constitute a Synod: because the native Presbytery is under the same jurisdiction and has the same *status* as himself. Otherwise we should have *confusion*—two jurisdictions in the same matter at the same time over the same subject.

All these positions appear to be necessary inferences from the underlying principles of our Constitution and the necessary limits of extraordinary power. Their validity, it seems, can be impugned only (a) by denying the Presbyterian dictum which forbids the possible coexistence of two identical jurisdictions—a ground which no one has formally taken and perhaps no one will formally take; or (b) by denying the validity of the writer's inference concerning the status *in ecclesiâ* of the native church and Presbytery. It has been maintained, for instance, that, after a body of believers have been admitted to sealing ordinances by the foreign missionary and have had ruling elders and a pastor ordained and installed, this primary court possesses all church power and may perform all the functions of the whole Church, because it is at once the parochial, intermediate, and general Presbytery of organic and complete Presbyterianism—a germ which develops by a force *ab intra* into the full grown tree. Indeed, the writer is aware of no Presbyterian doctrine on the subject antagonistic to his own, whose truth would not depend on and flow from that very pre-supposition. This misleading generalisation, however, proceeds on the hypothesis of a *total absence* of the organic Church from the foreign field, *which is not the state of the question*. The native church is not the product of a super-ecclesiastical energy, as the wine of Cana was the formal creature of a supernatural force. It is cordially conceded that, if there were a church of such an origin, or even a body of two or three Presbyterians (like Adam and Eve), the doctrine would be true with all its necessary inferences, as far as that particular church was concerned. But such a fact would be an ecclesiastical *miracle!* The very difficulty of *the actual question* is that the subject matter is a fact ecclesiastically natural, extraordinary indeed, but *not*

miraculous. The terms of the problem presuppose *the presence and agency* of the Church, in an extraordinary way, for the very purpose of *starting* the regular organism, which, of course, is that of the existing Constitution: otherwise the evangelist is not an officer *of the Church*. The Presbyterian missionary has no power to organise a church on the principles of the Prelatical or Independent church order, or on the principles of any other Presbyterian constitution than his own. For instance, our missionaries exert their power *in our name*; and the product must be in as true and real organic connexion with us as a church organised by Presbytery or a Presbytery constituted by Synod. So far as the new church has any form at all, it is at every stage that of our Book. In whatever respect its form is incomplete, the evangelist is, for the time being, the complement thereof. When the form has been completed, not by evolution *ab intra* but by additions *ab extra*, his occupation is gone. If this pre-conception is accurate, then, in the inchoate church, there can be no *vacancy* in the ecclesiastical sense of the word. It must first once occupy its appropriate place before there can be an occasion for the regular succession. The most "formless" condition in which we can conceive the material of a future ecclesiastical cosmos is that of two or three believers converted in a heathen land. To them the Presbyterian evangelist fills every office. When ruling elders have been created, then the evangelist is at once bishop and presbytery. When a parochial bishop has been created, then the evangelist is presbytery. When a presbytery has been created, then cometh the end, and the evangelist's ever-receding extraordinary power must all be delivered up. At every stage the organic product is of the evangelist's own kind—genus, species, and even variety.

It is also freely admitted that, at any point in this progress, the native church may, for good and necessary reasons, withdraw from her natural connexion with the mother church; and thus achieve a *status* of equality in church power with the parent; and take up, self-moved, the development at the point where it was left off. But this would be *revolution!* For a constitution to be constructed on principles that provide, either periodically

or paroxysmally, for *revolution*, is an undreamed-of absurdity. No one maintains that there can be such a thing within the world of Presbyterianism. The multiplication of churches by Presbyterian evangelists in the heathen world is indeed an extraordinary and temporary mode of procedure, but it is *not* revolutionary; it is normal to the Church, and her immanent laws provide for the emergency. But the severing of the slip from the parent stock and the setting of it out as a separate plant of its kind, is not a work of regular growth. It is a work of dismemberment and violence from without. The circumstances which justify and require the exercise of this inalienable right of revolution, do not come within the limits of this monograph.

Nor is it denied that different denominations may band together to do a foreign missionary work, directed by a board of managers that have no ecclesiastical responsibility. But this, again, is not the state of the question. The question concerns the status of those churches which are founded and gathered by the evangelists of the supreme court of a Presbyterian Church. It is to be presumed that the churches founded by the missionaries of a voluntary society have no ecclesiastical connexion, but are in the position, substantially, which is achieved by revolution. This whole procedure, however, is extraordinary, unecclesiastical, and not within the limits of this discussion. Our question is the practical one, "What have our evangelists the right to do?" It appears to be no weak confirmation of the view herein maintained, that it gives the same ecclesiastical status to the work of both the foreign and the domestic missionary. All admit that the work of the latter is in immediate connexion with our Church. Is then the former an ecclesiastical officer of a *different order*? If not, how is it to be admitted that his work bears a different relation? Are our officers ordained to do work which stands in no vital connexion with the Church that ordains and supports them?

Furthermore, if the view we are resisting is to be accepted, there is no reason of *principle* why our Church should maintain a separate Foreign Missionary agency. If the churches founded by our men and money have no more original union with us than those founded by other missionaries, why not send our men and

means to the American, or the Northern, or the Reformed Board? Whatever reasons of *expediency* may be alleged for separate action, there are none of principle. On the writer's view, every reason that can be given in justification of our separate ecclesiastical existence, may be urged for our separate missionary operations: and, in addition, it might be urged that, on the opposite view, the expenses of a separate work ought to be altogether saved. The whole nature of the case, therefore, seems to require that we hold firmly to the doctrine, that the evangelist is an officer of the Church who wields individually the power of church courts, as far as may be necessary, in order to establish the Church in fields where the Church in her courts cannot go.

The question is here suggested, whether the different Presbyterian denominations ought to aim to perpetuate their distinctive organisations in foreign lands. The question does not necessarily belong to this discussion and cannot here be logically treated. It is the writer's conviction that *they ought not to be perpetuated*. But, notwithstanding this opinion, he believes that every child is *the child of its parents*; and that, whilst the parents may resist an unsuitable marriage, they may not, in this matter, either force an unwilling obedience or refuse consent without just and important reasons. The existence of separate Presbyterian organisations is itself anomalous, and there *ought not to be any reasons to justify the anomaly*. Every reason that requires these distinct Presbyterian denominations *ought to be taken away*, and then there would be no occasion for even a temporary transfer thereof to foreign fields; but all this does not change the stubborn fact, that it lies in the fundamental nature of Presbyterianism that every church which claims to be Presbyterian, must, in all her governmental acts, proceed as if she were *catholic*. To assume voluntarily any other attitude is to stand self-convicted of anti-Presbyterianism. Her great principle is that the Church is one and catholic, and to the realisation of this principle she is bound by every instinct of her constitution.

III.

Another question, on which diversity of doctrine and practice

prevail at home and abroad, is easily answered from the same point of view, *i. e.*, that the extraordinary end, as the measure of extraordinary power, is the only rule that can be applied *without confusion*. The question is: Who are the subjects of the evangelist's jurisdiction? We answer that they too must be *extra ordinem*—outside of the organised Church and her jurisdiction. It seems to be an identical proposition, when it is said that the proper object of extraordinary power is also extraordinary. The governmental power of the foreign missionary does not extend to foreign believers who may be resident or laboring in the same field with himself but having a regular and responsible connexion with the church at home, unless they voluntarily seek dismissal from their former church relations and identify themselves with the native church. For instance: when our Church sends out women or laymen to labor under the evangelist's superintendence, he indeed directs their labor, but he has no ecclesiastical jurisdiction *over them*, because they have at that very time a definite place within the ecclesiastical order. He cannot change their ecclesiastical status, or discipline them for offences, or ordain one of the laymen as pastor or evangelist: otherwise we should have *the same disorder* of two jurisdictions in the same matter at the same time over the same subject. It is not a question of "Jew or Gentile," "Greek or Barbarian," or "American or Chinese": *it is a question of jurisdiction*. It matters not what blood may be in his veins, he must first be within and under the evangelist's extraordinary power before its energy can affect him. If he wishes it otherwise, he must make it otherwise. Furthermore, if we should admit (say) that the foreign missionary has a right to ordain a fellow-laborer, who is a layman, to be an equal evangelist, then we have the monstrous conclusion, that every one of our missionaries can perpetuate and multiply general evangelists in the full sense of the word—a work which the Church has always kept and must forever keep in her own hands. *Every repository of extraordinary power must have separate appointment from the original source. "Potestas delegata delegari non potest."* Even when the foreign missionary ordains as evangelist one that is properly the subject of his jurisdiction, *he is not a*

general evangelist, and cannot become one without appointment from home. *He* cannot ordain another, but only has such limited authority as a Presbyterial evangelist possesses, and for the wise use of this he is responsible immediately to the general evangelist. In the noted case that has lately occurred in one of our own Missions, let the General Assembly cure the irregularity if it will, but let it also distinctly forbid its recurrence.

IV.

The actual facts of the Foreign Missionary work, however, generally present a still more complex problem. A "Mission" is usually composed of more than one general evangelist, and there arises the question: What is the relation of these evangelists of the same Mission to each other as to the exercise of extraordinary power? Is it joint or several? According to the principles of this paper we must answer that *the power is joint and not several*; and must be administered by the "Mission" as a body, or a temporary "distribution" must be made according to the exigencies of the case and after the analogy of the existing Constitution. The evangelists are each "parts" in which is the power of the whole, but this common power is *over* the power of every part, and must be exercised by the whole body, or a system of evangelistic courts. It is not a matter of expediency or privilege, but of vital Presbyterian principle, that is here insisted upon. The same principles that lie back of our Book, lie back of our evangelists, without which they have no *authorised* existence.

When co-evangelists preach the gospel in the same field, and some of the hearers profess to be converts and apply to be received into the communion of the Church, it is not possible that these applicants are subjects of two jurisdictions at the same time in this same matter. It cannot be allowed that, in the same church, whether forming or formed, there is a power to admit and reject the same person at the same time, or to declare an accused both guilty and not guilty. But, if this power is not to be wielded jointly in the same particular Mission, then each evangelist's private opinion is an authoritative judgment, and, as

is well known, these judgments are often contradictory, one pronouncing a certain custom (say polygamy or feet-binding) a bar to communion, another not. This would be disorder of the deadliest sort, and defeat the very end of the evangelist's office. The same principle applies, only with greater force, to the exercise of the higher governmental powers. It cannot be that the same man at the same time and place, is eligible and ineligible to ordination, or liable to be ordained by one at one moment and deposed by another at the next, or to be recognised by one evangelist as a Presbyterian minister and discounted by another at his side. The Church has no liberty to do her work on principles that make such *extraordinary confusion*. We have here, therefore, a clear case of joint power. What, then, is the proper way of its exercise? Evidently it is substantially, though not formally, the method of the Church at home. It must be exercised jointly by these officers, either in convention or by a distribution of power. If its exercise in convention would result in a deadlock, then by distribution. It may safely be assumed that no one holds that the particular distribution of church power made in our Form of Government is *jure divino*. Another, in some respects different, would be allowed and required by the nature of Presbyterianism if it should appear to be more conformable to decency and order. In like manner these co-evangelists, having no ready-made distribution, must nevertheless make one according to unwritten law, *i. e.*, Presbyterian principles of church power. Thus will they do the work of an evangelist in the most becoming and efficient way, and thus create the Presbyterian Church "where never was one before." As a matter of fact, in most Foreign Missions, this very thing is done informally by common consent and common sense. Some one of the most experienced and judicious missionaries exercises the power of final judgment after conference with his brethren. It would perhaps be more decent and orderly that some one be formally appointed to the exercise of the power of final judgment, to decide only such questions as are lost by a tie vote in the convention of all the general evangelists of a particular Mission. But, whatever may be the proper way out of this particular difficulty, it

seems necessary to hold that evangelists must exercise their power jointly and not severally, when they coexist in time and space.

V.

It is also, perhaps, proper to add that the evangelist is a *responsible* officer of the Church. Office and responsibility go together. The opinion is sometimes met with, that the evangelist is an extraordinary irresponsible officer, bearing some true analogy to an apostle as such, so that the Church cannot control his work or review and reverse his decisions. This would be to make him "the whole" and not "a part;" another Church, and not a church officer *within* her ecclesiastical order. To be irresponsible to the Church, the officer must be *inspired and immediately appointed by Christ*: and then *he* is over the Church and the Church is responsible to *him*. Apostles had indeed independent, several, and irresponsible jurisdiction under all circumstances; and their common inspiration—that indispensable qualification of an apostle—justified the fact, made it becoming, and excluded confusion. But every officer of the established visible Church, according to Presbyterianism, is under and responsible to the whole; and the right of appeal and complaint by the subjects of evangelistic jurisdiction, is just as orderly and inalienable as in any other case. The appeal must be made to the court whose immediate evangelist is appealed from: in case of the Presbyterian evangelist, to the Presbytery; in case of the general evangelist, to the General Assembly. Presbyterianism cannot afford to concede that any of its officers are apostles or anything like them.

J. A. LEFEVRE.