

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIV.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXIII.

ARTICLE I.

THE FOREIGN EVANGELIST AS VIEWED BY ONE IN THE FOREIGN FIELD.

III.

HIS HOME RELATIONS.

To the Presbytery.

The editorial published in the *Missionary* for May, 1874, was written "to present the views of the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions" upon the subject of the foreign evangelist's home relations. About two weeks after its publication, it was indirectly approved by the Columbus Assembly, as we have seen. Within a year thereafter, the pamphlet entitled *Ecclesiastical Status of Foreign Missionaries* was published. This paper, however, is confined entirely to the question of his relation to the native Church, alluding only incidentally, on page 9, to his home relations. The *Manual* was published and approved, as we have already seen, in 1877, in which the same theories are announced, on this point, as in the two papers just cited.

Now, it is a very curious fact that the views of the Executive Committee on our home relations, as thus presented from time to time, have never been discussed. So far as is known, not one syllable, *pro* or *con*, has ever been elicited from the Church. Not

ARTICLE II.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE EVANGELIST.

The fifth article of the last number of the REVIEW, entitled "*The Foreign Evangelist as viewed by One in the Foreign Field,*" lays upon us the disagreeable task of making a reply. When we first turned over the pages of the article and saw our own name *passim*, we thought of a certain famous Anglican clergyman, who, on entering a room whose walls were covered with mirrors and seeing himself reflected wherever he looked, said that he thought he was in a convocation of the clergy, and, of course, *was delighted*. But only a few pages of the argument had been read before we had a distinct consciousness of recollecting the story of an American backwoodsman, who happened to be dining for the first time in a first class hotel, and, when the waiter, after bringing the viands, laid a napkin by the plate, said: "I wish you, sir, to understand that I know when to use my handkerchief without having any hints thrown out to me." If ever any author for sixty pages pursued, to use his own oft-recurring phrase, "*an ignis fatuus,*" the writer of that article is the man.

1. He argues in vigorous terms, that, according to "the Scriptures and the Constitution," there is no such office as the evangelistic office and no such officer as the evangelist; and severely criticises the present writer for using such language. Now, it appears to us that the subject-matter of the discussion is too serious to allow us to make a point of a *word*. The terms were used just as we found them, and as the Assembly used them in their directions to "*the Committee on the Evangelist,*" of which we were a member for the two years of its existence. If, however, it will help to keep the peace, we give our brother hearty permission to substitute for the offending words any others that he pleases; for instance, "the office of the minister of the word, who is appointed to do the work of a missionary;" or, "the missionary or evangelist, as a minister of the word," is an officer appointed to do so and so. By this arrangement *we* shall get all we contend for, and *he* can settle the terminology to suit himself, and confine

the *words* (office and officer) to the minister of the word: all which would be according to *his argument*, but not according to the Constitution and the Scriptures, as we now proceed to show.

2. The brother says: "Never, in a single instance, does the Book speak of the office of pastor or evangelist, but always, without exception, of the office of the minister, the duties of the pastor, and the work of an evangelist." Now, our previous article of October, 1879, was written, though not published, as was stated at the time, before the new Book was adopted, and may well allow the merits of the above quotation to be decided by the words of the old Book, Chap. III., Sec. 2, which are as follows: "The ordinary and perpetual officers in the Church are bishops or pastors; the representatives of the people, usually styled ruling elders; and deacons." "The very phraseology" of what was the Book from 1729 to 1879 thus freely and formally predicated *officer* of the bishop or pastor. More than this: both the old and the new Book, in one of the most solemn and formal of its provisions, that for the call of a pastor, makes the church say to the minister or probationer whom they call: "The congregation (or church) of — do earnestly call and desire you to undertake the *pastoral office* in said congregation." (Old Book, XV., 6; New Book, VI., III., 6.) Add to these extracts from our standards one from the Scriptures, 1 Timothy iii. 1: "This is a true saying, if a man desire *the office of a bishop*, he desireth a good work." The old and the new versions agree in the italicised words. The same Greek word, *ἐπισκοπή*, occurs in Acts i. 20, where the authorized version renders it "bishopric," and the new version simply office. The meaning in this place, too, is *the office of a bishop*.

"Now, when we consider this language of our" present and our former "Constitution," and of the old and the new version of the Scriptures, "and compare it with the definitions and phraseology" of our brother, "the contrast is so striking that no one will fail to be impressed by it!"

3. Now, that it has been shown that our brother's conclusion is a mistake, let us expose the error in his argument. He founds his argument on Chap. IV., Sec. II., Par. I., of the present Book, which is as follows:

"Of the Minister of the Word.

"This office is the first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness. The person who fills it has in Scripture different titles expressive of his various duties. As he has the oversight of the flock of Christ, he is termed bishop. As he feeds them with spiritual food, he is termed pastor. As he serves Christ in his Church, he is termed minister. As it is his duty to be grave and prudent, and an example to the flock, and to govern well in the house and kingdom of Christ, he is termed presbyter or elder. As he is the messenger of God, he is termed angel of the Church. As he is sent to declare the will of God to sinners and to beseech them to be reconciled to God through Christ, he is termed ambassador. As he bears the glad tidings of salvation to the ignorant and perishing, he is termed evangelist. As he stands to proclaim the gospel, he is termed preacher. As he expounds the word, and by sound doctrine both exhorts and convinces the gainsayer, he is termed teacher. And as he dispenses the manifold grace of God and the ordinances instituted by Christ, he is termed steward of the mysteries of God. These titles do not indicate different grades of office, but all describe one and the same officer."

Now, the first thing that impresses one upon reading this extract from our Constitution, is, that "the highest officer" of the Church has many *names* or titles, whilst the lower officers have each a single *name*, to wit, ruling elder or deacon. The second impression, justly received, is that the official work or duties of this highest officer are so numerous and varied that no one name, by its material signification, can possibly be an adequate description. The third impression is, that in discourse we may *logically* predicate of him under *every* name, whatever may be predicated of him under *any* name. This is simply saying that the language of the Book and the Bible conforms to the law of all language. The *name* may never be confounded with the *thing*. The inference from all these premises is that it is good Presbyterian speech to say that either the bishop or the pastor or the minister or the presbyter or the angel of the Church or the ambassador or the *evangelist* or the preacher or the teacher or the steward of the mysteries of God, *is an officer of the Church*, and is invested with an *office* of the Church. It is difficult to imagine the state of mind of that man who will select one of these scriptural titles, and that, too, one out of the middle of the list, and then argue that the Constitution and the word of God and the very safety of the

Presbyterian Church allow us to ascribe *an office* to him *only* under that one title, or describe him as an *officer only* under that one name. This is certainly a specimen of "extraordinary confusion," *logically considered*. At any rate, the inference is as far from validity as his former statement, about the "very phraseology of the Book" and Scripture, is from fact.

4. Our Form of Government, Chap. VI., Sec. II., says:

"Of the Doctrine of Ordination.

"1. Those who have been lawfully called are to be inducted into their respective offices by the ordination of a court.

"2. Ordination is the authoritative admission of one duly called to an office in the Church of God, accompanied with prayer and the imposition of hands.

"3. As every ecclesiastical office, according to the Scriptures, is a special charge, no man shall be ordained unless it be to the performance of a definite work."

In Section V., Par. VIII., of the same Chapter, it is said: "In the *ordination* of probationers as evangelists, the eighth of the preceding questions shall be omitted and the following substituted for it." Here, again, we find the same conclusion necessarily flowing from the very words of our Book. Those who are lawfully called to office, must be inducted into their respective offices by *ordination*. Ordination is the authoritative admission of one duly called to office. Presbytery *ordains probationers, as evangelists*, to their proper work. If this is not saying of the qualified probationer that he is called to office, and by ordination *as an evangelist* authoritatively admitted to office, then no possible premises can ever give a conclusion. The syllogism stands thus: all ordained men are inducted by their ordination into their *respective* offices; J. B. is a man ordained *as an evangelist*; therefore J. B. is inducted into the office of an evangelist.

We thus reach the same conclusion reached before, viz., that it is sound orthodox Presbyterian language to speak of *the office of the evangelist* and the evangelist as an *officer* of the Church. If a man is ordained *to the work* of an evangelist, then he is inducted into the office of an evangelist; if to the work of a pastor, then *into the office of a pastor*, etc., etc. By one act he is at once and

inseparably ordained to a work and installed in an office. True Presbyterianism knows no ordinations *sine titulo*.

5. But common sense will also conduct us to the same result. Now, we do not in the least mean that reason is in any sense superior to, or the measure of revelation. But we do mean that revelation is given *to* reason, and will not outrage it. In the use of human discourse, it conforms to the laws of language, that most wonderful product of *reason*. Now, the word *officer* designates one that is invested with an *office*; and the word *office* means simply a charge or trust conferred by public authority and for a public purpose. Whoever does an act *in the name and by the authority of the church*, is a church officer and is invested with an ecclesiastical office, and his act is an official act of the church. If the world is not evangelised before men and books, inspired and uninspired, speak under other laws, the present dispensation will continue *in secula seculorum*. One might as well point out to a child the impropriety and dangerous tendency of saying, "My father is sick," and teach the poor creature that his father, *as such*, is not and cannot be sick, and insist on his using before that predicate a subject that better suits the "constitution" of the universe.

6. The author of the article under review plainly takes for granted that the writer holds and teaches that the evangelist's office is not one and the same with that of the pastor or bishop or teaching elder, etc. The "Baltimore brethren," that is to say, the Secretary and the Chairman of the Executive Committee, are soundly castigated for this dangerous heresy. But our critic may rest assured that what the "Baltimore brethren" contended for in the conferences of "the Committee on the Evangelist," was that the evangelist, *as an officer*, was simply a minister or teaching elder; and that, when he was set apart to that special work, which the Assembly and the Book described as "the work of an evangelist," it was necessary to intrust or delegate to him authority to perform certain governmental acts which the pastor is not authorised to do *in the same way*; that is, *severally*. Of the Chairman of the Executive Committee, he says: "In this definition, as well as in the language throughout the entire article, he

makes the evangelist, *in the character of evangelist*, an officer of the church." (The italics are our own.) Now, we deny it. We have *not*, in the definition or in any passage of that article of 1879, or anywhere else, said either that or anything that fairly implies it. Our opponent, in the character of opponent, has inserted the italicised words. The language of the definition, and he had just quoted it, is: "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." If one should have occasion to describe his father as an officer of the Church, would that affirm or imply that his father, *in the character of father*, was an ecclesiastical officer? But our critic follows up this unjust charge with what he supposes to be a corroboration, saying, "he pointedly distinguishes him as an officer from the pastor." Well, what of it? We certainly do distinguish one *officer* from another, just as we distinguish one drop of water from another, because they are perfectly distinct, though in the good and exact logical sense of the words, *it is a distinction that makes no difference*. Then, to clinch his grave charge, our brother cites our words with his own italics: "This is the *differentiating* characteristic of his *office*." The whole paragraph from which the citation is made is here given, that the reference of the subject may be seen and the *differential* difference understood:

"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) 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 as temporary and extraordinary."

The reader will at once see that the quoted sentence means "this *work* is the differentiating characteristic." Now, upon our brother's mistake, we remark, (*a*) that our statement makes the differentiating characteristic reside in the *work* of the evangelist. If any one can define an office without reference to its object-matter, we will be delighted to witness the exploit. But (*b*) it does not appear that it was a misconstruction of the sentence that

was the quasi-creator of this *ignis fatuus*. It seems rather to have been a misapprehension of the force of the expression "*differentiating characteristic*," which means, not characteristic difference, but characteristic *differential*. The figure is mathematical, and denotes a value that by an inherent law regularly diminishes to zero. It means the same as "*distinguishing characteristic*," with the additional qualification that the distinction happily grows less and less until it vanishes. And this is precisely what we believe and what we wrote about this extraordinary and temporary work of the evangelist. He first receives members into the church; then he ordains and installs ruling elders, and by that act loses his power to receive members. He then ordains a pastor, and parts in like manner with his own pastoral power. And so on, until he reaches the zero of extraordinary power.

7. The article under review sharply rebukes the writer for avowing that the problem can be solved only by "the general principles that underlie and inform Presbyterianism," because "the (old) Form of Government barely recognises the evangelistic office and then leaves it to be administered without the help of constitutional enactments." It is unnecessary to spend many words in reply. Scarcely any one will be alarmed by the warning. It is too well known and believed that no ecclesiastical or civil constitution can foresee and provide formally for all the duties to which its officers may be called; and that in all such cases the officers and courts must be guided by the *informing* and *underlying* principles of the written code. Indeed, no *written* law can be safely interpreted or applied without constant reference to these very unwritten laws. Some of the best improvements of the new Book over the old are simply the formal enactment of what had been received and practised for years according to the essential principles of Presbyterianism. Such is the history of all our written laws concerning foreign missions.

8. A few words are, perhaps, due to our opponent's exegetical treatment of the Greek words rendered *evangelise*, (*evangel* or *gospel*), and *evangelist*. He makes much of the conclusion he reaches, that *evangelise* always means to preach, and hence, that the evangelist, *as such*, is only a preacher of the word. Now, it

must be remembered that the signification of a word in discourse is very rarely its unmodified etymological meaning. It is freely admitted, that "to evangelise," either with or without an inner object (the object *effected*), means simply to *preach* the gospel. This being the primary sense of the word in Scripture, it abundantly justifies the Book in its statement of the reason why the minister of the word is *termed* evangelist. But has not the verb a larger meaning? And has it not a larger sense when it takes an outer object, or the object *affected*? All other verbs have. In Acts viii. 25, it is said the Apostles "evangelised many villages of the Samaritans." Now, it is not at all impossible that the verb here has the meaning which it conveys to us when we speak of "evangelising the world," *i. e.*, spreading the gospel and establishing the Church throughout the world. This is what King James's translators understood Philip to have done. In their heading to this chapter, they say, "The disciples being dispersed by reason of a great persecution at Jerusalem, a church is planted by Philip in Samaria." In Robinson's Greek Dictionary of the New Testament, certainly very good authority, an *evangelist* is defined as being "a preacher of the gospel, not fixed in any place, but travelling as a missionary to preach the gospel and establish churches." This meaning Dr. Robinson assigns to the word in all the three passages in which it occurs, and refers to Neander, Theodoret, and Eusebius as authorities. On this question these authorities, especially Eusebius and the translators of the authorised version, could not have been biassed by modern notions concerning the evangelist. Besides all this, it is unquestioned that the word "gospel" (*evangel*) is sometimes used in the Gospels, and often in the Acts and the Epistles, in the same wide sense, as denoting the whole gospel scheme, including the Church. And every time the expression "the gospel of the *kingdom*" is used, it is explicitly declared that a kingdom or church is connected with the good news or system of truth. Indeed, the first preaching of the gospel was in the words, "The kingdom of heaven (or God) is at hand." It is well known how intensely real and visible "the kingdom of God" was to the hearers of the Baptist, Christ, and the Seventy. The new Book also twice uses the word

evangelisation in this wide sense of planting the gospel Church: "The General Assembly shall have power to commit the various interests pertaining to the general work of *evangelisation* to one or more commissions." And again: "The General Assembly shall have power to institute the agencies necessary in the general work of *evangelisation*." When, now, we remember that, for some reason, it is a very ancient opinion that the *work* of the evangelist, *distinctively considered*, is to *evangelise* the world; not only to *preach about* the kingdom, but to *plant and establish* the kingdom in its doctrine and government; and that such has ever been and is now the received doctrine of the Presbyterian Church throughout the world; and that her standards and her courts and her teachers, whenever they speak at all on the subject, use the *terms* in this sense; and that the evangelists of Scripture, whether as such or otherwise, *uniformly did so act*; we do not feel, when we follow their example, disturbed in the least degree by the inferences of "*one in the foreign field*" from the primary sense of the term.

9. Besides all this, the other specimens of exegesis to which we are treated, are not at all favorable to arouse a spirit of revolt against the old authorities and of submission to the new leader. His exegetical remark (on Phil. iv. 3), that "the chivalric Paul used so vulgar a phrase as '*those women*,'" when the Apostle did not say *women* at all, and, if he had said it, would have used a most honorable appellation, even the one by which he addressed his mother from the cross, is *extraordinary*. The Apostle simply says: "Help *them who* labored with me in the gospel." In the previous verse is found the antecedent of the pronoun, with which it agrees in gender and number, and thus we discover that they were *women*. We commend to our brother the *ordinary* interpretation of the aforesaid passage, in which Paul is commending the not faultless Euodia and Syntyche to a male fellow-laborer who would not work with them. Paul, in effect, says: "I beseech Euodia and I beseech Syntyche that they be of the same mind in the Lord; and I request you, true yoke-fellow—a request (*vai*) which you will surely grant—to lay hold on the work with them, whoever and whatever (*αἰτινες*) they are, seeing that they labored

in the gospel with me and Clement and the rest of my fellow-laborers, whose names, though I write them not, are written in the book of life." The *argument* of the passage, stripped of its charming form, is from the greater to the less: "If these women were good enough to work with me and Clement and other ministers of the word, though they have their imperfections and sinful infirmities, they are good enough to work with you, and you will, therefore, *please* work with *them*." In like manner, our critic, in his remarks on 1 Tim. v. 14, where Paul gives counsel (*βοιδομαι*), but does not express his *will*, has given us an equally *extraordinary* interpretation. The *ordinary* one, that Paul expresses his *wish* that the *younger widows* of his day—that is, all under *sixty* years of age—*should marry*, ought to satisfy any man, even "one in the foreign field," notwithstanding his hesitation to work with female assistants, whoever they are.

10. Our brother does "most seriously object" to our taking the extraordinary work of the evangelist as the differentiating characteristic of his charge or office. He has proved to his own satisfaction that preaching is the only work that is ascribed by the *term* to the evangelist. He excludes the administration of the sacraments, and, by an extraordinary interpretation of 1 Cor. i. 17, claims to have distinct authority for the exclusion of the administration of *baptism*. "We have seen," says he, "that what distinctively pertains to him according to Scripture and our Book, is to preach the gospel; and that, as an officer, he is not differentiated from his brethren at all; . . . (and) must exercise this extra power (of government) *as an elder*." If this passage says anything, it says: *The evangelist, as a preacher, is differentiated from his brother preachers by the distinctive characteristic of preaching; as an officer, he is not differentiated at all from his brethren; but as an elder intrusted with extraordinary power, he is neither differentiated nor not differentiated!!* On this explicit, clear, and logical deliverance, the following remarks are submitted: We (*a*) do not know what it *distinctively* means, and have no *means* of ascertaining its sense. We (*b*) do not perceive how that which is *common* to all can be *distinctive* of any. And (*c*) we have a serious objection to the *underlying* principles

thereof. We used the term "evangelist" in the sense in which we formally defined it; a sense which our antagonist perfectly understood, for he tries to prove that it is incorrect. He then puts *his* sense into the word in *our* article, and complains that "there is a want of explicitness about the whole passage that is calculated to mystify and confuse!! There would be the same trouble with any other passage of our article or of our *Book*, which does *not* use the *term* in its naked and primary etymological sense. Let us try it in the passage which he quotes in this connexion, substituting his *distinctive* terms, and it will read thus: "When a minister is appointed to the work of the 'minister of the word, distinctively considered,' *he is commissioned* to preach the word, and, 'what does not pertain to him, distinctively considered,' to administer the sacraments, . . . and to him, 'not *distinctively considered*, but *as an elder*,' may be intrusted power to organise, etc." Furthermore, the whole question concerns "*the power of jurisdiction*" and not "the power of order." Such was the title and subject of the former article. On the principle that public appointment to a work carried with it the delegation of the needed authority to accomplish that work, we seriously asked, and answered as well as we could, the question, "What powers must the Church delegate to its evangelist?" This, of course, raised the preliminary question, "What is the distinctive work of the evangelist?" We took the term in the sense in which it was given to us, and used "evangelist" and "missionary" interchangeably. Permission is freely given to all and every one to qualify the terms, *ad libitum*, with "*as elder*" or any other *secundum quid*. It will not change the bearing of a single sentence on the question discussed, but will, perhaps, show "*one in the foreign field*" that he has been chasing an "*ignis fatuus*." Whilst, however, we feel free to grant this large liberty to the reader, it must be understood that it is done only because it makes no difference as far as this discussion is concerned. We do not wish to turn aside to an irrelevant matter. But we do not believe that the minister of the word preaches as one thing and rules as another. We believe that he preaches as a teaching elder and rules as a teaching elder; that he has one office and not two. He

does not exercise *potestas ordinis* as a teacher, and *potestas jurisdictionis* as an elder, but both as a *bishop*. If ever there be occasion, we feel prepared to defend this position by Scripture, the standards, common sense, and authorities.

11. We now inform our reviewer that there is one quite vulnerable point in our "definition," upon which he might have founded a *just* criticism, if he had been as keen for *things* as he is for *words*. As our object is not victory, but the service of the Church in a matter of vast importance, in which there are most serious difficulties, however lightly and cavalierly our brother may regard and handle them, we are glad of a suitable opportunity to correct our error. We therefore give the definition of an evangelist, which, with our present light, we feel prepared to defend and teach. We now say: "The evangelist is an officer of the Church, with a temporary and extraordinary mission and authority to wield ecclesiastical power in an extraordinary way." His *work* is temporary; *i. e.*, there will be no occasion to plant and establish the Church during the last part of the gospel age; for then the evangelisation of the world will have been an accomplished fact, and "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." The occasion of the mistake is the fact that there is no *material* difference between the work and the office. The work, taken subjectively as a duty or charge, is the office. Every minister is authorised to do any ministerial work, but each one receives a special charge. The special charge characterises each minister's work. Thus speaks the Book, Chap. IV., Secs. 3-6. Another correction of our former article is also necessary. The error, however, was not ours, but the copyist's, and escaped our notice at the time of sending off the manuscript. On page 699, the expression "evangelistic courts" is printed, where we had written "evangelistic committees," the latter word in an abbreviated form, which, we suppose, occasioned the mistake. It is so plainly a mistake, that the proper word can be substituted without calling for any other change, even the least. The former error, corrected above, calls for the total change of the next sentence, and then the transposition of 2d and 1st. If we had meant "courts," we could not

possibly have used the alternative expressions which we employed; but, meaning "*committees*," those expressions are natural, and require no change. The writer is just as much opposed to *extraordinary courts* as his critic. With this explanation, we resume our reply.

12. Our critic severely censures our use of the word *extraordinary*, as applied to the *way* in which the evangelist wields his power of jurisdiction. The acknowledged fact that the foreign missionary often wields the power of church-government *severally* and not jointly, we characterised as an exercise of the power of jurisdiction "*in an extraordinary way.*" We call the attention of the reviewer and the reader to the fact that the ordinary several power (*potestas ordinis*) is outside of this discussion, and not to be named. We are discussing the evangelist's power of jurisdiction, a power which is exercised *jointly*, by *courts*, when administered in the ordinary way. On this point we used *several* and *extraordinary* interchangeably, just as we used evangelist and missionary. This ought to have protected us from the charges laid at our door, for the reviewer *understood us*. He, referring expressly to the power of jurisdiction, says of us: "When he says that this power resides in the evangelist, in an *extraordinary* mode, he, of course, means that in him it is a *several* power; for the ordinary mode is that of our Book, which says: 'ecclesiastical jurisdiction is not a several but a joint power, to be exercised by presbyters in courts.' This, we are all aware, is the almost universal opinion." And this almost universal opinion he stigmatises as "the *fundamental error*, the *fruitful source* of the whole difficulty," and "the *natural consequence* (!) of exalting the title evangelist to the place of a distinct office." (The last three italics are our own.) He then goes on to prove the opinion of "*one* in the foreign field," and thus overthrow the "almost universal opinion" on the subject. We need not follow the argument. It is founded on the fact that courts may in an ordinary way exercise their power through commissions, and that the foreign missionary is a commissioner of a court, and therefore the court through him exercises her power in an ordinary way; the difference between a board of commissioners and one commis-

sioner duly appointed, being a difference of degree, and not of kind. Thus he seeks to prove that "the method for doing the work abroad is the same as the method *for doing the same work* at home." Now, to a man who looks at *things* and not at *words*, this puzzle is easily solved.

(a) Admitting for a moment that the difference between a commissioner and an organised body of commissioners is not one of kind, we may ask whether there is not a difference of kind between such a "commission" as our Book authorises its courts to raise and such a "commission" as the evangelist receives from Presbytery. The word is plainly used in two different senses. The chapters which authorise the one and the other, are treating of widely different subjects. There is no objection to the evangelist terming himself a commissioner of Presbytery; but then he must not claim analogy, much less identity of kind, with the members of such a commission as the Book provides for in its Section on "Ecclesiastical Commissions." He is not *such* a commissioner. (b) An ecclesiastical commission is always appointed *to a specific work*. It is not appointed to ordain *any one* under the jurisdiction of the court, or organise churches *anywhere* within its bounds, etc., etc. It is appointed to ordain A B, to organise a church in C, and so on. Here, again, is a difference of kind between the commission of an evangelist and the commission of an "ecclesiastical commission." It is thus self-evident that the evangelist is not an *ecclesiastical* commission of "one," instead of "two or three." (c) There is, however, a difference of kind between that method which *requires* a body of co-commissioners and directs them to ordain a particular man, and then dissolve, *ipso facto*; and that method which commissions *one* man to ordain any man he judges qualified in a foreign field, and to continue to do so indefinitely. *What is committed* to the one is vastly different from *what is committed* to the other, and the repositories of the different trusts are commissioners of a specifically different kind. Our critic says more than once, that "the ordinary and regular method" of Presbytery for doing certain things, is "by means of a Committee of two or three," and then asks, "But if it appoints only one, is his office thereby changed?"

Certainly not, but, *ex vi terminorum*, the "ordinary and regular method" is changed. Of course, whatever is done at all, must be done in some way; and, whatever is not done in the ordinary way, is done in an extraordinary way. It will be hard to convince the Southern Presbyterian Church to reject the almost "universal opinion" for this substitute. By mere inspection, without conscious argument, people will perceive at once that the foreign missionary wields the power of jurisdiction in a way that is *extra ordinem*, and not in the way in which that power is ever wielded within the established Church. If, however, it will help to keep the peace, we are perfectly willing to substitute *severally* for "extraordinary way."

13. The reviewer likewise criticises brethren for saying that the evangelist is an "extraordinary officer," and that he is invested with an "extraordinary office." The present writer has never used those expressions, and thinks that they are quite objectionable in this discussion. It is always desirable to use a test word in the same sense throughout one and the same discussion. And certainly neither the officer nor the office is *extra ordinem*. They are both within the established order, and duly provided for. It is the *work*, taken objectively, that is out of the reach of the courts as such, or their ordinary commissions. Every minister of the word receives, by ordination, the same office. The pastor may become evangelist, or the evangelist pastor, without reordination. But we assure our alarmed brother that the brethren who use this objectionable expression, hold the same doctrine as himself on this point. They use the phrase not in its strict sense, but as an abridgment and symbol of a larger formula; just as the writer used (and was perfectly understood) the phrase "extraordinary power" interchangeably with the more cumbrous but exact language of his definition. In official communications and conferences spreading over two years, with men of every shade of opinion, and among them the man who is (if we mistake not) the author of the anonymous article quoted from, we have never heard any other doctrine broached. All have agreed that the evangelist is simply a minister of the word, to whom is intrusted, from the necessity of the case, extraordinary or several

power of jurisdiction. The disagreement has been on other and far more serious points—difficulties that cannot be removed by stating one or the other side more correctly and moderately. And these difficulties, too, are of such a nature that they cannot be solved by any possible doctrine as to the *way* in which the evangelist exercises ecclesiastical power. And, unless some of our missionaries in the foreign field, with a discriminating head and a truth-loving heart and a single eye to the welfare of the Church, can suggest a solution from that wisdom which can come only from practice and experience, the instruction will have to be given in the form of chastising providences—either upon our own Church, or upon some other.

14. Our brother is very sure that the foreign missionary, in his exercise of power of jurisdiction, is the delegate of *Presbytery*. *Perhaps he is*; and if this become the settled doctrine of the Church, then there will necessarily be a corresponding limit placed upon the evangelist's powers. In our former article we considered him the delegate of *the General Assembly*; and if this become the settled faith of the Church, then there will necessarily be larger powers put into his hand. The question concerns a matter of fact, and the fact must be discovered by inspection. That he is the delegate of the court which appoints him, may be assumed as a general truth until it is denied. Of course, then, the home missionary is the delegate of the Presbytery, for he has no appointment from any other source. But the foreign missionary, whilst he is undoubtedly appointed by the Presbytery, is, as a matter of fact, and *now* in accordance with written law, appointed by the General Assembly also. Now, which of these appointments is the one that determines his status as a delegate? He cannot be the appointee or commissioner of both *in the same respect*. We remain impressed with the conviction that he is, in this respect, the delegate of the Assembly, though we freely confess our inability to frame a syllogism from which that conclusion will necessarily flow. The following considerations lead us to this view:

(a) As before the work of general evangelisation was formally, by a constitutional provision, committed to the General Assem-

bly, it was actually so committed, according to the underlying principle of Presbyterianism, that a work which is common to the whole Church properly pertains to that Presbytery which is also common to the whole Church; so now, though there is no written law declaring it to be so, the general evangelist is actually regarded and treated as speaking and acting in the name and by the authority of the Assembly, according to the general principle that an officer is doing the work of that court to which the work properly pertains.

(b) The General Assembly is responsible for the support of the foreign missionary, and requires from him a report of his work, and approves his diligence or disapproves his neglect. A delegate most naturally reports to the court whose delegate he is.

(c) The Presbyteries, according to the new Book, may be regarded as having, since 1879, given up their powers over the foreign *work* into the hands of the Assembly, and having reserved to themselves only the right of ordination and judicial procedures.

(d) The ordination by Presbytery may be regarded as the induction into office, and the commission of the General Assembly as the call to the work. Thus the call authorises the ordination and the ordination gives effect to the call, and the commission is one and joint, and the responsibility is to both: to the Presbytery in one respect and to the Assembly in another, all which accords with the *facts of the case*. Now, whilst we would not find it a difficult task to pick flaws in the above statements, we are unable to make a statement on the other side that is not beset with still more serious faults. It is easy, indeed, to cut the knot by dogmatically affirming that, of course, the evangelist acts in the name of his Presbytery *only*, or in the name of the Assembly *only*, but this procedure does not commend itself to the general good sense of the Lord's people, and blindly refuses to *untie* the real knot, which is "*the actual facts of the case.*"

15. This brings us to the severe and scornful treatment of that part of our former article which discussed "the complex problem presented by the actual facts of the case." Now, we say frankly to our brother that we feel great reverence for the *facts* of God's

providence, whether complex or simple, always receiving them as the revelation and execution of his eternal decrees. And when those facts are not contrary to aught that is expressly set down in Scripture or to a good and necessary inference therefrom, we accept them as the execution of his *positive* decrees. But, to our brother, this complex fact of an organised "mission" is everything that is bad, a veritable Pandora's box, but without "*hope*" at the bottom to follow and ameliorate the innumerable and unmitigated evils that fly abroad and infect the whole Church. Well, there is left *one* in the home field that feels undisturbed and serene! *We* never wove that complex fact. It was put into our hands—*jointly* with the other Baltimore brethren—just as the words "evangelist" and "evangelisation." We studied it as best we could, with the Scriptures and the Book before us, especially the Acts of the Apostles, which our brother interprets so extraordinarily. The ordinary interpretation, which makes the church at Jerusalem the home-church, and the Gentile churches as "missionary" churches in the very process of formation and union with the mother church, taking away from them, of course, the distinctive and differential modification made by the presence of apostles and prophets is altogether on our side. But the brother mistakes us when he supposes that we were trying to present a theory that would prevent, in the foreign field, those difficulties and confusions which arise from the sinful infirmities of men, even the best. It was such confusion as necessarily results from the theory itself that we were arguing against, or rather, used as a *reductio ad absurdum*. No system, however coherent in its subject-matter, alas, can relieve the Church, either at home or abroad, from this the saddest of all confusions—conduct which the acknowledged theory forbids. And our critic perceived very plainly the object of the paper, for he expressly argues against "the theory," and then, as he thinks, clinches the argument by examples of confusion arising from a *disregard* of "theory." The trouble between Paul and Peter at Antioch was not one of doctrine, and did not arise from antagonistic principles. Peter was the first of all the Apostles to receive and practise and defend "the theory" that was common to him

and Paul as the *law* on the subject. He had also in Antioch previously conformed thereto in his practice as well as his teaching. Paul rebuked him for his *inconsistency*. In like manner, the strife between Paul and Barnabas was with reference to the fitness of John-Mark for the work, not with reference to "the theory" that the agent of the work should be a *fit* person. And in the solution of the difficulty, too, they both acted on the same "theory," to wit, that each should follow his own conscience and *leave the judgment to God*. On the contrary, neither one charged the other with "distinctly and emphatically discarding and setting aside both the Constitution and the Holy Scriptures in discussing the evangelist" John-Mark. It is not our purpose in this communication to defend the positions of our former article—which we leave to the future—but to defend ourselves against the charge of publishing principles that are "unscriptural," "unconstitutional," "unwise," "dangerous." Once, in a time of great confusion and unpleasantness, we were officially declared to be a dangerous citizen. Now we are charged, in a tone of decided authority, with being a dangerous "ecclesiastic." It seems that Adam and Eve, as hand in hand they go forth from Eden for their sin, can be the only *scriptural* example that is left for us now to follow.

"Some natural tears they dropt, but wiped them soon:
The world was all before them, where to choose
Their place of rest, and Providence their guide."

16. The brother bitterly attacks the "organised mission" as an unconstitutional "*court*." Now, if his censures were due to the unfortunate appearance of that word *once*, in our discussion of the "mission," or if he had drawn from the use of the *word*, as he did in reference to the other *words*, the bad inferences which would, in that case, justly flow, we would say no more than we have said and leave the subject for future impersonal discussion. Certainly, if the word *court*, in its proper sense, were applied seriously and intentionally to the "mission" as an actual fact, its well known and accepted ecclesiastical use would tend to exalt the "mission" to an unconstitutional place in our agencies for the evangelisation of the world. But here the brother attacks, not

so much the word as the thing. He cordially endorses the general principles, laid down in the beginning of our article, *which are inductions from the ordinary and perpetual FORM* of the Presbyterian Church as our guide in the discussion. Would our critic have us make inductions of general principles from any other particulars than complete ones? Certainly not, for that would be to make genus equal species; nay, in the way he argues, *individual* would equal genus, and would have in it mere matter, no essence, and no distinctive individual traits. Now when these principles of the ordinary state are applied to an extraordinary state of things every important word must be qualified by *quasi* or *quoad hoc*, for the change in the *status* and relation of the things necessitates a corresponding change in the symbols. *The very problem proposed to be solved was:* Given, these acknowledged principles of a *regularly organised* Presbyterianism, how far can they be applied to an *organising* Presbyterianism, where there are no "parts," that is, no proper courts? The only thing assumed by our statement of the question was, that they must be applied as far as they can. Co-evangelists are individually "quasi-parts," that is, "quasi-courts," a temporary expedient to do the work of courts; and collectively, they are to exercise the power of the whole *in an extraordinary way, i. e., as a quasi-court of evangelists to do the work of the highest court.* We used these inductions in the words in which we found them ready-made by Presbyterian authorities. It does not alter the sense a whit to write: "The whole ecclesiastical power is *in* every court and *over* the power of every court." In its application to the question it means, as we contended, "The whole evangelistic power is *in* every evangelist and *over* the power of every evangelist." The first our brother admits and claims. The second he denies. In the foreign field, according to *him*, the power of the whole is *not* over the power of every part. We will see the results of this denial presently. We stated the question, as raised by the application of these principles thus: "What is the relation of co-evangelists to each other *as to the exercise of extraordinary power? Is it joint or several?*" The inference drawn from these general principles was in the following words: "According to the prin-

ciples 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 plain that if we had used the word *courts*, it was with the same limitation as "parts," not real courts, but "bodies" or "conventions" of those in each of whom there is the whole delegated power. We confess freely, however, that the *word* is inappropriate, and, by our own misfortune, tends to misrepresent us; for, in our last words, embodying the naked principle to be conserved, we say: "It seems necessary to hold that evangelists *must exercise their power jointly* when they co-exist in time and space." This is all we ever contended for; this we abide by—and this does not make them a court in any proper sense of the word. The Faculty of a Theological Seminary, or the Board of Directors, have just as many general marks of an ecclesiastical court as the "mission," and in one respect *more*; that is to say, many of their decisions are final and without review or appeal. Every act of this "mission" is not final, until confirmed by the General Assembly. This robs it of one *essential* mark of a court. What is it, then? It is, ecclesiastically considered, just what the "Baltimore brethren" are. If we are an Executive Committee, so are they. If we are an ecclesiastical commission, so are they. In one respect we are superior in committed authority, and they are a sub-committee or sub-commission. In another respect they are superior and we are nothing, for they can open and shut the doors of the Church and its ministry, and appeal must be taken, if taken at all, to the Assembly; and it was in this aspect alone that we discussed it. But does not the "mission" in this latter aspect look like a court? Undoubtedly—to the superficial observer; for it is doing the work of a court. It must be *understood* that the power is wielded in an extraordinary mode by a temporary and vanishing expedient. Substitute for the "mission" our brother's plan. He says, in his own italics: "*Let each*

one (each evangelist) have sole jurisdiction over a distinct part of the field. Any one might invite his brethren to travel with him, preach with him, and even ordain with him, while only he would have authority and jurisdiction in that particular district. This is, in fact, the only possible way in which it can be done." Taking Paul, as an evangelist, for a "precedent" and "authority" to himself, he says, with charming *naïveté*, "Paul was at liberty to travel when and where he chose, to stay as long as he chose at any one place, and move from one city to another, to establish new stations without a vast amount of formal recommendations of missions and approval of Executive Committees. He was also at liberty to choose his own native assistants, and make tents (bricks?) to support himself, or call upon the churches to support him. . . . Let the evangelists be free and independent of each other and directly responsible to the Church at home. . . . Let each man take hold of the special work to which he feels called, and be free to develop it without interference on the part of his brethren. If it be a college, let it be under a close corporation, composed of intelligent Christian men in the field. If it is direct ecclesiastical work, let him have his own field and place of residence, and gather round him his native assistants, as Paul did." Such is the way, according to "one in the foreign field," in which the evangelist should have the liberty to do his own sweet will in his own "district." This claim and theory is undoubtedly extraordinary to the last degree. But does not the evangelist, in this view, look like a *Prelate in his See*? Undoubtedly, to the superficial observer, for he is doing the work of a prelate. The same *understanding* is necessary here. Which, then, looks the more anti-Presbyterian? a quasi-court or a quasi-prelate? And now suppose a *coup d'état* were performed just in these respective states of affairs—then the quasi-court would become a real Presbyterian court, and the quasi-prelate a real prelatical bishop with a see. Which is the contingency we are providing for? Exactly the former. Which against? Exactly the latter. *Our* principles provide for the vanishing away, as fast as possible, of all that is temporary and extraordinary and "quasi" and "quoad hoc;" so that, whenever the cord

that binds the foreign Church to the mother Church is cut or breaks, that sundering may leave a regular Presbyterian Church, *with its real courts*, in which the evangelists, thus carried off from the home Church, will appear as simple ministers without any extraordinary differentiations from their brethren.

17. Our brother (as usual when he puts a meaning into our words which he sees we did not intend or imply) grows especially severe and sarcastic in further handling this "*evangelistic court.*" Using the word "mission" to denote collectively a number of evangelists, we said: "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?" As an alternative expression, we speak of "co-evangelists preaching the gospel in the same field." By actual "facts" we meant the common *policy* of sending two or more evangelists to one place *to work together*, or, if one be sent alone or is providentially left alone, to send, as soon as possible, another to reinforce him. Besides, our critic mistakes the exact meaning of the word actual, which (we quote from a dictionary of logical terms before us) means (a) "what is opposed to *potential*, . . . (b) what is opposed to *real*." The same authority says that "the term *real* always imports the *existent*." We were discussing *actual* facts without reference in the least to the question whether they were *real* or not. Therefore we first postulated *one* evangelist in the field, and drew certain inferences from that hypothesis. Then, co-evangelists, and did the same, and the inference was that their power is joint and not several; and that is all. And these two are its *only* senses in logic. *And the brother understood us.* He says: "We have hitherto considered the mission in the same light as Dr. Lefevre, that is, as an '*evangelistic court.*'" "We suppose it is in that light only that he regards it" in. He then substitutes for *our* "mission" the "mission of the Manual." Of course, by "this hocus-pocus *modus operandi*" we are put into a painful dilemma. But the reader's attention is called to the *real*

fact that the subject of discussion was the *actual* "jurisdiction of the evangelist," and was applied only to one *historical* fact, a then recent ordination in China, which was a *real* jurisdiction that was not *actual*. The "mission of the Manual" regards the missionaries in the only light in which the Executive Committee could regard them, that is, the light in which the missionaries are responsible, *ad interim*, to that Committee. In writing our article, by a habit which we have contracted of sticking to the point, we did not even think of "the mission of the Manual." Certain things were committed to the Executive Committee by the action of the Assembly, whose commission it is. Some, or all, no matter which, of these things were sub-committed to the body of the missionaries of each given field. But the Executive Committee have not one jot of "the power of jurisdiction," in the sense of our article. Our article discussed the mission under a different aspect, which altogether left out *lay* missionaries, who are *never* called evangelists or co-evangelists, and who are never ordained by Presbyteries and who have no "powers of jurisdiction" at all. The venerable brother who criticised our article "in the same number of the REVIEW," and who, our present critic declares, "strangely enough supposes that Dr. Lefevre *proposes* to create this court," *was right in his supposition*, only instead of court there should be put some term that would unequivocally designate an agency for the co-exercise of the power of jurisdiction in an extraordinary way. Never before had we seen or heard a logical discussion of the subject of our paper, and we are agreeably surprised to find that the venerable and the younger critic have not compelled any withdrawal from the actual facts of that article, which we hope some day to see *realised*. This proposed "body" or "convention," or whatever it *actually* is and is to be called, would then be the agency for the exercise of the joint-power of jurisdiction of *co-evangelists*. There would be no "mongrel" or "hybrid" characteristic about it; it certainly would be *extra ordinem*, as all else that is involved in the discussion, and, like the scaffolding of a building, to be taken away when the building is finished. Over this proposed body and its proposed functions, the Executive Committee would have no control; and

its members could "freely correspond" and confer with each other as under their own vine and fig-tree. The only thing it would secure would be the *joint exercise of the key of government*; and, surely, this appears to be according to the Constitution. Any possible improvements, by addition or subtraction or reconstruction, in the Executive Committee, or the "mission of the Manual," would not touch it. We again submit the result of our study to the Church, without further defence at this time, and ask our brethren to look at it patiently. Something ought to be done in this matter. Is the Church ready to adopt the principle that co-evangelists must *not* exercise their power of jurisdiction jointly? Or, admitting that "principles" require a joint exercise thereof, is she willing to adopt the method of escape proposed by our brother—"send but one to a place?" Because of difficulties created in one mission by brethren of differing judgments, are we to set aside the guidance of principles, or the policy which is dictated by the experience of all missionary agencies in the world?

18. If our brother will re-read pages 644-5 of our previous article, he will see that he has totally misstated our position in the following language which he uses in reference to us. "He maintains that the native Presbytery 'becomes immediately a member and constituent of the General Assembly whose evangelist brought it into existence.' Admitting this theory, we cannot see why a particular church may not become a constituent part of the home Church as well as the Presbytery." Now, that is the very thing we contended for. We insisted that the church, organised by our evangelist in a foreign land, is in true and real connexion with our home Church; that it is just precisely the particular church of our Book; and that the evangelist is the connecting link that binds it temporarily to the Assembly. We hold that, first by unwritten law, now by the new Book, the other courts have given up by distribution their rights in the foreign field to the General Assembly, just as the States gave up their public domains to the federal government at the time of the adoption of the present Constitution. This is the only one of our missionary principles that has passed into *written* law, but it logically carries all the rest.

19. Again, our critic says that he "cannot understand why" we "limit the work to the formation of a Presbytery." Well, *we* understand it. It is because it is not *necessary* to the work of an evangelist that he should have any further extraordinary powers. We are opposed to delegating powers one single step further than actually necessary. A native Presbytery, when it has been formed, must be reported to the General Assembly, which will assign it to a Synod, and give its commissioners seats in its own body; and, when there is a sufficient number of contiguous native Presbyteries, the General Assembly will set them off into a native Synod. This is as far as the native Church can go as long as it remains under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

20. Our brother argues, and with considerable force, for the theory which antagonises ours as to the ecclesiastical *status* of the native church. We had stated it thus: "It has been maintained 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 . . . and is a germ which develops by a force *ab intra* into the full grown tree. . . Indeed, the writer is aware of no Presbyterian doctrine antagonistic to his own, whose truth would not depend on and flow from that very pre-supposition." We freely admitted that there might be such a church, but claimed that a church organised by an evangelist was not such, but one whose FORM was that of the evangelist's own church. Our position was that "at *every* stage the organic product was of the evangelist's own kind—genus, species, and even variety." *Who* could give him *authority* to organise a church in any other *form*? The evangelist, whose criticisms we are answering, contends that the particular church which he organises and over which he ordains and installs elders and a pastor, is such a germinal church. We reply: then (a) he is, contrary to his own as well as our expressed teaching, an evangelist of a different kind from the domestic evangelist; or, (b) that he has the super-ecclesiastical fac-

ulty of producing what is not after his own kind. And, if so, whence did he get it? Not from his Presbytery, for the Presbytery had it not to give; and *where* is the evidence that *he* is an evangelist, like Philip, "not from (*ἀπό*) men, neither through (*διὰ*) man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father" (Gal. i. 1). In describing the church which it is part of the evangelist's work to organise and equip, he declares, "Such a church is not Congregational . . . ; nor is it Prelatic . . . ; nor yet is it *Independent*, since it is governed according to Presbyterian law sown in the hearts of the people and sworn to by the officers." The reply is easy. Such a church is saved from Independency only by the fact that it is, through the evangelist, under the care and government of the home Church. Surely it is not in connexion with any other Church than the evangelist's; and if not with *his* either, then it is an Independent Presbyterian church. But there is the "Presbyterian law" in the hearts of its members and officers, and therefore, he continues, "several such churches planted in any district will as surely grow into a Classical Presbytery as the many roots that shoot downwards from the seed will push above ground one single stem, destined to grow into a full-grown tree." Such, indeed, would be the result, if there were nothing else than that good law in their hearts. But, since "another law" is there also, even the "law of sin," we cannot be so sure beforehand that the germ will grow properly or make any growth at all. The surer way is to plant those "saplings" in an orchard, and cultivate them on general principles. Besides, it may be added that there are just such Independent Presbyterian churches at home, which, with all their opportunities and all their piety, and all the outside pressure, remain Independent still. Is it actually the work of the Presbyterian evangelist to establish such churches? Do not our principles require that we plant the regular organism, as it is described in the Book, and cultivate the field accordingly? This is to be done, of course, not through fear "lest the peach-seed planted on foreign soil should spring up as orange or mango trees"—which would not be so very bad—but lest, for want of proper cultivation, it grow not at all, or make a wild growth and produce degenerate fruit, with

bitter poison in the kernel and no luscious meat on the hard shell. The reader is asked just here to recall the former picture of the foreign field, divided into districts, in each of which *one* foreign evangelist has his residence, his native ministers, his lay co-workers, the sole direction of the work, and the sole ecclesiastical jurisdiction; a picture that beats that of the evangelist Paul, as drawn in the Acts of the Apostles! Now, let this picture be filled out with sprinkling Independent Presbyterian churches over each district, and what does it look like? A *quasi* prelate over independent churches, which have no bond of union except that clergyman's care and government! Let that one man, for any reason; good, bad, or mixed, renounce his allegiance to the home Church, and we have a complete Prelatical Church. We acknowledge that our principles make us prefer some actual state of things that looks more like Presbyterianism—even if it be not the regular thing—only capable of becoming such by the withdrawal of the foreign from the home Church, as the ripened fruit falls from the tree that bore it.

21. But again: it does not appear, on our brother's principles, that there is need for the evangelist's having any power of jurisdiction at all. This, indeed, would solve one difficult problem, but would create a greater—a minister of the word, placed where he could *in no way whatever* use the power of jurisdiction. If these aforesaid churches, without the exercise of any power *over* them, will and must unite of their own motion into a Presbytery, why may not and must not the native converts, in like manner, self-moved, unite into a church, thus organising themselves as a particular church, and letting the foreign evangelist confine himself, as the term denotes, to preaching to them "to do all things whatsoever Christ has commanded." Their *right* to do so cannot be denied, except on the principles of Prelacy. The brother is, in fact, making a mistake about his *seed* both ways. The Book says: "The power which *Christ* has committed to his Church, rests in the *whole body*, the rulers and the ruled, constituting it a spiritual commonwealth. This power, as exercised by the people, extends to the choice of those officers whom he has appointed in his Church." Such is the underlying prin-

ciple of the organised Church. Now apply it to an organising Church. Postulate a small company of God's people, separated in the divine providence from all others. Having the right to choose the officers of the church, irrespective of the distinction between rulers and ruled, suppose they make that selection. Now, who will dare to say that they have the greater right of creating their officers, and deny them the lesser right of setting them apart to their respective offices in an extraordinary way under these extraordinary circumstances? *This is the starting point of a germinating church, working from within; and thus she creates and puts on the organised form.* Christ's own interpretation of his first parable of the kingdom of heaven as a visible Church, that of the tares and wheat, says: "*The good SEED are the CHILDREN of the kingdom;*" and these "children" are those who, in the language of the previous parable, have received "the seed of the word" "*into good and honest hearts.*" From all which it appears that church power resides germinally, not in the parochial presbytery, but in the Lord's people *as such.*

22. One word more, and that about "The Mission of the Manual." From our former article no one could have known that there was such a thing as the Executive Committee or its sub-committee, the Mission of the Manual. We were discussing a thing over which neither the one nor the other has any control. We do not suppose that improvements cannot be made in the agencies which the Assembly has established. Our paper proposes one. Of course there may be one or two things, about the oversight and division of the work, which are now committed to the Committee, but actually belong to this proposed agency. One thing is certain: if there be an Executive Committee at all, it must have these sub-committees for advice, and, in urgent cases, action *ad interim.* Another thing is also certain, that no man has as yet clearly drawn a line of division between purely executive matters and jurisdictional matters. Some things are border matters, which have the nature of both. The best illustration of these border matters is that given by the sacraments of the Church. They at once belong to both the *potestas ordinis* and the *potestas jurisdictionis.* The Book *classes* them under the former head;

but *treats* them as belonging to the latter. They are both. Their administration is at once an act of teaching and an act of government.

We wish to add, that the venerable Secretary of Foreign Missions has not seen or heard a word of this paper; nor will he, until it appears in the REVIEW; nor has there been a word of conference with him or any other of "the Baltimore brethren" as to its subject-matter. The writer alone is responsible. It would be almost a miracle, if, in discussing so new and difficult a subject, he had not employed both terms and concepts which his brethren of a different opinion will not compel him to modify. He expects it; and may Christ give triumph to the truth, whatever it is.

J. A. LEFEVRE.

ARTICLE III.

FRATERNAL RELATIONS.

The subject at the head of this article has been so fully discussed in the religious newspapers and in the courts of the Church as to be well nigh threadbare. Still, it may not be amiss, before the last act of the drama is concluded, to review its history from the beginning, and to trace the successive stages of its development. Such a survey will throw some light upon the present attitude of the Southern Church; and may perhaps determine whether she is adhering to her declared principles, or is receding from them. It may not affect the final result, which many regard as substantially reached, and as only needing the outward ceremonies expressing it to the world. Should no change be wrought in a single mind, it will nevertheless be of advantage to put on permanent record a connected history of the case; as it will certainly relieve the conscience to make a last effort towards extricating the Church so dearly loved from the peril of a great mistake.

The original policy of the Northern Church towards the South-