

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—NO. 2.

APRIL, MDCCCLXXXIV.

ARTICLE I.

A BRIEF IN THE CASE OF THE MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

I. Is the law recorded in Leviticus xviii. and xx. directed against fornication, adultery, or incest? Answer: Leviticus xviii. 6–17, and the similar verses in Leviticus xx., are unquestionably levelled specially at incest. (1) This has been the judgment of the vast majority of the Church, both Jewish and Christian. There is hardly a dissenting voice. (2) If incest is not meant, the Jews had no written law against incest, which is wholly unprovable when we consider the commonness and enormity of the crime. (3) The preamble to the law is, “None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to him, to uncover their nakedness.” “Near of kin” is in the Hebrew **שֵׂאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ**—“flesh of his flesh.” The verse reads literally, “Man, man to the flesh of his flesh ye shall not approach.”

The margin of King James' Version renders **שֵׂאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ** by “remainder of his flesh;” and this gives substantially the same meaning to the passage. It is accepted by Prof. Bush in his Commentary. But Gesenius in his Thesaurus, as in Dr. Robinson's translation also, clearly makes out that “flesh of his flesh” is the true rendering. One of the most learned of the English Hebraists coincides with Gesenius. **שֵׂאֵר** is rendered flesh in

sacred day as the best of all the seven, that we may hail its periodical return as a joy and a delight, being joyful and glad in it, cheerfully devoting its sacred hours to the worship of God, to the cultivation of the divine life in the soul; that it may thus be a token between us and God, that we recognise him as our God, and that he recognises us as his people; remembering that the repudiation of the Sabbath is a repudiation of the very idea of a God, which is absolute atheism. All external violation of the Sabbath law, therefore, is sin in the direction of atheism. For instance, to cut wood on the Sabbath, to cook on the Sabbath, to write letters on the Sabbath, to make social visits on the Sabbath, to transact little items of worldly business on the Sabbath, to read secular papers or secular literature on the Sabbath—all such little external interruptions of the sacred rest of the Sabbath are sins in the direction of atheism. Their tendency is to break up and dissolve the divinely appointed token of your recognition of God as your God. Let us, therefore, remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

K. M. McINTYRE.

ARTICLE III.

A PLEA FOR EMPHASISING THE DIVINE RIGHT
OF PRESBYTERY.

The *jus divinum*, or divine right, of Presbytery is not proposed as a theme for argument in this paper. Its truth as a doctrine is assumed. The writer's purpose is to call attention to its importance as a factor in the Church's growth and prosperity: an importance which he believes has been injuriously overlooked both in fact and in the discussion on "aggressiveness." It may be well at the outset merely to state the argument for the divine right of Presbytery.

1. The Scriptures recognise the existence of a Church government: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls." Heb. xiii. 17.

2. They recognise this government as of divine right and not

of human invention, because (a) authoritatively ordered by inspired men, (b) whose mission was to set in order the polity and worship of the Church as well as its creed; (c) who to this end declared that Christ had given to his Church certain officers and ordinances; (d) who define the duties and qualifications of these officers, and the right observance of these ordinances; (e) and who enjoin obedience to the one and observance of the other as Christian duties.

3. Examination shows that this divine government is Presbyterian.

Now this is what we would insist upon: *That the doctrine of divine right of Presbytery be made very much more prominent in the teaching of the Church.*

I. It is right so to do.

Whatever God has revealed, the Church should teach. God is *sovereign*. To withhold any part of divine revelation is to put upon it the seal of our disapprobation, and to treat its author with contempt. It is surely no part of the Church's mission to encourage the world in disregard of divine authority. There is a widely prevalent indisposition to respect any revelation which is not thought fundamentally necessary to salvation. This defiance of God's supreme authority is sometimes flung from the pulpit and proudly flaunted as Christian charity. Practically, the current maxim that it matters not to what Church one belongs is tantamount to saying: "If God's word has anything to say that will ensure my salvation, I will listen; but if he has any revelation about matters which are non-essential, like Church government and ordinances, I do not want to hear it. The Almighty ought not to concern himself with trifles. Such things had better be left to our discretion. The best results in worship and government are to be had not through divine revelation, but by human wisdom. I do not want to know what the Lord has to say about them." So, too, said Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin. Like Jeroboam and Jehu, such people have no use for God except as an almighty convenience. Their attitude is sheer rebellion. We insist that God's will is paramount; that his will respecting the order of the Church has been re-

vealed; that it is man's duty respectfully and carefully to consider it, and humbly and conscientiously to obey it. It is, therefore, the duty of the Church to teach the divine right of Presbytery, because it is right to enjoin subjection to God, not merely as a *gracious*, but as a *sovereign* God. Like Paul we should shun not to declare the whole counsel of God.

Whatever God has revealed the Church should not shun to teach, because God is *gracious*. In the economy of redemption God is economical of the divine resources. In grace as in nature there is no waste. He never does for us what we can do for ourselves. It was simply because man is incompetent to devise a suitable polity and worship for the Church that God has imposed them. And here it may be observed, that should any object that it savors strongly of arrogance to emphasise the divine right of Presbytery, it will suffice to say that arrogance may be justly charged to those Christian bodies which ask the world to accept a polity and worship their own wisdom has devised; but that to accept what God has revealed is humility. It is certainly humble to accept God's ordinances as wisest and best; it is assuredly arrogant to insist that mankind can do nothing better than accept the fruits of one's own wisdom. This is the attitude any Church must take which denies that God has himself instituted a government for his Church or left anything in polity or worship to human discretion. This position requires that in order to the attainment of the grandest spiritual triumphs of the Church, the wisest and best Christians should be insufferably conceited. Such a theory is self-destructive.

Grace is exhibited not only in God's doing that for man which man is incompetent to do for himself, but in doing that which is so essential to his happiness. The Church is an institution which has for its object the gathering and perfecting of the saints; an object, surely, of the gravest importance. It is impossible that God should make any unprofitable revelations: "All Scripture is profitable." Since, therefore, God has himself instituted a government for his people in this dispensation, we may feel assured that it is the wisest possible adaptation to our needs, and admirably designed to secure our highest spiritual attainments and hap-

piness. A divinely instituted polity is therefore a revelation of *grace*, and for this reason it is the duty of the Church to teach it.

In one issue, this year, of a certain weekly publication there appeared a sermon as delivered by a famous Presbyterian divine, and another by a no less famous Baptist minister. Said the Presbyterian: "As to the difference between different denominations of evangelical Christians I have no concern. If I could, by the turning over of my hand, decide whether all the world shall at last be Baptist, or Methodist, or Congregational, or Episcopalian, or Presbyterian, I would not turn my hand. But there are doctrines which are vital to the soul." Said the Baptist: "I should very strongly recommend you always to obey the prescriptions of the great Healer, 'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.' Do not follow a part of his orders and neglect the rest. The Lord Jesus must be received as a whole, or not at all. Say not, 'This is non-essential;' for such a speech is flat rebellion. I do not believe in any words of our Lord being non-essential. They may not be essential to our salvation, but every word of Christ is essential to our spiritual health; neither can we disregard the least of his precepts without suffering loss through our disobedience." Right manly words, and loyal! True, too! Realised by us to be true, for the Presbyterian Church has suffered and is suffering loss through her disobedience in not emphasising the divine right of Presbytery. The world deifies indifference to God's statutes under the name of "charity," but the greater number of new converts in the warmth of their new-born love and zeal are pretty sure to affect those Churches which seem most jealous for Jehovah.

It is right, therefore, to give prominence in our teaching to the divine right of Presbytery. It is the Church's sacred duty to recommend the doctrine as a *provision of grace*. What man was incompetent to do, that God has done. He has revealed a polity which, because it is his, is best adapted to edify the Christian and conserve the truth of the gospel for his posterity. We wish to note, by the way, that the custodianship of the truth for its faithful transmission to posterity is an object of Church organisation which very many people seem neither to have conceived

nor appreciated. Apparently the masses have adopted the sarcastic definition of the Church which is said to have come from a Congregationalist minister: "A society of Christians organised to hear preaching." And those ministers who, like Bishop Ryle, are preaching evangelical doctrine in organisations irretrievably committed to Romish tendencies, forget that the mission of the Church is not simply to preach the gospel, but to ensure its transmission to every creature of succeeding generations. Such ministers preach the truth to one generation, but fasten chains of error on their children's children. Fidelity to the truth of the gospel is the preacher's chief concern, but scarcely of less importance are those institutions which God has ordained for the perpetuation of gospel truth. The Church is the pillar and ground of the truth.

But suppose we fail to discover to others the beauty of the Presbyterian polity. Suppose that mental immaturity which is due to youth or defective training, fails to appreciate the beauty, interdependence, and symmetry of gospel truths as expounded by the Reformed theology, and the adaptation of a divinely given polity and worship to conserve those truths, what then? Shall we take the ground so often tacitly assumed that there is nothing more to be done? Shall we pronounce that certain classes or people or populations are "not good Presbyterian material"? Shall we repeat that other hackneyed phrase that, "People must be educated into Presbyterians"? Shall we concede so much to the spirit of rationalism? No! God devised the Presbyterian polity not for such only as appreciate its wisdom, but for all who recognise his authority. The heart must submit, though the head may not ken. The best of us on earth know only in part; and all of us are disciples. Whatever soul can understand his obligation to obey God, and can be made to see that Presbytery is ordained of God, is good Presbyterian material. God is not only gracious, but *sovereign*. The Church should proclaim his will with all authority.

What if there be leaning, dependent natures, full of unquestioning obedience and worshipful veneration for authority, shall we contemn and scorn and neglect them, because so unlike the

sturdy Presbyterian type of worshippers? Are we to turn them over to Pope and prelate and priest, and disown them for Presbyterian material? Reverence for authority is the foundation of all true religion, and that Church makes a proud and lamentable mistake which disdains the souls whose first quest is their *King*. Let the Church take such gently by the hand and lead them to Him who alone is Lord of the conscience. Let the Church show them a "thus saith the Lord" for the Presbyterian polity, and they will prove our staunchest and most loyal members. It is our duty to preach the divine right of Presbytery with "all authority."

II. And there is *need* so to do.

For, as a matter of fact, we have not the ear of the masses. This is fully recognised, for it has given rise to the discussion of what is called "*aggressiveness*." For the cause of it, a diligent search has been instituted. Some writers have referred it mainly to defects of administration. Some few have referred it to defective teaching. It has been said, for instance, that the Reformed Theology has not been sufficiently emphasised. Not undertaking to answer for any other of the Presbyterian Churches, we hardly think the Southern Church justly chargeable with this neglect. Some ministers are doubtless unwise, but scarcely any are derelict. But with respect to the divine right of Presbytery, it must be admitted that we have shunned to declare the whole counsel of God. And why may not our numerical inferiority be largely due to this neglect of an important doctrine—the doctrine, in fact, of which our name proclaims us to be the champions?

Let us ask ourselves the question: *Why should* we have the ear of the masses? Our ministers go into destitute regions to gather saints and organise churches. They are thoroughly evangelical. It looks to them like solemn trifling to preach anything else but truths essential to salvation. If they do, it is done with infinite reluctance and fluent apologies. They stand before the people and say, in the language of the Presbyterian divine above quoted: "If I could by the turning over of my hand make Presbyterians of you, I would not turn my hand. There are doctrines which are vital, and I am here as God's instrument to save souls." And they preach earnest, faithful gospel sermons, which the

Spirit blesses to the conversion of souls. What next? What do the masses say? Say some: "We have heard good Baptist doctrine;" others, "good Methodist doctrine." Say *all*: "We see no reason, therefore, why we should be Presbyterians, but there remain reasons why we should 'follow Christ in baptism,' or 'go where we can do the most good,' or 'join *the* Church.'" And very soon thereafter these same converts are asking, "What is the Presbyterian Church good for any way? The preacher himself wouldn't turn over his hand to make us Presbyterians." It is due to this training that communities may be easily found where distinctive Presbyterian preaching is regarded by other denominations as an impertinence to be resented and rebuked, though they themselves indulge in little else than laudations of their peculiar tenets and abuse of the tenets of others.

And we have not the ear of the masses, although the Presbyterian ministry is notably an educated ministry; by general consent, the most thoroughly equipped ministry. One able writer undertakes to show, not that our ministry is educated too much, but in the wrong direction, out of sympathy with the masses. This line of argument is wholly independent of that we are now pursuing. We allude to it only to say that a superior standard of education ought to give us the advantage with the liberal professions. But is such the case? Have we any such advantage? Have we our proportionate part even of the liberally educated? It is certain that a disproportionate number seem allured by pretentious pretensions. And why? We do not propose to explore all the causes, but we deem the following sufficient: The thoughts of professional men are too much preoccupied to spare time and attention to theological topics. In the matter of religion they are more disposed than most other men to let others do their thinking. The greater number yield a facile deference to a show of exclusive authority. Now with such minds the question of divine right is Alpha and Omega. We ought to recognise this fact and urge upon their consideration the irrefragable evidence that the great Head of the Church, while he subordinates ecclesiastical order to doctrinal purity, for the purpose of ensuring purity has instituted in Presbytery a government for his Church which they

are bound to respect. And yet we doubt if there is more than one in a thousand of the liberally educated outside our own pale, who have ever heard that the Presbyterian Church claims to have a government which is by divine right and therefore obligatory. Our silence has not only robbed us of advantage, but actually brought us into disrepute. How so? Because people ignorant of the real and sufficient grounds of our ardent attachment to the Church have accounted for it inadequately and in some cases maliciously. They have miscalled our affection—bigotry, because in their ignorance and arrogance it seemed to them blind and obstinate. Our tenacious adherence to divine institutions, at the cost, in former times, of liberty and life, instead of being admired as heroism, has been foully calumniated as austerity and fanaticism. Writers of fiction, whose influence is underrated by sober-minded Churchmen,¹ but who, nevertheless, are potent, because so generally read—writers of fiction, Sir Walter Scott in the lead, have wrought mightily and effectually to misrepresent and villify the grand old martyr Church, which kept alive the principles of civil and religious liberty; which, as Froude says, “has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence or rust under enervating temptation.” Our modest reticence has suffered even the children of the Church to be alienated, and to go down to their graves uninformed of the most glorious earthly and temporal heritage God has ever given man—a polity and worship for his Church. There is a justifiable pride which our children should be taught to feel in the gifts of God to his Church. Humanly invented rites and holy days of man’s appointment should be waved aside, as of no account in the eyes of those who appreciate the dignity of a divine institution. But that this honor is not more highly esteemed is largely due to our reprehensible silence.

And in this reprehensible neglect of the doctrine of divine right we have the explanation of another puzzling fact—the won-

¹Of course, in this country, we use the word “Churchman” not in its narrow, British sense, to designate members of an Establishment, but in its proper, unrestricted sense—a Church member.

derful fact that, while the Presbyterian Church is among the most liberal on earth, although she alone, in her symbols of faith, recognises other evangelical communions as branches of Christ's Church visible, still she has the repute of being the most intolerant and uncharitable. Now, what is the explanation? Is it not this: that we are supposed to regard forms of government and worship as matters of indifference?—to teach that "one Church is as good as another"? In *us*, therefore, it is thought unwarrantable and unpardonable to stickle for Presbytery. Nothing but an uncharitable, partisan, schismatic temper can account for *our* pertinacious adherence to Presbytery and reprehensible repugnance to other polities! But do other communions exclude us from the Lord's table? Do other communions insist on "confirming" our members and reordaining our ministers who seek admission to their fold? Do they refuse to receive the gospel or the eucharist at the hands of our ministry for the alleged reason that their ordination is invalid? Do they denounce Protestants as schismatics while recognising the Greek and Roman apostasies as Churches of Jesus Christ? All such misbehaving arrogance the world excuses on the ground that consistency with their principles demands it. *These* may prate about *the* Church without rebuke, but to defend Presbytery against aggression and to resent arrogance is atrocious intolerance and bigotry. Why? Because the world is persuaded that we hold one polity to be as good as another, and that we are contentious not for conscience' sake, but to gratify a spirit of intolerance. That is the why. Now suppose, that while advertising the public of our recognition as sister Churches of all who preach evangelical doctrine, and the validity of their orders although unapostolic and irregular in form, we were at the same time signally and emphatically to proclaim that Presbytery is by divine right and therefore obligatory, then, we hesitate not to say, our scriptural charity in contrast with unscriptural presumption would not lack of hearty appreciation. It requires this framing to bring it out in bold relief.

Another evil: There is a growing disinclination to unite with the Church. It is alleged in excuse that people can be "as good out of the Church as in it;" that participation in Church quar-

rels will be avoided; that the Church is brought into disfavor by the inconsistencies of members; that the propriety of self-distrust lest one should scandalise the cause, justifies one in the neglect of Church ordinances. Now these and multifarious other pretexts would not for an instant be thought tenable if the fact were clearly recognised that submission to Church government is obligatory, because God has given his Church a form of government. There is need that we should inculcate this truth and so do our part to correct the evil.

We wish now to call attention to what is justly regarded as by far the most difficult problem we have to contend with. It is said that the Presbyterian Church is so aristocratic and so stiffly decorous in its membership and tastes that the industrious poor and reputable middle classes are repelled. In the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW for October, 1882, the author of the article "Aggressiveness of Presbyterianism" says: "The independent, sturdy yeomanry, the mechanics, artisans, and laborers of our towns, are not, as a class, found in the Presbyterian Church, but in the Methodist and Baptist. We know this is vehemently denied in some quarters, but it is too notoriously true to admit of argument here, as any city or town pastor can testify." It is true! We have known pastors to complain that it was impossible to persuade their people to show outsiders such attentions as would invite their attendance on the services. There is reason to fear that in some communities our people regard the Church as a *social circle* "organised to hear preaching." There seems to be an utter disinclination on the part of such to seek for accessions in the highways and hedges. They attend services, behave with decorum, maintain the pastor, but it is impossible to arouse in them any local missionary zeal. They hear the gospel and are careless who hear it not. The stranger is chilled by his frigid reception and returns no more. Visitors who are not of the same social circle are received with a stare and leave with resentment. Is this picture overdrawn? We think not; but whether our people are censurable or blameless, the fact remains that our town and city churches are generally restricted to one class of people, and it is almost hopeless to expect accessions from any

other class. This ought not so to be. Well! What is the remedy? Says one: "Our people must be carefully polite and kindly considerate of all classes." Very true! Such conduct becomes the followers of Christ; but if we are to coddle people, if we are to erect amiable Christian courtesy into a means of grace for purposes of denominational thrift, its delicate aroma will be lost and its beauty coarsely marred. Say others: "We need more piety; we need to be revived." Yes, assuredly! We do need more Christ-likeness, more sincere love of souls, more realisation of his love, constraining us to self-denying service. But all this is inadequate to remedy the evil. The fault is not wholly on the side of our people. If they were all they ought to be, the human nature of the other party would insist upon determining their Church relations on social grounds. *They, too*, regard the Church as a social circle. *They, too*, seek congenial company. They are fortified in this position by the assurance that "one Church is as good as another." And just so long as this is held to be true, just so long will the evil prevail. The only thing which will ever bring the rich and the poor in harmony in the same congregation is the conviction that God has enjoined the consciences of all men to observe a polity which is from himself.

Ah! objects one, you are relying upon outward conformity, and despairing of inward grace. Not at all! Please reflect, that the proper aliment of grace is the word of truth; that if Christians were perfect, we should need no government at all, and that it is just because we are imperfect that a government is given; that the polity and worship of the Church have been given her for the gathering and *perfecting* of the saints. In order that gracious influences may exert their full power on the hearts of men, they must be taught to reverence divine institutions. A *sovereign* will has imposed them, and with a *gracious* design. Let us not be found fighting against God, and defrauding man. While, therefore, we should be more pious, more kindly, more zealous, the appropriate remedy and only adequate remedy is to enforce the divine right of Presbytery.

Let us ask ourselves the question: Why should people of all classes and conditions of life be Presbyterians? There is no

reason except this: that all classes and conditions of men should submit themselves to divine truth; no human traditions can bind the conscience. Is it true that Jesus is the Son of God? Then all conditions of men should shun the Unitarian societies; but not for this reason need they be Presbyterians; they may choose any Trinitarian Church, and if the divinity of Christ were all of revelation, social considerations might be permitted to dictate the choice. Is it true that he who believeth *hath* everlasting life? Then Arminianism, too, is to be avoided, and the circle of choice still further narrowed, but the Christian may be determined in the choice of *any* Calvinistic Church by social reasons; there is no necessity laid upon his conscience to be a Presbyterian. And so, considerations of convenience, or congeniality, or taste, etc., may control the choice of Church relations in so far as anything in doctrine, worship, or polity is left to human discretion. But if nothing be left to human discretion, if all things pertaining to the Church are determined by divine legislation, then all classes and conditions of society are conscientiously bound to walk by the same rule. And if Presbytery has been divinely prescribed, then this constitutes a sufficient reason why men should be Presbyterians regardless of social status. Were there no other difference between us and other communions than the matter of polity, we would still have a righteous claim upon the consciences of all classes, because Presbytery is of divine right. In order, therefore, to reach all ranks of people, the Church should make very much more prominent the divine right of Presbytery. Just as superstition brings all classes of people, from kings to paupers, to worship at the shrines of Rome, so should an instructed conscience affiliate all classes in the Presbyterian Church.

What, says some one: Would you have us to be high-churchmen? No! High-churchism is exclusivism; high-churchism is schismatic. The doctrine of divine right no more unchurches other communions than the doctrine of a present and finished salvation disowns Arminians for Christians. But we would have people of every condition in life to take an interest in the Church as God has constituted it; to be loyal to it, because divine prescription makes loyalty a duty; to love it, because the gift to

them makes love a privilege with which none may interfere. We would have the doctrine of divine right preached, not apologetically, but imperatively; we would have it proclaimed with all authority.

We pass now to the consideration of evils within the Church, which are largely due to that neglect which is deplored. The first which claims our attention concerns the eldership. The office of the ruling elder does not receive that respect to which a divine appointment should commend it, simply because the divine appointment has not been sufficiently emphasised. The ruling elder is popularly regarded as a sort of vestryman, deriving his office and authority from a man-made Constitution. He may assist the pastor at the communion table and the council board. He is a sort of brake upon the ministry. He is himself a layman, representing the laity and protecting their rights against clerical intrusion. As a fellow-laborer, he is gladly welcomed; as a ruler, he is scarcely known. Should the Session attempt the management of the Sunday-school, it is a usurpation; should they interfere with the choir, it is an impertinence; should they venture to disapprove gambling expedients to raise Church funds, it is a gratuitous interference; should they condemn the round dance for its unblushing immodesty, their sentence is only an indiscreet opinion. Ruler? Indeed!

And this consequence is inevitable: when nothing is expected, nothing is done. The ruling elders themselves, it must be admitted, often fail to have any adequate idea of their functions and responsibilities. The average elder has adopted the prevalent notion that his office is adjuvant and supplemental; he is to assist the pastor in the discharge of his duty, and curb the pastor when he transcends his duty. He has not conceived of himself as an independent ruler, bearing on his own shoulders personal responsibility for the care of souls. It never occurs to him that it is his duty "*severally* as well as jointly to watch diligently over the flock committed to his charge that no corruption of doctrine or morals enter therein; to visit the people at their homes, especially the sick; to instruct the ignorant, comfort the mourner, nourish and guard the children of the Church." It never occurs

to him that he is individually responsible for the welfare of the Church, and therefore he rarely burdens his mind and heart with the interests of the Church, or ventures to inaugurate any movement for the good of the Church. He will be consulted; but will not suggest. He does not expect at the hands of the people any deference as a ruler, and therefore is not so very circumspect to deport himself as becomes the dignity of his office. The inefficiency of the eldership has not infrequently, of late, been discussed under the head of "aggressiveness." Can any one doubt that whatever may be the cause or causes, the evil would be, more than by any other means, effectually and promptly corrected by a genuine revival of the doctrine of the divine right of Presbytery, restoring the office of ruling elder in the respect and affections of the people, to its proper place of dignity and authority? How serious is the evil to be corrected we realise most when we reflect that instead of one pastor every church should have three or more. Our strength would be quintupled. The Church has a divine right to that much greater efficiency of which it is defrauded by our culpable neglect of a doctrine which is not "essential to salvation"—not "vital to the soul."

And the evil is self-perpetuating. For, ignorance of the divine right and authority of the eldership, corroborated by constant experience of the eldership as it actually is in all its unsuspected inefficiency, leads to the unhesitating choice of those for the office whose qualifications are, not for work, but for air-brakes on progress. And secondly, this perpetuation of the evil is brought about by the failure of the eldership to foster zeal for good works in the growing generation. If the eldership recognised it as solemnly true that "all those duties which private Christians are bound to discharge by the law of charity," such as the duty of "praying with and for the people," the duty to be "careful and diligent in seeking the fruit of the preached word among the flock, and to inform the pastor of cases of sickness, affliction, and awakening, and of all others who may need his special attention;" that such duties "are especially incumbent upon them by divine vocation, and are to be discharged as official duties"—if the elders fully realised this, what an example to the Church! what a train-

ing of their successors! But as it is, their successors are far more likely to think their whole duty discharged in attendance on the Session and other Church Courts. We speak not of them all. Our case would not only be sad but irreparable, if these strictures admitted no exceptions. We rejoice that personally we know many exceptions. But, on the other hand, can it be truthfully denied that the indictment holds good of the class? Still, the blame does not attach wholly to them; it is due mainly to the ministry, who, because it was not "vital," have failed to emphasize the "profitable" doctrine of the divine right of Presbytery.

Another grievous result of this failure is the growing neglect of discipline. To unite with some other Church is the ready menace and resort of all parties justly amenable to censure. Quick to resent even righteous displeasure, members change their Church relations with the utmost facility, since "one Church is as good as another." There is no hesitation from fear of incurring the sin of rebellion against God who has made it their conscientious duty to obey them who are over them in the Lord, for they have not been taught to respect Presbytery as of divine right. And therefore it is that Sessions are often deterred from the exercise of salutary discipline, especially in its mildest forms, because they know that not only the persons offending, who would derive incalculable benefit from such discipline, but all the family, with the little innocent children and many connections, may be lost to the good influence of sound teaching and encouraged in alienation from the Church. And so, for fear of consequences more wide-reaching and disastrous than the offence which needs discipline, discipline is falling into disuse, and the Church is growing more and more worldly. All this, in great measure, would be avoided if the people were taught a proper respect for the divine right of Presbytery.

God has given his Church a polity which is adapted to all her needs. Man has both soul and body, and so we have in the presbyter the custodian of spiritual things, and in the deacon the custodian of temporalities. And yet it is a frequent thing in the Presbyterian Church to supplant God's deacons with trustees, who often are not even Christians. And so it has occasionally

come to pass, that godless men—in the slang of the day—have “run” a church. They have determined what preacher, organist, soprano, tenor, etc., would draw best, and make the church a financial success. Practically, they have usurped the functions of both elders and deacons, and ignored the rights of the people as well. When a church has deacons, they should be trustees before the law; and no trustees should have powers, as the representatives of the property, exceeding those which belong by divine right to the deacon. Prominence given to the divine right of Presbytery would soon reinstate the diaconate in its proper place.

Again, because our people are not familiarised with the divine right of Presbytery, our ministers are deprived of their full weight of influence and their full measure of usefulness. We do not mean to say that our ministers are not influential for good and actually useful. Nor do we mean to deny that some have so much influence as to sway their congregations at their will. We mean to affirm that there is a legitimate influence which is not available. Some pastors are men of infinite tact and magnetism and administrative ability—in a word, they are masterful men and they rule well. In fact they sometimes rule too well, or rather too much, inasmuch as their co-presbyters in the Session are but puppets in their hands. But the success of such pastors is too often wholly due to personal qualities, such qualities as give them preëminence and acknowledged leadership among their peers in Presbytery or Synod. Influential as they may be in their churches, their influence would be greater and more potent for good if the people deferred not so much to the man and more to his office. Not all men have the same gifts. Very few men have gifts which compel a prompt and ready deference, nor does the Holy Spirit make such gifts essential qualifications for the office of bishop; but he enjoins obedience to all who bear rule, because their office is authoritative. To defer to the personal will of the incumbent, while heedless of the divine will embodied in his office, is not only to dishonor a divine appointment, but very injuriously to restrict the influence of the ministry. The evils resultant from this neglect to emphasise the divine right of

Presbytery are far-reaching and so numerous as to be almost incalculable. The successor of one of these strong-willed and tactful pastors is almost sure to suffer in the respect of the congregation, because the congregation has been unwittingly trained to reverence the man and not his office. For this reason suitable material from which to select a pastor is arbitrarily limited. It is needlessly hard for such churches to be suited; they demand of the man what they should accord to the office.

Or it may be that a church has been regulated by some zealous but pragmatic sisters who never dreamed that anything was required of a pastor, for the good of the flock, but to dispense entertainment and comfort from the pulpit or at the fireside. A pastor for that vacancy must reach a high standard of pulpit and social qualifications; as to administrative ability, that is superfluous. Should the new incumbent attempt to rule in that congregation, he will raise a lively breeze. A preacher is wanted; not a bishop.

And not only a preacher, but a pastor. Yes, a good pastor is in demand. And what is a good pastor? One who visits "*officially* the people, devoting especial attention to the poor, the sick, the afflicted, and the dying"? Yes! a good pastor must do all that, but more also. If he restrict himself to *official* visits, instructing the ignorant, comforting the poor, the sick, the despondent, the afflicted, remonstrating with the erring, encouraging the weak, and prompting the slothful to every good word and work, he will have his hands pretty full, but he will not fill the popular requirements of a good pastor. A good pastor, according to the popular notion, must go to and fro and show himself genial, and social, and entertaining, and agreeable, that church thrift may follow pastoral fawning. Such is the emulation between denominations that the personal popularity of the pastor is mainly relied on as a means of church aggrandisement. Said a brother minister, on one occasion: "The Presbyterian Church cannot increase except through the popularity of the pastor." And to secure popularity it was thought that one must carefully abstain from obtruding Presbyterian doctrine on the ear of the people, and as carefully cultivate the art of pleasing by agreeable attentions. Now, popu-

larity is not to be despised. It is needful that a pastor be held in esteem by them that are without, but that esteem is not jeopardised, on the contrary, it is won and held by courteous fidelity to conscientious convictions. Nor are door-step attentions and fine flowing phrases so sure of securing a permanent hold on the affections of men as a cordial interest shown in their soul's salvation. Of course the pastor must not be unsocial, but much of his valuable time is lost to the church because it is thought that the preacher's popularity can be maintained only by agreeable, social intercourse; and that such popularity is the best reliance for attracting the worldling to the church. The nature of a manly man revolts against being put in the same list of attractions with the organ and the stained glass windows. He is an ambassador of God, with a message from God that is mandatory, and he prefers to win people to the church by faithful work in the discharge of his proper commission. He would make disciples, not to himself, but to the Lord—disciples who should say, as did Cornelius: "We are all here present before God, to hear all things that are *commanded thee of God.*" If our own people were more loyal to their divinely ordered polity and worship, they would save much valuable time and service; do more to honor the Lord, and be more successful in winning souls. "Them that honor me, will I honor," saith Jehovah.

And loyalty to a polity because it is divine, implies true piety. A church which relies mainly upon the popularity of its pastor, along with the attractions of the choir and architecture, the beauty of its maidens and the social status of its members for numerical growth, is trusting to carnal means to accomplish a carnal end. To upbuild a church which shall be admirers of the Rev. Mr. Creamcheese, and of one another, is certainly a carnal project. "While one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" But a church which relies for conversions wholly on the Spirit's operations by the word of *truth*, and for accessions to its fold, mainly upon the fact that its polity and worship are divinely appointed, shows a respect for the Lord's will as paramount which argues fervent piety and effectual zeal. Accessions to that church will be very likely of

such as ardently ask: "Lord, what wilt *thou* have me to do?" They will be the Lord's disciples, and not man's.

Furthermore, they who are actuated by carnal policy in their church relations are apt to be careless about the church membership of their infant children. The *neglect of infant baptism* is mainly on the part of those parents who, because they believe that "one Church is as good as another," prefer that their children should choose for themselves when they reach the years of maturity, and on the same policy which actuated themselves. The obvious remedy for the neglect of infant baptism in such cases is, plainly, a clear apprehension of the divine right of Presbytery.

Should anybody wonder that our non-communing members are so easily alienated from the Church of their fathers, with her grand history and long roll of noble martyrs? There is no real bond of attachment between them and the Church. They may have a preference, indeed, for their pastor, and for the congenial society in which they have been reared, but when they leave their homes for new regions their church preferences also are left behind. The future church relations of such children are determined by just those considerations which prevailed at home. We have known evangelists, while straining every nerve and husbanding every resource to build Presbyterian churches in mission fields, to be much discouraged when they received neither cooperation nor sympathy from young people of good Presbyterian families and strong home churches, because such young people despised the day of small things and associated themselves wholly with denominations of influence, wealth, or fashion. The proverb is of universal application: "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it." If the training has been worldly; if they have been attached to the Church by convenience, or congeniality, or policy, or taste, or associations, when they leave home, if not before, they will change their church relations through the same motives. But if they have been taught that God, in order to conserve the blessed truth of the gospel, has given his Church a polity and worship to which, though not "vital," yet "profitable," it is their

duty and high privilege to conform, then in vain will prove all efforts to allure them from the Church of their fathers. Is it not high time that such training should vigorously begin, that we suffer no more depletion of our young blood and energy? Let us continue to preach our evangelic doctrine, but no longer neglect our apostolic order. Let us lift high the dignity of Presbytery, the system of ecclesiastical government whose germ was planted in that authority which the first man's fatherhood gave him over his children to disciple them for the worship of Jehovah, and whose consummated glory was seen by John on Patmos when he beheld the throne of God, and about it, four-and-twenty elders on four-and-twenty thrones.

In closing this plea for emphasising the divine right of Presbytery, we can do nothing better than quote the words of the lamented Thornwell: "We dread the consequences of surrendering the *jus divinum Presbyterii*. The power of our system has never been effectually tried, and its full strength can never be developed, until our people shall be brought to feel that it is an institute of God. As long as we hesitate to trust it, or rather to trust in the Almighty Saviour who appointed it, we shall not be permitted to do valiantly for our Master and his cause."

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.