

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 3.—JANUARY, 1888.

I. REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

The word Revival implies the previous existence of life ; more properly, it means resuscitation or resurrection from the dead. But according to usage, and with reference to the secondary meanings of the word *life*, it means calling into active exercise a life which has become torpid or has been slumbering. Hence, it has special application to the church, not to the world outside. In Acts 2: 41 ff. we have an account of a revival in the proper sense of the word ; for all the statements there concern the members of the visible church of God. What is commonly called a revival—a general religious movement among the unregenerate—was called by our fathers an “awakening.” There is a sense in which such an awakening may be called a revival, to-wit : a revival of God’s work, (Hab. 3 : 2)—that work of salvation, of calling in His elect—which He has been doing from the beginning. This work seems at times, and in some places, almost to cease ; the Lord seems to abandon His church and give it up to the power of Satan, as in the days of Elijah, at the crucifixion of Jesus, and in the “Dark Ages.” Then comes a time of reviving, a great movement among the dry bones, and a great multitude stand up for the Lord. (Josh. 24—1 Sam. 12.—Judg. 2.—1 Chron. 29.—Hezekiah, Josiah, the Maccabees, Pentecost, the Wilderness, the Brethren of the Common Lot, the Reformation, the Kirk of Shotts, Northampton,

II. BOARDS IN THE NORTHERN CHURCH.

The occasion of the division of the Presbyterian Church was the adoption of the Spring resolutions by the General Assembly in 1861. The causes of that rupture, for they were many, lay back of 1861 or anything done by the Assembly of that year.

We propose to deal in this article with one of these causes only, indulging the hope that others will present through this *Review*, and before the meeting of the next General Assembly, other causes quite as potent as the one here presented.

Had there been no war, still the rupture would have come ; and should the two churches unite again under the welding heat of sentiment which is already being warmed up for the centennial year at Philadelphia, there will certainly be another division after the cooling down of the pathetic, when the time comes for actual work. Or we might more properly say the division will come in *our* church rather than have the reunion. The true Presbyterian Church, as we find it set forth in the word of God, can never, in loyalty to Christ, carry on her work by a system of *Boards*, such as is now being operated by the Northern General Assembly. And it may be further asserted that it is the fixed purpose of that Northern Assembly not to abandon its Boards or their system of working.

Those Boards are *unscriptural* and therefore *unpresbyterial*. When the Constitution of the entire Presbyterian Church in America was adopted, there was no such thing known to the church as *Boards*. Not one of them had an existence. The theory of that Constitution "was that the supervision and control of every church within the bounds of every Presbytery, and connected with it, as well as the aggressive mission work within those bounds, belonged exclusively to that Presbytery." The Board system supervened, gradually gaining strength. If our recollection is not at fault, the first determined effort to get rid of them was made very soon after the rupture of 1837-38. And after a trial of sixteen years, the battle to drive them out of the church and substitute committees, as we now have them in the Southern Church, waxed so warm that one of the most distin-

guished men of the many who did honor to our church in the days of our fathers, in a calm review of the Boards, and the aggressions which they had made upon the fundamental principles of our Bible Presbyterianism, used this language: "Great issues are at stake, and constant changes needful. And changes must come, the more for the peace of the church if they come through natural channels,—but come they must, either peaceably or forcibly, through the Boards or over the Boards." As far back as 1848 the great ability of Dr. Plumer was put to its utmost tension in a very exhaustive report on the one single question of *economy* to the church, without attempting to justify the existence of any such external human machinery to carry on the church's work of evangelizing the world. But when he had given battle in that low plane he was utterly routed. Had it been possible, but it was not, to find in the Scriptures a plea for the establishment of these external agencies, still there was not even an *excuse* for operating them, as they were then operated. The well established fact was, that the responsibility to the General Assembly was a mere *nominal* responsibility, while the patronage of the Boards and their secretaries was sufficient at all times to hold the balance of power in the General Assembly. The only guarantee left to the church against an absolute usurpation of power was a guarantee contingent upon the personal integrity of a set of men who knew they had the reins in their own hands, and might coax or drive the church to any extreme.

While the *power* of these Boards was almost unbounded, and certainly unrestrained, it was exercised in such a way as to embolden these secretaries to a still greater stretch of that power. They in a number of cases were chosen by a bare quorum of less than one-third of the members of the Board, and in one case it stands as history that—"one Secretary was elected by a majority of *one* vote, which one vote was subsequently discovered to have been given in mistake by a gentleman who did not know even that he was *not* a member of the Board." This officer continued to *hold* after the fact was discovered, and exercised and performed all the functions of his office, with such an

influence over four or five hundred men as might, in the nature of the case, fall to him, when these men felt that their support really depended upon him.

All these facts and all this danger to the church and her great work were not hid away in a corner. They "excited alarm," and were brought prominently before the old church in the annual meetings of her Assemblies.

The actual facts and their evil consequences were exposed and laid bare before the church by some of the best and ablest men from the South—true blue men, the ring of whose orthodoxy was like the ring of silver. How were they met? Let us turn to some of the journals and reviews of the old church, and some deliverances of her Assemblies and see. Perhaps as hot a contest as had been made up to that time was an effort in the General Assembly of 1854, to bring the church as near as possible to the true Scripture idea of doing her own work. That Assembly and its doings, especially touching the Boards, were extensively handled in the public prints, both North and South. Many of these are in the possession of this writer, but one extract will be a true sample of the spirit of the whole Northern press at that time. We quote the *Biblical Repertory*, July, 1854, p. 560. "Dr. Musgrave closed the debate by one of the most effective speeches delivered on the floor of the Assembly for a long time," and further, on page 561: "The sense of the house was so strongly evinced in favour of Boards and in opposition to merely speculative objections to their existence that we presume the controversy will not be renewed." The power and authority of the church had been handed over to an outside corporation, a human institution, irresponsible to the church in any higher sense than a mere nominal responsibility. When the tried and loyal men from the South demanded a restoration to the church of her true power and authority, they were met with, "The sense of the house was so strong in favour of the Boards, that the controversy will not be renewed." But the presumption was unwarranted, for the controversy was renewed again and again, until Thornwell made that masterly argument at Rochester which to this day remains unanswered and unanswerable. The *wedge*

was there *driven*, and any casual observer could see that the split was inevitable; the fibres were cracking and breaking from one end of the log to the other. There was then no war, no man had been elected president on a purely sectional platform, the avowed purpose of which was hostile to the old union. And yet the church was going apart—certainly going apart on this question of Boards. The slavery question had been settled by the Assembly of 1844 on *scriptural* grounds. Less important issues could be postponed.

But the Board question could not be settled. It was up before every General Assembly. The North was in the ascendancy then, as it would be now if there should be another union, and having seized the church by the throat, that majority grappled with her till it tore from her the chartered and vested right to manage her own affairs. And having transferred that right to these Boards, it was never their purpose to come back to the scriptural doctrine. That doctrine still lives in the hearts of many of the sons of those Southern men; but when they now rise to its defence they are met with the statement, “you are waving the old Confederate flag.” There was no “Confederate flag” in the days of our fathers, and yet they contended with more earnest determination than many of their sons of to-day are doing.

The New School church, which is now the *magna pars* of the Northern church, had adopted a voluntary system, a human device, a batch of wet nurses for the church of God. The notion rapidly grew and became almost universal that the *church* as such could do nothing. If it was at all an organization of the people of God it must still look to human contrivances to carry on its work. In itself it was feeble and utterly incompetent to the work.

That church was keenly watching this conflict, and not unfrequently gave a blow when they saw an opportunity. The whole attempt was to force the South to abandon the idea that “the church was the agent of God to do his work: to *do* it, not to *see it done*: to do *his work* and no other work.” Voluntary associations of every class and kind to do all sorts of work, good and bad, had risen in the East as rapidly and rank as potato sprouts

in a hotbed. It was, at that time, claimed and rightly claimed that the idea of Boards was on *Eastern idea*. It was not claimed to be scriptural, but it was better than Scripture. It was Eastern! It was Puritan! It was Yankee!

With his whole mental vision focused upon this one idea, the great leader of the New School, Albert Barnes, uttered these words, "Virginians and Kentuckians and all the people south and west of them have a peculiar prejudice against Eastern people, or 'Yankees,' as they call them * * * an intense horror of having the Presbyterian Church Yankeeified." There was more in the remark than even Mr. Barnes understood with his semi-Pelagian theology and Erastian church government. He wondered, as do his followers to-day, why Southern people could not abandon principle and conviction and pass quiescently over to their ideas—we had almost said to their convictions and principles; but why should mention be made of things which may be in fancy only, for there may be ideas which are not principles, and notions which are not convictions. The rapid strides of power made by these Boards in the old church reached its highest pitch, perhaps, when Dr. Janeway, Secretary of the Home Mission Board, during the late war, issued his orders that *home missionaries* along the line of the border States would not be allowed any salary from the Board's treasury till they could give to Secretary Janeway satisfactory *proof* of their loyalty to the Federal Government! This writer remembers well reading one of these infamous orders. He will never forget the anxious concern and distressed expression upon the face of that missionary, as he said, "This *order* will starve my children. Had I better take that oath and feed and clothe my family?" This was the power of a Board and its secretary, the natural, legitimate outgrowth of what the church had been sowing. It was the *exercise* of the power of a Board over the heritage and people of God. The church was made thus to play the mistress to her inferior, her garments were rolled in filth, for she was sporting with the ungodly. But never in that day, or this, has that church uttered one word of disapproval or censure. And,

indeed, how could she and still retain Boards to do the work she should do herself?

But some one may say, doubtless will say, "Those were war times, and now they and all their sad scenes and memories should forever pass or be buried out of sight. The Northern Assembly has given up that *one man* power, and their mode of procedure now is very much like our own." Well, when the brother gets through such pious meditations and reflections, I would be glad to call his attention to the following extract, where he will see the "strong hand" of the *one man* reaching out over "standing committees and departments" as the "ultimate authority:"

NORTHERN ASSEMBLY—BOARD OF PUBLICATION AND SABBATH-SCHOOL WORK.

By the action of the last General Assembly the name of the Board of Publication has been changed and now is, "The Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work." The colportage and Sabbath-school work are consolidated in one department. The executive officers of the Board are: the Rev. Elijah R. Craven, D. D., Secretary; the Rev. James A. Woren, D. D., Superintendent of Sabbath-school and Missionary Work; the Rev. J. R. Miller, D. D., Editorial Superintendent; Mr. John A. Black, Business Superintendent. In the work of the Board hereafter the missionaries are to give special attention to the organization of new Sabbath-schools in destitute places.

Thenew by-laws make the Secretary, Rev. Dr. Craven, the chief executive officer of the Board. Formerly each Standing Committee and department acted in some measure upon their own discretion and often in conflict with the policy of some other branch of the great work, with no ultimate authority except by the vote of a large Board. It has a head now, and a good one, who will hold the helm wisely and with a strong hand when needed. The reduction of the Board from forty-eight to twenty-four members will give efficiency to its operations.—*St. Louis Evangelist.*

Dr. Craven is vested with quite as much power by the "last General Assembly" in Sunday-school matters as Dr. Janeway was in Home Missions; and if not to *exercise* them, for what purpose? This one man power is to be exercised upon the part of Dr. Craven, as Secretary of a Board, and is vested in him by one of the by-laws of that Board. But the Northern Assembly went much further than this and gave, by its actions on Home Missions, one of the most ominous signs of spiritual despotism

ever adopted by any General Assembly before or during the war. We refer to the rule which empowers the Board to take to itself in its Missionary Synods the fee simple title to church buildings aided by their money. This rule works to enslave congregations in the frontier and destitute parts of the country. The resemblance between this tenure and that of popish churches in the Bishops, with the same tyrannical consequences, forces itself upon every thinking man in our church. It makes one recoil from the very thought of *organic union* or any other kind of union with a body holding such views and vesting such powers in its Boards.

Ecclesiastical Boards are based upon the idea of *independency or congregationalism* in Church government. They are contrivances patched up and suited to a form of church government which denies a scriptural bond of union so perfect and unique in itself that it logically passes from Session to Presbytery, Presbytery to Synod, Synod to Assembly. If there is union at all with those who advocate Boards, it is imperfect union, *not* intended to be *lasting*. The union must come from without not from within, spring out of and be dependent upon political relations. There can be no lasting and durable concert of action, for there is no internal bond of union. They never can be worked therefore in a Presbyterian Church system. Two forces cannot co-operate in any system except they be agreed. The Presbyterian Church being a divinely ordained institution, has to violate its own principles to work harmoniously with Boards. Their principles and the principles of the church cannot be in active operation at the same time without being in conflict. The church never can do her work with them half as well as she can do it without them. They belong not to her, and they are not in accord with her. They may answer a purpose in churches where no high conception of government prevails than is found in those practices which govern nominating conventions and political or social assemblies. But for a church like ours, with a perfect system of government, "recognizing no external agency with any right to interfere," systematically organized for the Master's work, they hinder, retard and obstruct that work. Where they act to the full extent

of their power, church action must cease, and when the church acts with vital force and power the Boards must cease.

One of the most pointed verifications of this truth we find in an editorial of a recent date in one of the Northern Presbyterian journals. The editor is trying to enlighten one of our Southern ministers on the subject of Boards. I sometimes read his paper because I find in it a kind of editorial smartishness which enables him to say some sharp things without knowing it, and some truthful things without anticipating the effect of the rebound.

“Dear Bro. Lapsley:—One of the evils which we are inclined to complain of in our branch of the church is that the Assemblies interfere with the Boards too much. The Assembly has as absolute control of the Boards as you have over your children, or the merchant over his clerks. Some of the Boards are protected from too much regulating by committees of the Assembly by the nature of their work; for example, Foreign Missions. But the Board of Publication is in easy reach and the wonder is that it is not dead long ago. There has not been an Assembly since the re-union which has not gone for that Board with axes and saws and augers to ‘improve’ it. Next to that comes Home Missions. We had a hard tussle of it a few years ago to prevent the giving of every Presbytery absolute power over the Board. They would have made 210 pieces of it. We compromised by giving each Presbytery absolute control of the work of the Board in the Presbytery’s own bounds. The Presbytery makes out a catalogue of its requirements in men and money. The men are provided by the Presbytery. The Board are (is) allowed to discriminate in regard to the money so that the whole sum shall be evenly and justly distributed with regard to necessity and utility. But for that one saving clause which leaves the funds in the control of the Assembly”—(The fact is, the funds are left in the control of the Board. See minutes of Northern Assembly, 1883, pp. 643 and 644, which is the rule of the Board to-day), “that Board would break down.”—*The Interior, in June, 1887.*

That is a very strange and *funny* piece of composition. The

Assembly "has as much control—as a father over his children—a merchant over his clerk," But he must not exercise that control. If a father should "go for" his children "with axes, and saws and augers" it must follow that there is something fearfully wrong about either father or child. And in the dilemma the *Interior* can take its choice. The fact that when a child "is in easy reach" of its parent the "wonder is that it is not dead long ago" forces the conclusion that something is wrong, and dreadfully wrong, with either parent or child. If the relationship existing between a merchant and his clerk is such that the interference of the merchant will be disastrous to the clerk, then, to say the very least of it, they cannot work together, and for the good of the merchant they ought to go apart. If the safety of a child consists in getting as far away from the parent as possible, the child must be a dreadfully bad child or the father a fearfully cruel father. Certainly they are not in harmony and it might be well for both to separate them entirely. But they finally "compromised" with the Presbytery, and that "one clause" saved the Board from "breaking down." Compromises always imply differences so wide that they cannot be reconciled and therefore both parties must surrender something, each to the other. We then have the church *surrendering* part of her *principles* to bring her into harmony with her Boards. They also surrender part of their *principles*. Then the two must be, fundamentally, very far apart.

We thank the *Interior* for the article. But some one will say, "that article is taken from a Northern Presbyterian journal, but we want to know what the Northern Assembly says." Very well; let us see. That Assembly met this year" (1887) in Omaha, Nebraska. The Committee of *Home Missions* made its report on the sixth day. The report was adopted unanimously. We copy from the report:

"9. Distribution of Resources.—As to the proportion of money to be used in the various forms of work, [School work and Church work], conducted by the Board, we refer to the Board itself without instruction. So many special providences of an open door and the money to enter it, have been granted by our good Lord, that we believe it best for the Board to follow his leadings day by day."

And again from the same report :

“ All instructions are hereby removed and the Board is bidden to go anywhere in this broad land in accord with the Presbyteries on the ground, wherever they find the most hopeful opening to make the best use of all the moneys they can possibly get.”

Just how much is meant by “ accord with the Presbyteries ” will be clearly seen a few pages further on in this article.

Here is a complete handing over to be done by *human contrivance* “ without instruction,” and with “ all restrictions removed,” the very work which God committed to His church, to do, *as a church*. The Assembly having thus with presumptuous imbecility confessed herself *unfaithful*, finds an abundance of time to devote to *secular and political* matters, as in the “ complaint of Rev. J. H. Baird against the Synod of Pennsylvania for favoring a prohibition amendment ” to the State Constitution.

There has been for a long time a “ remnant ” in the Northern Assembly dissatisfied with the *modes of operation* of the Board of Home Missions rather than the *fact of its existence*.

In 1880, “ overtures were received from seventeen Presbyteries and one Synod asking for the appointment of a special committee to consider the modes of operation of the Board of Home Missions in its relations to the Presbyteries.” The committee was appointed and to it “ the overtures were referred, with instructions to meet in conference with the Board of Home Missions in New York to afford opportunity to the Memorialists or any of the lower judicatories of the church, or any minister or elder to present their views and to confer with the Board concerning any measures which, in the judgment of either, might tend to increase the efficiency of the Board in the good work committed to its care. The committee was also instructed to report to the next Assembly.”

It may here be observed that the above action exalts the Board into the dignified position of a *court*, and the memorialists, “ seventeen Presbyteries and one Synod,” are lowered to the position of *petitioners* to whom an “ opportunity ” is “ afforded ” to “ present their views ” before the Board at its place of business in New York. It may further be noted that the

whole work of Home Missions is "committed" to it—the Board.

This committee was continued and enlarged by the Assembly of 1881, "and to the Assembly of 1882, they made a report, recommending the adoption of certain principles and rules of action for the Board which a majority of the committee believed would tend to increase the Board's efficiency and remove that dissatisfaction with some of its modes of operation, which the overtures and other communications submitted to the committee revealed as existing in some considerable quarters of the church, and which the committee also believed would tend to bring all the Presbyteries more fully into harmony and earnest co-operation with the Board in the great work committed to it."

It may be noted here that the fact is made very prominent that the work of Home Missions is committed to the Board. The Presbyteries, even in their own bounds, are to "play second fiddle" to the Board. For "to it" the "great work is committed." This committee made its final report in 1883, which was amended and adopted.

"In lieu of the principles and rules recommended to the last Assembly, we now propose for adoption the following :

"1. Within the bounds of a Presbytery the work of the Board of Home Missions should be carried on in harmony with the Presbytery, according to the principles and rules hereinafter stated; but discretion should be allowed to the Board in outlying districts, where direct Presbyterial control is difficult or impracticable.

"2. The Board should not, in ordinary cases, decline to grant an appropriation recommended by a Presbytery, unless in its judgement, after viewing the whole field to be supplied, it should appear that the funds at its disposal are all needed for more deserving or more promising work, and whether it does thus appear must be determined by the Board. But in all questions touching the organization of churches, or the character of ministers, the Board, in case of difference between itself and the Presbytery, should abide by the final judgement of the Presbytery.

"3. The formal issuing of commissions should be discontinued and in lieu thereof the Board shall issue to the missionary an agreement for the amount to be paid him."

These are the "principles and rules" to govern the Board in its relations to the Presbyteries.

The first one of these rules brings out two facts.

1st. That there are in the bounds of every Presbytery *two* bodies vested with partial jurisdiction, the Board and the Presbytery,—the one a divinely appointed *court*, the other a humanly constructed *machine*.

2d. That the *court* has only partial and co-ordinate jurisdiction in parts of its own bounds, but no jurisdiction at all in the other parts of its bounds, while the *machine* has co-ordinate and equal jurisdiction in some parts of the bounds of the Presbytery and *absolute jurisdiction* in the remaining part, with no rule, law or principle to govern it, except its own discretion. And to the *machine* the work is committed.

The second one of these rules brings out the facts,

1st. That the Board has *all the power of the purse*.

2nd. That the Board can refuse to grant aid to any Presbytery and put *all* its money in Texas or Florida to the utter starving of missionaries in the great northwest if “it shall appear that the funds at its disposal are *all* needed for more deserving and more promising work,” and whether it does thus appear, must be “determined by the Board.”

This, perhaps, is the explanation of the fact, that notwithstanding that Board is always reported behind with its finances, nevertheless it has funds for Texas or Florida whenever a sickly little church, or an unemployed minister can be reached and captured by the Board’s agents in these States. And it may suggest another fact, that if organic union were effected these churches and preachers would have to take care of themselves. For there would be no further need then to “compass land and sea to make one proselyte.” Churches or preachers who can be bought up by a promise of money to build houses, which when finished do not reach the value of “California box houses,” or a promise of a little money to pay salaries for a few years, will never amount to anything, in any way. When the money runs out, both the churches and the preachers will run down. The writer knows of two or three instances of this kind in Texas. The money is no longer supplied and the houses are deserted to bats, or converted into sheep sheds, or rented for other purposes, and the preachers are drifting about in various

agencies. The principle is a wrong one, and we do not fear it. The people must learn that the most lasting churches are those where the people help themselves. A church which will not give its own money to support its own cause, build its own house, and support its own preacher is thoroughly *heretical*.

It is the duty of the minister to teach and enforce this great truth, and the agent of a Board who comes among our churches and teaches our people that all these things which they should do for themselves will be done by his Board, for them, is "worse than an infidel." He will find when the loaves and fishes are exhausted they will "walk no more with him."

But there is one thing to which most serious and earnest objection is here offered. It is the constant twaddle about "our common Presbyterianism." The Presbyterianism must be *very common* indeed that can want to co-operate with, or take part in, a system of church work carried on as the Northern Assembly carries on its work in the South, especially in Texas. Our people should be taught and shown that the differences between the two churches are *real* differences, so numerous and so serious that they cannot be removed, that the two churches are not agreed in either *principle* or *polity*. When we find a Northern Presbyterian church in one of our towns or cities, we should treat it, when it deserves to be so treated, with the same Christian courtesy and fraternal regard extended by us to any other evangelical denomination. We should no more hesitate to establish a church where they have one than we would to do the same thing, where we find any other denomination of Christians, Cumberland, Baptists, or Methodists. When their people move among us, we should lay no special claim to them more than we would to a Congregationalist, for it is a fact that the Northern and Southern Presbyterian churches are not one; that is one of the fallacies by which they pick up many of our people on the frontier, saying, "we are all one," when we are not one. Neither are the churches separate parts of a whole, which are to be brought into one. Waiving the question of interpretation of the *Confession of Faith* where the difference is really greater and more serious than any difference which ever

existed in this country between two great political parties as to the interpretation of the *Constitution* of the *United States*, waiving also the question of the wide difference between them as to the secular and spiritual power of the courts of the church, we declare that the two can never work together on any plan of co-operation now known to either. The following facts will make this clear :

1st. The Southern Presbyterian Church, as a church, demands a perfect and entire conformity to the word of God in all her practical work, no less than in the formulas of her faith. The model of the church is the work of the Almighty. Her doctrine is revealed by Him, and the *order of procedure* is furnished by Him. To the church as a spiritual commonwealth He has committed the means of saving His people out of the world. He has made the church perfect in all her parts for the accomplishment of every end to which she is called. For this He has furnished a *form of church government*, beginning with the deacon and up through all the courts to the very highest, the *methods* for work, in which are the most perfect that can be instituted for effectually doing whatever is to be done. He has enjoined upon her to do steadily and unremittingly all that her ability enables her to do, and with that doing there is a promise of accruing ability to do more, until the world by her shall be brought to Him.

This simple, beautiful, scriptural system, addressed directly to the faith of God's people, has been characterized by the representatives of the Northern Assembly as the "*Jus divinum* theory in its dotage."

2d. The Northern Presbyterian Church, as a church, holds that the church of God, as organized, is not sufficient to do the work of the Master. She takes refuge behind many kinds of human contrivances, and fluctuates between the word of God and the ingenuity of man. It is this defect in her system which gave rise to all her voluntary societies. Declaring herself insufficient to do the work, she professes to be all sufficient to commit it to human contrivances, by them to be done. And then, strange to say, gives herself to work which was never addressed

to either her faith or practice. She thus takes a position which *revolutionizes* the whole theory of the church, as it is found in the Word. For that Word says the church must do the work of the Master, and *she* says the Master's work may be *committed* into the hands of Boards, and all that is required of her is to *see* that the work is done.

The germs of revolutions are seldom seen by the masses. But when they have progressed sufficiently to take shape and form they often claim to be fighting in defence of, and to propagate, those very principles which they are certain to overthrow and destroy. The seeds of apostasy are planted, and grow, and ripen in a similar way. There was at first simply a defection in the Northern Church from the one simple doctrine of the Scriptures that the *church of Christ is herself a great Missionary Society*, "competent, in her organized capacity, and fully provided in her constitution, with all the agencies for carrying on her work." This simple defection enthroned itself in the bosom of that church, and she at once become as incompetent to do her work *herself* as the *Congregational Church*, out of whose defects, at this very point, grew up all voluntary associations, church fairs, lotteries and raffles, which prevail to such an alarming extent in the North, and are gradually working their way into the South. The result is that instead of showing the Lord's people that their money must come into the Lord's treasury as a part of the actual worship of God, come in faith, and as a religious act, commemorating our Lord, and our devotion and obedience to Him, come as the widow's mite came when He himself sat over against the treasury watching the rich men cast in of their abundance—that church teaches, that the *Boards* will use "all the money they can possibly get."

But it is claimed that the defection is after all a mere difference in method and amounts to but little. An ex-moderator of our own Assembly while arguing in favor of organic union found that our church had been granted the legal power, if she so chose, to "have Committees, or Boards, or Agencies," and then declared that he had found a provision in our own *charter for Boards* that we therein recognized "Boards" as an agency for carrying

on church work. Of course that class of men see no difference. And they invariably let out the true inwardness when they try to settle this great question as a matter of sentiment; even to the boast that they "were deeper down in the rebellion and did more fighting than some who are now opposed to organic union." But these gentlemen might be reminded of the fact, that *Benedict Arnold* did more fighting in the Revolution than either *Thos. Jefferson* or *Alexander Hamilton*. True men, the world over, commend these patriots for maintaining their independence after *Benedict* had renewed his loyalty to George the Third. It is not a mere sentiment. It is a principle and has enough in it to reach across the whole diameter of revealed truth. It has enough in it to change the position of the church towards God and man, towards His people and a ruined world. And, formulated under the name of Boards and put to work, it is ready to traverse the doctrines of the Reformation and confront the teachings of the Apostles.

But the question comes up, is the church not bound to work through means of some kind, and has not the Northern church done a grander work through her Boards than our church through her committees?

To the first of these questions we answer yes. But the means must be *legitimate*. It must not be the fruit or product of the church entering into a free-love copartnership with a gay and godless world. The command to "multiply and replenish the earth" can never be pleaded to justify any woman in rearing a house full of illegitimate children. Some have overlooked and others have preferred not to see that in our church the work is committed to the *Presbyteries* and that is the *starting* point. The work is thus in the hands of a church court and under its control. In the Northern church, the work is to be operated not by a church court, but by a human contrivance called a *Board*. In our church, the Presbytery controls the missionary and regulates his pay, he drawing it through the Presbyterial Committee. In the Northern church the "Board shall issue to the missionary an agreement for the amount to be paid him." Certainly our committee at Atlanta would never attempt to issue an agree-

ment with a missionary as to his salary, and then send him to Texas without even consulting the Presbytery into whose bounds he proposed to come and do his work. The Presbytery is the only court vested with authority or power to allow him to labor within her bounds and that power must not be infringed by the Assembly itself, much less by an agent which it had no authority from the word of God to create or employ.

The second of these questions may be answered by a comparative view of the progress of the two churches for the last five years:

COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE PROGRESS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHUCHES,
NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN, FOR THE LAST FIVE YEARS.

Increase of Members.

In the Northern Church	16	per cent.
In the Southern Church	18	1-2 "
Sabbath-schools, Northern Church	16	1-3 "
Sabbath-schools, Southern Church	25	1-2 "

Additions on Examination.

Northern Church	67	2-3 "
Southern Church	83	1-3 "

Certificate.

Northern Church	26	7-12 "
Southern Church	31	1-6 "

Licentiates.

Northern Church	26	2-3 "
Southern Church	26	3-4 "

Contributions.

For all purposes, Northern Church	25	1-9 "
For all purposes, Southern Church	11	1-2 "
For Foreign Missions, Northern Church	33	4-5 "
For Foreign Missions, Southern Church	28	1-4 "
For Education, Northern Church, (loss)	58	9-11 "
For Education, Southern Church, (gain)	22	1-9 "
Amount given per member, Northern Church	\$15	91
Amount given per member, Southern Church	9	41

The above table was prepared by one who is thoroughly competent, and perfectly accurate.

When the reader takes into consideration the immense wealth of the Northern Church, and the comparative poverty of the Southern church his verdict must be in favor of the latter and her committees.

R. K. SMOOT.