

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXIV.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXIII.

ARTICLE I.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

Philippians i. 1, 2: Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons: grace be unto you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Macedonia, of which Philippi was one of the chief cities, was conspicuous among the ancient nations as the kingdom of Alexander the Great. According to Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, Macedonia was represented by the brazen part of the great image, and destined to be the third of the four universal kingdoms, that should precede the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Philippi was distinguished in profane history for the decisive battle between Mark Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus, the friends of Julius Cæsar, and the exponents of imperial power, on the one side; and Brutus and Cassius representing the Roman Senate, on the other. In ecclesiastical history, it is also celebrated as the seat of the first Christian Church in Europe. This Church was founded by the Apostle Paul, who was attracted thither by the vision of a man of Macedonia calling to him, in these words: "Come over into Macedonia and help us." The apostle went to Philippi, and began the work of founding a

had told me that he had done a similar thing at the world's creation, I should be ready to believe it. But *I should believe it on the authority of God's express testimony, not on the strength of a mere hypothesis and a set of analogies which I have just described.*

I repeat again, I have no mission at this time to assert this Westminster construction of Moses as the only true one. It may be asked, Why then do I argue its possibility? Why did I, in my former arguments, seem to imply that this might be the issue between the Bible and science? I answer: Because I wished to illustrate the full value of this saving principle, by showing how, even in that aspect of the debate, it would defend us against infidelity.

And now I close. I beg the reader's pardon for detaining him so long, excusing myself by the honest plea, that my chief object is, not the vindication of any poor credit I may personally have, but the exposition of vital principles, which will, sooner or later, be found precious to all Christians. As against my rigid critic, my purpose has been solely defensive; and if my haste or carelessness has let slip one word, which to the impartial reader savors of aggression or retaliation, I desire that word to be blotted from memory. None can accord to Dr. Woodrow more fully than I do, the honor of sincere devotion of purpose to the truth; or can join more cordially than I do, in the wish, that he may soon return home with recruited energies and prosperous health, to the work of defending truth.

ARTICLE IV.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1873.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

The number of Commissioners present during the sittings of the General Assembly at Little Rock, Arkansas, was over one hundred—making one of the largest Assemblies since our or-

ganisation. This extraordinary attendance, at a point so remote from the great centres of wealth and influence in our Church, is due, no doubt, to the fact that the facilities for travel to Little Rock have been greatly improved during the last few years, making that city accessible now by rail with all parts of the country east of the Great River; and also to the fact, that our Assembly has never before held a session on our Western frontier; and so every delegate appointed felt a natural curiosity to see those distant regions of country, and the rising towns and cities of the far West; about which, just now, all the rest of the country feels more or less concerned, and to which all eyes are turned. The Richmond Assembly showed a good degree of practical wisdom in selecting Little Rock. It was an experiment, and it was a success. We know now that our Church can hold the sessions of her highest court anywhere she may choose within her broad domains without any apprehension that her interests will be hazarded by being permitted to fall into the hands of delegates either few or feeble because of the location. One fact, which is considered worthy of mention as a very striking feature of this Assembly, was the unusual number of young men, full of zeal and energy, and this explains the circumstance, that from the very opening to the closing of the sessions, no one, at any time, appeared to feel that he could *lead* the body. None had any pet theory to put forward, none had any past, public record to look after as a base line of observation for future action. Every man spoke frankly, acted freely, and moved independently; and no one looking over the Assembly could have doubted for one moment that these men had come together to look after the interests of the kingdom of the Master. They looked like earnest, working men who would be willing to endure hardships and privation for the cause without a murmur. It was also pleasant here and there to see a venerable father, though they were few, either as ministers or ruling elders; and now and then to hear them speak forth their experience as the word of that matured wisdom which comes of much labor and toil in the Master's cause. Their grey hairs and care-worn expression in some cases were unquestioned tokens of

the fact, that hard work and indefatigable labor had brought on premature age, and that they were thinking and laboring more for the rewards of immortal life than the pleasures or riches or honors of earth. They reminded us, as we looked into their faces, of some rivers we have seen flowing through heavily timbered lands, darkened a little by shadows of earth, but still reflecting the brightness of heaven.

OPENING SERMON AND ORGANISATION.

Rev. Thomas R. Welch, D. D., the Moderator of the last Assembly, opened this Assembly on the 15th day of May, in the large and beautiful new church in Little Rock, of which he is the pastor, with a sermon from Acts i. 8. We felt a decided pleasure and peculiar satisfaction, as we listened to this excellent man of God unfold and enforce this Scripture with remarkable simplicity, excellency, and power. It was a most thorough exposition of the great principles and duties of the Church and her ministry under the New Testament dispensation. Had it not been that we are opposed to publishing such sermons with the *imprimatur* of the Assembly, we should have risen up in our seat and moved that the Committee of Publication be ordered to publish this discourse in pamphlet form for general distribution. We say we are opposed to publishing opening sermons by the authority of the General Assembly, for this reason amongst others, that as a general thing, by the time a man reaches distinction sufficient in our Church to secure to him the Moderator's chair, he has some theory or notion or hobby which he would like to see adopted and carried out by the whole Church. So nine times out of ten the retiring Moderator will seize upon this occasion to make his sermon the channel through which to impress the Church with his own peculiar views; and the particular notions held and advanced may be touching those very questions about which there is a wide diversity of opinion in the Church. Dr. Welch happily avoided that error over which other men, older and more distinguished than he, have stumbled. If he has any croquet, he had the good sense and sound judgment to waive it for the time, and gave us a sermon which was rich in

gospel truth and calculated to make glad the heart of every man who has ever tasted of the waters of life flowing rich and full from the fountain of grace.

On the second ballot, Dr. Henry M. Smith, of New Orleans, was chosen Moderator. The wisdom of this choice was soon made manifest to the whole Assembly, by the prompt, impartial, and accurate manner, as well as most excellent good humor in which he discharged the duties of this responsible office. In the choice of a man to fill this highest office in our Church, several things are to be taken into consideration. In the *first* place, the ideas held by us of the parity of our ministry should make us to understand, that any man, who may be a commissioner to this high court, is thereby adjudged to be entitled to this distinction if the Assembly should choose to confer it upon him. But while this is the case, there are certain qualifications for an executive officer which are not found in every man, for all gifted men are not gifted alike; and this being the case, the General Assembly should never fall into the egregious blunder of taking into consideration everything except the right thing, in selecting a Moderator—choosing a man sometimes, because he is an old man, or because the Church in his general region has not been thus honored for a good while, and thereby claims to be entitled to the honor. This distinction should always be conferred upon some man who has done real service to the Church, and can also add thereto a *peculiar fitness and qualification for the position*. In the *second* place, it ought to be a settled principle of the Church, never, for any reason, to confer this honor upon the same person a second time, however worthy or peculiarly well qualified he may have shown himself to be. It will be a sad day for the Church, should the time ever come, when her material is so scarce that she must work over again some of that which has already been wrought up to the high places of honor and distinction.

The Committees for the most part were well constituted, but appeared a little slow in getting down to their proper work. They were large in numbers both of ministers and elders, which appears to us to be the true idea of constituting these Commit-

tees. It puts every man to work at the very beginning of the Assembly and makes some good proportion of the body well acquainted with all parts of the work to be done. It interests all parts of the Church in every matter of concernment to the whole, and generally nobody is dissatisfied, nobody is slighted, nobody is over-worked. Every thing being properly digested in the committee-room and brought forward in a clear light before the body by concise and well written reports, a great deal of time is saved to the Assembly, whose sessions are almost always short and limited. It delivers the body from a number of motions and amendments which generally have no other effect than to tangle and confuse the business, and, above all, it frees the body from a vast amount of useless speech-making, all of which things are of vast importance in an Assembly which convenes for business and not for rhetorical display.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH OTHER BODIES

Very early in the meetings of the Assembly, it was announced that Rev. Chas. H. Stitt, D. D., the corresponding delegate from the Synod of the Reformed Church in America, was present. He was introduced by the Moderator in suitable manner to the Assembly. Dr. Stitt's reception by the whole body, and the individual members of the Assembly, was of the most cordial kind. There are good reasons why our Church should embrace every opportunity to show how kindly she feels towards that Church, which being sound in doctrine and consistent in practice has manifested its cordial sympathy with us in times of sore trial and deep distress. Dr. Joseph R. Wilson, the delegate from our Church to the Reformed Synod, made his report to this Assembly, in which he said:

“Whilst I was careful to say that I carried with me from the Assembly I represented, no authority to propose terms of organic union, I ventured to express the hope of a closer alliance than now exists between the two bodies, should a benignant Providence open the way thereto. The utterance of this sentiment produced a deeper impression than I could have foreseen; and, in view of it, a committee was appointed (unanimously, I believe,) to take into consideration the subject thus suggested, with instructions to report to the Synod of 1873.”

Dr. Wilson also presented a communication from the General Synod, touching this same matter, from which we make the following extract:

“Whereas, so formal an overture from so large and respectable a body of kindred faith and order is deserving of the most courteous attention:

“*Resolved*, That a committee of five ministers and three elders be appointed to consider carefully the matter of the desirableness and feasibility of the proposed relations, and report thereon, if possible, to the next General Synod.”

The matter was referred to the Committee of Foreign Correspondence of the Assembly. That Committee reported the following paper to the Assembly on the day following, which was unanimously adopted by a rising vote of the Assembly:

“Whereas, in a paper officially communicated, the last General Synod of the Reformed Church in America has notified this General Assembly of the unanimous appointment of a committee to consider carefully the desirableness and feasibility of establishing closer relations with our Church;

“Whereas, The Assembly regards said notification as indicative of a desire on the part of that venerable Synod to enter into closer relations if the way be clear;

“Whereas, This Assembly on its part cordially reciprocates this feeling, and knows of no more effective method for ascertaining whether the two bodies are prepared for a nearer connection than the method of conference; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That this Assembly do now appoint a committee, to be composed of the following named ministers and ruling elders: Rev. B. M. Palmer, D. D., Rev. Joseph R. Wilson, D. D., Rev. William Brown, D. D., Rev. R. K. Smoot, Maj. T. J. Kirkpatrick, William Henry Smith, Gen. A. M. Scales, whose duty it shall be to confer with a similar committee, if appointed by the General Synod of the Reformed Church, for the purpose of ascertaining in what manner such more intimate relations may be established, and what ought to be the nature and extent thereof, and report the result to the next General Assembly.

“2. That the Stated Clerk be directed to forward a copy of this paper to the General Synod of the Reformed Church, to meet in New Brunswick in June of this present year.”

A proper sense of delicacy and propriety suggest that we should await the action of this Committee, and cautiously abstain

from saying a word until their report is made and the Church hears what they have done in the premises. And the propriety of silence on our part is all the more necessary and imperative, as the present writer constitutes one of the Committee. Yet we think it proper here to say, that the Committee of Foreign Correspondence, and the whole Assembly, understood the meaning to be conveyed by the words "formal overture," as used by the General Synod, in altogether a different sense from that in which the same expression is used in the courts of our own Church. That is to say, the General Synod did not mean to convey the idea, or produce the impression that the Presbyterian Church had laid before them, by "formal overture," a subject for their official consideration, but that the remarks of our delegate had opened up, or disclosed to them, a state of feeling which actually existed among the members of our Church.

Delegates were present from the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and the Associate Reformed Synod of the South. They were received cordially, and made appropriate addresses, which were responded to in a suitable manner by the Moderator. Official information was conveyed to the Assembly, that two distinguished gentlemen were deputed by the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, to bear the kindly sympathies and fraternal regards of that body to this Assembly. These gentlemen, however, did not appear in person, but sent instead a very cordial letter, which was duly responded to by our Assembly, and the selection of a suitable commission to represent us before that body was intrusted to a committee, consisting of the Moderator, Stated and Permanent Clerks, with the largest discretion of power in the selection of the same. This is the first kindly notice which has been taken of our Church as a separate and distinctive organisation by any of the numerous Presbyterian kinfolks which we have across the waters. We have been treated heretofore more like a poor boy of rough manners and uncultivated speech, but of kindly heart and good intentions, is sometimes treated by his cultivated and wealthy cousins who live in the city and see more of the world; that is to say, we have been just a little snubbed by them. We are truly sorry that these

gentlemen could not be present at our Assembly and mingle freely with our members; no pains on our part would have been spared to make their visit pleasant. But as they found it impossible to attend, we take the liberty here in advance of any commission, to say to them in this informal sort of way, that we hold the body from which they proceeded in very high esteem, and fully reciprocate the feelings which prompted their appointment. We further hope that the correspondence thus happily inaugurated may lead to a better understanding of our Church as a separate organisation, and the means and spirit with which she hopes to accomplish her distinctive mission in the earth.

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

It may not be amiss just here, to mention another incident touching this question of correspondence with other bodies, which we have looked upon as a mere straw, telling how some gentlemen in our connection, and many more out of it, would like to see the wind blow. It is this: Somebody had sent a large package of pamphlets printed on cheap paper to the Assembly to be first distributed among the "brethren" and carefully read and studied by them, so that they might get light and be prepared to act in the contingency of a coming postulate. These were accompanied by a circular letter, which was to be read and was read, in a formal manner, by the Stated Clerk, inviting the Church, through this high court, to appoint and designate twenty-five chosen men to represent our Church in the "World's Evangelical Alliance," to be convened in New York city in the month of October of the present year. This budget of matter was all referred to the Committee of Foreign Correspondence, to be by them taken into mature consideration and reported on at their earliest convenience. The Committee had no difficulty in reporting at once; for they could not find one single reason for reporting favorably to the appointment, whilst there appeared to be numberless reasons for discarding the whole matter as inappropriate and really out of the province of the Assembly's jurisdiction. The report gave rise to quite a lively discussion, in which many brethren appeared to see the whole matter very

differently from the light in which it appeared to the Committee, and even ventured to suggest that the Committee had not seen it in any true light at all, but that all the way through their report there were internal evidences that they had been groping in darkness; in short, had brought in a very ugly report. After much speech-making about the "Evangelical Alliance," and various misinterpretations of that sacerdotal prayer of our great High Priest in the 17th chapter of John's Gospel, the Committee were forced to the conclusion that the advocates of the measure proposed in the circular letter, and reported adversely to by the Committee, were somewhat in the fix of the prophet, when he described his vision as one in which "the light shall not be either clear or dark." The Committee's report was opposed by two classes of members. The first was headed by that excellent brother, the Rev. Allen Wright, of the Indian Mission. He most earnestly desired the Committee's report tabled, and favored the notion, that the Assembly should embrace the occasion to send delegates to this grand evangelical convocation. He was followed and supported by our urbane and sprightly friend, Rev. W. H. Adams, of Charleston, S. C., whose speech was a sharp overhauling of the Committee, for bringing in a report which, being somewhat destitute of diplomatic phraseology, read a little plainly and bluntly, but nevertheless was quite a clear statement of the matter in hand. The second class, led by the Rev. Geo. L. Leyburn, of Virginia, and elder Joseph Hardie of the Synod of Alabama, opposed the report of the Committee, and likewise opposed the sending of delegates. They were of the opinion that our Church ought not to be represented there, but they did not think we ought to state our reasons so fully and strongly as they were set forth in the preamble to the Committee's resolutions. These brethren struck the middle course between the two, and, as is usual in such cases, it carried the Assembly. The amendments offered by them prevailed, and the Assembly, like a wise and prudent body, refused to send delegates, but kept the reasons to itself, under a broad, but modest, plea, in the significant words: "Yet inasmuch as it has not now before it *data* sufficient for the full understanding of the character and purposes

of the Evangelical Alliance, and the extent of the authority claimed for it and its 'National Branches;' therefore, resolved, That the General Assembly deems it inexpedient to appoint delegates to attend the approaching meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York; but expresses the sincere hope that the Spirit of grace may preside over all those deliberations, that all its proceedings may redound to the glory of God, in the advancement of our common Christianity."

This was, perhaps, the best that could be done under the circumstances. If, however, we were inclined to say anything further about this matter, it would be, first, that according to the best of our recollection, at the very time when the Committee were roundly charged with not knowing much about this matter, the chairman of the Committee took the floor and read extensively from the printed documents of the "Alliance," and, referring to its constitution, endeavored to impress upon the minds of the members that it was a feature of that Constitution, that no religious denomination would be officially represented in its meeting, and that if delegates should appear there and claim to be officially sent by our Church, they would be excluded and the Church laughed at for her blind folly and innocent presumption; and, secondly, that our Church should be very slow in the future about rushing into correspondence and fraternal greetings and diplomatic salutations with every organisation of a religious character which might desire to correspond with us, under the pretext, that, if we refuse, somehow or other we will be doing violence to somebody's conscience.

CONFERENCE ABOUT CORRESPONDENCE.

Beyond all doubt our Church is to be beset again and again on this very question of correspondence, and we shall be compelled to meet it however reluctant we may be to do so. For our part we do not hesitate to say, that we are growing more indisposed every day towards the whole thing, especially whenever advances come from a body whose official acts have been habitually offensive to us as a Church. We have several reasons which we consider weighty enough to put this matter to rest

without any further trouble or delay on the subject. The reader cannot fail to see that we are alluding to the Northern Assembly's fresh proposals to confer with our Church. It does not require a committee to develop the fact, that there is sufficient reason to distrust any overtures they are likely to extend to us in the present actual posture of affairs in that body. That Church has made three things very plain: first, it does not intend to repeal or change any of its deliverances concerning us; secondly, it does not intend to yield up its claim to make such deliverances again whenever it may choose to do so; thirdly, it proposes to open fraternal correspondence with the avowed desire and sole purpose that it shall ultimate in organic union. Now if they be honest, no conference of committees could make these matters any plainer than they are already made, or change the mind of that Church on either one of them. So upon the presumption that they are honest, it is evident that there is no need of a committee. At the same time, the keeping of a good conscience before God and men requires, that if we do not want organic union we should avoid doing anything upon our part which will look to them like favoring it. The appointing of a committee to meet their committee, will look that way, for that is the thing to which they are looking and for which they are longing. It would entangle us in needless complications; it would divert our people and our churches for a whole year or more from the singleness of our work. And, above all, it would be deceptive upon our part, when we remember what they would be led to expect from such actions. Let us not forget that sooner or later the deceiver is always the loser. The most direct, effective and Christian method for us to adopt is a square refusal to appoint any committee, dismissing in this way the whole subject. But we are asked, "If we decline, will they not have outgeneralled us? and what will the outside world say of us?" Such things should never stand for one moment in the way of men whose solemn duty is to please God and not men, dealing always honestly, squarely, and frankly, before the world, utterly ignoring the strategy of generals and the diplomacy of politicians. In our boyhood days, away down in West Tennessee,

there was quite a neighborhood commotion produced after the following manner: A rather elderly maiden lady, Miss Betsy, of a genial and social nature, and withal very fond of corresponding with young gentlemen, managed to open correspondence with a country boy of honest heart and simple manners, named James. At first James was somewhat disinclined to go into the correspondence, but was finally inveigled into it from a fear that "folks would say" he had treated the lady's advances rudely. James had never intended any thing like *union*, but Miss Betsy had started out with that avowed purpose, and the matter being fairly opened she did not intend to be foiled. James undertook to draw off, and Betsy brought action for breach of promise: the evidence was against the young man in the public estimation. James said he had never intended anything like *union*, and had only entered upon the correspondence to show that Miss Betsy should not put him to disadvantage before the people of the neighborhood. But the people of the neighborhood, pretty unanimously concluded, that James had played the fool and acted very badly to enter into the correspondence at all, if he did not intend any thing serious, when the lady had started out with that manifest purpose. So, poor James, by his want of independence and manly action, incurred the censure of that very public opinion which he had tried so hard to win. May not this little incident serve to point a moral with brethren who think we ought to appoint a committee for fear *they* will put us to disadvantage if we do not?

THE REVISED BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

The report of the Committee on Revision was read by the Assembly on the third day of its sittings. In this report, the Committee, through their chairman, the Rev. Dr. Adger, made a very clear and concise statement of what seemed to be the proper course for them to pursue in this matter, and referred the whole question to the Assembly, to be disposed of by that body as might seem to it best. A special committee, with the Rev. F. H. Bowman as chairman, was appointed, to whom this report, and the various reports from the several Presbyteries, on

the Revised Discipline, were referred, for the purpose of comparing and classifying the same, and bringing before the Assembly, in some proper form, their several actions. This Committee submitted to the General Assembly substantially the following facts: It appeared that forty-seven Presbyteries of the fifty-seven in the Church, had sent up certified reports of their action.

(1.) Out of this number, fifteen had, without any conditions whatever, or comment or criticism, decided to adopt the "Revised Rules as they now stand."

(2.) Five have adopted, with proposed amendments.

(3.) "Seven approve the Book; but on grounds of expediency they declined to adopt it."

(4.) "Three substantially approved," but asked the suspension of the work, and the discharging of the Committee.

(5.) Nine reject, and ask an indefinite postponement.

(6.) One "*non liquet*."

(7.) Four reject, and wish the subject dismissed indefinitely.

(8.) "One declines to adopt," but asks that the changes be added as amendments to the present Book.

(9.) Two express no opinion, "but ask an indefinite postponement."

From this collation by the Committee, it appears that out of the forty-seven Presbyteries, thirty approve the work of revision and the "Revised Rules of Discipline." The fidelity of the Committee in their work was commended. The Rules of Discipline as revised, with all criticisms and amendments proposed by Presbyteries, were lodged with the Stated Clerk of the Assembly, to be kept in the archives for future use or reference. The work of revision was suspended, and the Committee discharged. The other portion of the Book of Church Order, viz.: the Revised Form of Government, was disposed of in the same way for the same purpose.

Looking at the matter as it now stands, we cannot but express a regret that the two classes of men in the Church, the tender-footed and the profoundly indifferent, so trot together in this ecclesiastical harness as to defeat those who are deeply concerned for a better state of things in our Church touching the question of

discipline. We need no better evidence of the sad and lamentable condition of the Church on this subject, than the fact that, after so long a time agitating the question, there are ten *venerable* courts of the Church which have not condescended to notice one of the most excellent, thorough, and exhaustive productions ever offered to the Church on the subject of discipline. The state of the case, we fear, is getting very much worse from time to time. The present system is so utterly imperfect that it is about no system, and the way discipline is administered most generally, amounts to a perversion of the whole thing. Good men have long ago grown sick at heart, when they take a survey of the situation and the wicked scoff at the Church, when she talks gravely about her discipline. For her purity as well as her peace and unity we consider the proper exercise of discipline of the utmost importance. The soundness of her doctrine can never be maintained, unless the purity of her discipline is preserved according to the scripture idea. That idea is that discipline bears some sort of relation to the threatenings of God's law quite as pointed and significant as the relation borne by the sacraments to the promises of the gospel. One difficulty, which, we believe, stood in the way, is that ministers and elders, not exactly discerning this fact, felt that they had not the time from other duties and labors to sit down and carefully compare these two books (the old and the new,) in order that they might reach definite and sound conclusions of their own in the matter. Or if they had the time, the work appeared too arduous and the labor too great.

The Committee on Revision have reason to congratulate themselves that a majority of the whole Church has approved of their work and stand ready to make it the law of the Church; and all the more so, because the Presbyteries which have adopted it are able to give a reason for the proposed changes, pointing it out in the superior excellency, beauty, and truth, of the Revised Book. Yet a source of regret is, that part of this very number are willing to yield up, or waive, the whole matter upon that which is always an uncertain ground, *expediency*,—and yield up this deep conviction, too, to those very fathers and brethren who

have shown little disposition to tolerate the question, and would neither hear nor examine with any degree of patience the reasons which the advocates of the Revised Book were able and willing to give for the changes which they asked. The cry came up that they were weary of the agitation of these questions, and wanted the Church to have rest. Without having ever thoroughly considered the issues involved, they solemnly asked the Assembly and the Church to dismiss the whole subject upon the flimsy plea that such agitation would mar the peace of the Church. They seem to have forgotten that agitation is a source of purity and health quite as often as it is a disturber of the peace. They appear not to have seen that, as the ocean purifies itself by its own agitation; or the atmosphere, by its agitation, lifts the hazy fog from the valley and lets in the sunlight; and the forest tree, by the agitation of its branches, sends its roots deeper and fixes them firmer between the rocks; so the Church of God, must sometimes, by agitation, purify herself, clear up the haziness that hangs round her discipline, and fix the soundness of her doctrine deeper in the hearts of her people.

LICENTIATES AS ITINERANTS.

On the fourth day of the Assembly's proceedings, Dr. Welch as chairman of the Committee of Bills and Overtures, reported two overtures on this subject: No. 8, from the Presbytery of Tombeckbee, asking the Assembly to ordain a rule requiring all licentiates to spend the first year in itinerant or missionary labor, except in extraordinary cases; No. 9, from the Presbytery of Muhlenburg, asking that they be required to spend at least two years in such labor before becoming settled pastors of any particular charge. Two reports were presented. The majority report recommended action against the adoption of the rule. A minority report, signed by Rev. R. K. Smoot and elder W. O'N. Perkins, was presented, recommending that the rule be established. A question of order arose, on a motion to adopt the minority, as to which had the precedence. The Moderator decided in favor of the minority report. Dr. Welch argued against the adoption of the report in a speech of great power,

though very short, and we think it was his speech which defeated this measure. He laid down and argued four propositions: 1st, it would be contrary to our Form of Government; 2d, it has already been settled; 3d, it asks the Assembly to give the Presbyteries a power which they already possess, or if they do not possess, the Assembly cannot give them; and 4th, it would be unwise on many grounds. He was followed by Rev. J. H. Martin, Rev. F. N. Whaley, Dr. Wm. Brown, and Rev. W. H. Adams, all sustaining the position taken by Dr. Welch. The minority report was advocated by Rev. J. H. Leps, Rev. R. K. Smoot, and Rev. A. Pickens Smith. The speech of the last named was one of peculiar power and force and made a very fine impression on the Assembly. His first proposition was, that the adoption of such a rule would be of inestimable benefit to the young man. His second proposition was, that it would be of the greatest benefit to the vacant and feeble churches. His third proposition was, that it was in keeping with the spirit and genius of our Presbyterianism. The minority report was rejected, the overture lost, and the report of the Committee adopted.

It must be evident that the mind of our Church is turned to this question to an extent which deserves our attention. Last year, at Richmond, one of our largest Presbyteries petitioned for this same rule and the Assembly refused to grant it. So far from being satisfactory, we find that two other Presbyteries come up to the Little Rock Assembly, asking the same thing.

It appears to us that the overtures should have been answered in the affirmative. We believe that which was asked by these Presbyteries is in keeping and perfect accord with the spirit and practice of the New Testament. The Church under the present dispensation began her great work in this way. Her men were first sent out to go from town to town, from city to city, from place to place, to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ. They were itinerants or evangelists. But there is no proof in the Scriptures that they were all ordained. They did the itinerant and missionary work of the Church most generally before receiving ordination, and some who were most useful and most

fruitful as evangelists were never ordained at all. The error which we conceive to be at the bottom of this refusal, is to be found in the fact that the opinion prevails, that a licentiate cannot perform the full work of an evangelist.* To obviate this we have fallen into the habit of ordaining men *sine titulo*, and thus sending them forth as itinerants or evangelists. There is no scripture warrant for any such procedure, any more than there is for a church calling a man as stated supply, and both of these notions ought to be discarded, and the practices growing up out of them abandoned. Paul, the great apostle, did not enter upon the full work of the ministry for seven years after his conversion. Part of this time he spent with Ananias, part in the desert of Arabia, but most of it he spent as an evangelist, and assistant to Barnabas. The whole Church doubted the sincerity of his conversion and the genuineness of his call, and would not receive him into full fellowship in the ministry till, by the fruits of his labors as an evangelist, he had placed his divine call beyond all doubt. This view is sustained by himself in his forcible and unanswerable argument in his letter to Timothy, that by the work of an evangelist we make full proof of our ministry. The order of the Scriptures is, that men shall first evangelise and then settle as pastors. So Paul with his great discerning powers of intellect, his cogent logic, his magnificent powers of argumentation, gloried in the fact that he did the itinerant work as an evangelist. Apollos, with his glowing and burning eloquence, and Mark and Barnabas and Timothy and Titus and Silas, were all itinerants before settling as pastors, and some of them never settled at all. If there is a single exception in the New Testament, we do not now remember it; while Luke, with his chaste and elegant scholarship, was an itinerant or evangelist, who never received ordination at all, and the same is probably true of John Mark. We believe it is also in keeping with the spirit and genius of our whole system. It is implied in our standards and should be carried out in prac-

*If a mere licentiate cannot perform the full work of the pastor, how can he do the same in respect to the evangelist, who is of course quite equal to the pastor?—EDITORS S. P. R.

tice. There is a very plain and simple way in which this can be done. The young men can be used for this purpose under the guidance of the Presbytery. It would certainly be no infringement of their liberty, for when a young man is licensed to preach he promises *obedience* to his brethren in that *particular* Presbytery. But it is a well known fact that this truth is being lost sight of by many. Young men get their licenses, hunt their homes, make their arrangements to settle, and then *notify* the Presbytery of the fact, simply by asking that they may be transferred. A refusal of this on the part of the Presbytery is construed by licentiates and people into an unwarrantable interference. The Presbytery is the power which makes and unmakes the minister. It grants the license; it ordains and installs; it constitutes and dissolves the pastoral relation. And yet with all this specific prerogative, the tendencies are to ignore its jurisdiction in questions of location. Some ministers have gone so far as to accept calls and move to their new fields independent of Presbytery, and in other cases churches have become offended when the ministers whom they wanted would not go, because Presbytery said they should not. We think that the refusal upon the part of the Assembly to grant this request, only serves to strengthen these tendencies. The refusal of the Richmond Assembly, last year, to grant the request of Nashville Presbytery was peculiarly unfortunate, and has in our estimation worked much harm. That deliverance is not clear. The whole of the last two clauses is entirely foreign to the question which it pretends to answer, (see page 156, Minutes of 1872). It has made the impression upon the minds of many that the Presbytery has not the right to control the minister and licentiate and specify their fields of labor. It was claimed that young men are licensed to preach the gospel wherever God in his providence may call them. But the answer to this is, Who is to determine that question? Does not the whole genius and spirit of our system teach us that the Presbytery is the very power to settle that question? The people may ask it, the young man desire it, and the girl he is to marry may make it a *sine qua non*, but is not the decision of the whole matter in the hands of the Presbytery?

Nothing appears more clear from our standards, and yet nothing is made more obscure by the Richmond action, which was repeated at Little Rock, *because* it had been done at Richmond the year before.

It is presumed in these deliverances that an effort is being made to set aside the "frame of our whole system, by retarding the settlement of pastors." But the facts are, there is nothing in either one of these three overtures intended to make any such impression or produce any such results. Just the opposite is aimed at, and just the opposite would be the result. This is the way to save and strengthen our feeble churches. In many cases a salary sufficient to support a young man can be raised by combining feeble churches which would otherwise die out. The licentiates may build them up, grow with their growth and strengthen with their strength. This kind of work would lay the foundation for a vigorous constitution as well as a useful ministry. Having a knowledge of books they would thus get a knowledge of men. This would be a realisation of Paul's grand thought in Romans xv. 20, building on no other man's foundation. It has been feared that the inexperience of young men would work against the practice. But the answer is, that Paul took Timothy and Titus and *first led* them into the evangelistic field, just as Barnabas had led him, and then brought them to the full work of the ministry. So the licentiate could go forth under the supervision of some designated minister, make trial of his gifts, and afterwards go into the pastorate. There is need to have work done by our Church that the settled pastors cannot do. The young men can be made effective in this way. Our Church just now is in danger of running into an unwarranted extreme on the question of settled pastors, to the neglect of the itinerant work. Almost every young man in our Seminaries is looking for a pastoral charge, when every thing which would tend to his good and the good of the whole cause, when viewed from either the scriptural theory, or practical results, would require that he should spend a few years, at least, as an itinerant missionary. When the authority is once clearly asserted, and the Assembly confirms it, the Presbytery and the licentiate

will better understand it, and the Presbytery can always use its discretion. But the way in which the matter now stands, the peculiar answers given by the concentrated wisdom of two General Assemblies, necessitates the deliverance of another at some future time, which we hope may be something more clear and less indefinite.

EVANGELISTIC LABOR.

A most excellent report was read on behalf of the Committee on Evangelistic Labor, by Rev. L. C. Vass, chairman of that Committee. What we had to say about the office and work of the evangelist, has been said under the previous head, though not as fully as we might discuss it, if we had more space. That the technical sense in which it is generally understood, that an evangelist must be an ordained minister, is not the scripture sense, we think we have clearly shown. Whether the report of the Committee was prepared before or after the discussion of the Overtures, Nos. 8 and 9, we are not prepared to say. But if any of the members of the Assembly, who voted against those overtures, and then voted for this report, should have the patience and do us the kindness to read this article, we would like to call their attention to one feature of this report. And we are all the more urgent about the matter, when we remember that the report on evangelistic labor passed the Assembly by a unanimous vote. It will be remembered that those overtures asked the Assembly to ordain a rule whereby the Presbytery might assert her power over her licentiates and require them to spend one or two years in the itinerant or missionary labor before settling as a pastor. The Assembly declared by such action "the whole frame of our system would be set aside." Now, what we wish these gentlemen to note is, that in voting for this report they have recommended the Presbyteries to do a thing which comes equally as near "setting aside the whole frame of our system," as any thing asked for in those overtures could possibly have done. After urging upon the Presbyteries the importance of employing "at least one evangelist for all his time," the report proceeds in these significant words: "We

would also recommend the practice of some of our Presbyteries, who employ licentiates, whenever it is in their judgment expedient, for the first year or two in missionary fields, and who also give work in destitute places to their candidates during their vacations," (see page 316, Minutes of 1873). We commend the prudence and good judgment of our excellent friend, Rev. Mr. Vass, in putting into his able report, and getting it through the Assembly, *by a unanimous vote*, much of that thing which we most signally failed to do, even though backed up by all the ability, energy, and shrewdness, of our genial friend, A. P. Smith. And these gentlemen will notice the report leaves the matter in the power and judgment of the Presbyteries whenever they deem it expedient. We hope that the thing feared so much by the Richmond Assembly, and referred to, and re-affirmed by this Assembly, that leaving of licentiates in the hands of the Presbyteries to be worked a year or two in "missionary fields," whenever "in their judgment" it may be "expedient," will not be considered "an attempt to retard the settlement of pastors." While we sat and listened to the deliberations on these resolutions, we were not a little amused when the range of discussion took this turn: a motion was made "to strike out that part which advised the Presbyteries to employ licentiates and candidates in missionary work." But Mr. Vass replied, that, "to strike out would imply that the Assembly was opposed to the Presbyteries exercising the power of employing, in missionary work, our candidates." This put an extinguisher upon all objections, and the agitated Assembly subsided into unanimity.

It will be seen from reading the reports on this subject, that it appears to be the fixed purpose of the Assembly, to reduce the evangelistic work to a systematic method, and give it a due prominence in the great work of the Church. It is thus brought upon a level with the Sustentation scheme by being made a part of it, and so deserves the hearty coöperation of all our Presbyteries. We take it that no man questions the demand for the scheme, and the same reasons which demand its existence, reach far enough to make an equal demand for thorough and hearty coöperation upon the part of all the Presbyteries. The blended

unity of the work gives it strength and power, symmetry, and beauty. It preserves harmony and prevents discord and confusion. It is presbyterial, sound, scriptural. It places the General Assembly in her proper and legitimate sphere of action, while at the same time it preserves the well defined rights and prerogatives of Presbytery. It shows forth the faith that we have in the scriptural order of our government by the systematic and united work through which we develop that faith.

POWERS OF CHURCH COURTS AND METHODS OF BENEFICENCE.

We believe as strongly as any man in the limited and defined powers of the General Assembly, and, because we do believe this, we are opposed to that notion that the General Assembly has no powers at all. And it is just as fatal to the interests of the Church to overlook these as it would be to infringe upon the inherent rights of the Presbyteries. The principles which we have to state here apply with the same force to all the enterprises of the Church. We hold that Presbytery is the *original source* of power in the church courts. We further hold as undeniable, because fundamental, that all the Presbyterian congregations in our connection form one church, and when that one church is gathered together, by delegated representation, into one General Assembly, that Assembly has vested in it all the powers of the whole Church, in all matters pertaining to its general welfare, which any Presbytery has over its own constituent elements. The General Assembly when properly constituted is a court of Jesus Christ, for its legitimate work, as much as Presbytery or the court of session. It is nothing less than the *General Presbytery of the whole Church*. The source of its power is the divinely inspired Word of God. The constitution of the Church under which the Assembly works is simply the codification, systematising, and defining of these powers as they are found to exist in that Word. This is Presbyterianism according to the theory, as we understand it. It is Presbyterianism according to the divine idea of the Church in its concrete form. It is Presbyterianism according to the historical workings of the Church, from the day that Francis Makemie, in

1681, planted the first Presbyterian church in this country, on the shores of Maryland, down to this good hour in which we write. The leaven of Independency crept into our Church very early, it is true, by the admission of Rev. Jedediah Andrews and his Independent congregation. Yet there has ever been a sufficient amount of true Presbyterianism to rise up and assert our principles, and put forth its exertions to carry them out, albeit there has always been a lingering remnant of that Independency to harrass and perplex us in many of our undertakings. It reminds one of the chills and fevers in the malarial districts of the country—when you think you are entirely rid of them here they come back again on the seventh, fourteenth, or twenty-first days, unfitting the patient for any thing he may undertake. Just so, when we had supposed that the question was settled, and our people would understand the relations and bearings of all the church courts and their distinctive rights and well defined spheres of action, here comes a Presbytery, and there comes a Synod, rising up and talking about working their own schemes independently of the Assembly! There can be but one object in having a General Assembly, and that object is to accomplish the work of the Church among the children of men. This work is comprehensive, constant, and far-reaching, and should have the constant, united, and unbroken coöperation of all the Presbyteries. And those who oppose it, and attempt to strip it of its rights and prerogatives and vest these in synodical and presbyterial schemes, and thus cripple and hamper its movements, and, in many cases, defeat its purpose by their refusal to coöperate, and cut short the means till the supply is not adequate to the demand, should not complain if they are held to account for all the failures which follow. We believe that the Church constituted according to the Presbyterian idea is adequate to do the whole work for which she was set up in the earth. She has been divinely ordained to do something, to accomplish some purpose, to reach some end, and we believe that the means in her power will always be adequate to that end. And not the least among them all is the method by which she is to raise money to carry forward her grand schemes of Missions, of Sustentation,

and Evangelisation. The very order of our Church beginning away down at the deacon, and rising in systematic gradation till it culminates in the General Assembly, presents a method most perfect and thorough by which the people of God in our communion can do effectually whatever they are willing to do. It will be seen that this method, if we are correct, enters into and constitutes a fundamental part of her very nature. But it cannot reach its full development and extent in either session, presbytery, or synod. If it could, there would be no need of a General Assembly. The grace of contributing of our substance to the various enterprises of the Church, is a standard by which the piety of any individual Church may be as accurately graduated as by any other one of the infallible proofs which Christ has given us of a true Church. The observing the sacraments of the Supper is not more binding on us as a part of that outward means by which we worship God and show our faith in Christ, than is giving. And the Church which will give nothing, has just as signally failed in producing the proper evidence of being Christian, as the Church which will refuse to celebrate the Supper. They bear a like relation in the public worship of the Church. This prepares us for answering two questions which we so often hear presented. The first is: "When will this thing stop? Are we to be always giving?" We answer, surely, yes. As God shall prosper you, you are to give, and give cheerfully, and you shall no more think of ceasing to give, than to think of ceasing to worship God in any other one of the constituent elements of that worship. The second question is: "Are not a large number of our churches feeble, and the recipients of the charity of our larger churches—should *they* give?" We answer, yes. What church, so feeble, or so few in numbers, that it would consider itself excused thereby from celebrating the Lord's Supper. As long as it is our blessed privilege to enjoy the one, it is our solemn duty to do the other. What we need, then, is, that our Church shall give this theory a practical side in its application to these enterprises of the Church committed by the General Assembly to her various Committees of Sustentation, Foreign Missions, and Evangelisation. We need that this

method should be completely executed. We need that the whole Church in her organised capacity should steadily go forward. To do this she must be constantly calling upon her people to do their duty, just as she is required to do hers. Every effort should be made upon the part of ministers and sessions of churches, in the congregation, and among the able and wealthy members, to instruct and lead and bring the people into the way of giving. Not in separate, congregational, or presbyterial, or synodical schemes, but through the whole Church as an organised power of God in the earth, for spreading the light of divine truth and saving the souls of lost men. Any other theory, and the Church, as an organised body, will pass rapidly into dissolution, and all her enterprises be emasculated and her pretensions rendered worthless.

ASSEMBLY'S TRUSTEES AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

The relation between the Executive Committees and the Board of Trustees of the Assembly gave rise to more discussion than any other subject before the Assembly during its sittings. It came up on the report of a committee of ruling elders, mostly lawyers, to whom the question had been referred. Their report was advisory in its nature, recommending a series of resolutions, prefaced by a modest, chaste, and well written preamble, (see Minutes 1873, page 319). The resolutions may be summed up in about the following words: 1st. Orders the Trustees to pay over the Kennedy and Park funds to the Committee. 2d. Reserves to the Trustees, bequests which are uncertain as to their purposes, till the Assembly convenes. 3d. Orders the Trustees to pay over at once all donations, the uses of which are certainly known. 4th. Orders that all donations, of less than three thousand dollars, shall be paid at once to the Committees when the object is known, but not the *manner* of its use; but all amounts over three thousand dollars shall be retained by the Trustees, and only the interest paid over, till the Assembly shall dispose of the principal. 5th. That in all other cases, the Trustees shall retain and control the funds till instructed by the Assembly

as to what disposition to make of them. The 6th establishes the Committee for the purposes recited in the first section of the Act of Incorporation, and ratifies and confirms all the Committees have done heretofore with the Assembly's sanction. The first, second, and third resolutions, passed the Assembly with but little discussion. When the fourth was reached, the discussion became quite animated, and consumed a good part of two days. Rev. J. D. Thomas, Judge Perkins, and M. A. Candler, Esq., advocating the passage of the resolutions; while Rev. F. H. Bowman and Rev. J. S. Moore, with Rev. Dr. Brown, opposed its passage. The amount proposed in the original resolution was *one thousand* dollars, but, on motion of Rev. Dr. Brown, it was made *three thousand*, as Dr. Brown said, by way of compromise. Mr. Candler made an argument of considerable length and ability. He took the position—a very strange one indeed from his side of the question—that this was simply the question of Boards or no Boards, and then asked the question, “Shall we have bodies legally independent of the Assembly?” He maintained the further position that these Committees of the Church could legally own no property and hold no money. He argued that to grant the Committees the power to use the moneys donated to the Church, when the donor had not specified the manner, even though the object was specified, would be the abandonment of those principles which had been settled, and the establishment of that policy which had been condemned by the Assembly of 1861, after two days debate. There can be no question but what the speech of Mr. Candler carried this fourth resolution through the Assembly.

In writing an article like this, it is not necessary for us to go into anything like a full discussion of the questions germinal to the Executive Committees of the Church. But this we may say, that the Church can have no other object in the establishment of these Committees, than that they may do in the most efficient manner that work which is properly and legitimately her work. No one we presume will question the power of the General Assembly to appoint these Committees, and clothe them with just such power as she may choose—power to *handle and conclude*

all matters pertaining to their proper work, and when this is done, to report the same to the Assembly for review and control. When they are once established, they are constituent parts of the incorporated Church, and by virtue of this fact they continue the powers-vested in them to do the will of the Assembly. They possess, under rules and by-laws, the power of the General Assembly touching the several objects for which they are constituted during that interval from one Assembly to another. If it is the will of the Assembly to carry on a work of Foreign Missions, for example, then that work falls into the hands and under the control of that committee, for it is a coördinate branch of the incorporated Church, and it has a right under the charter to *go forward and conclude* its work, or any part of it, and report for approval or otherwise to the Assembly what it has done, as well as to recommend to the Assembly what may be done. That committee can handle money, hold property, as it does now at Hangchow and Campinas, establish mission points and schools, or do any other business which the Assembly can do touching the same matters. If any gift shall pass into the hands of the Trustees for the use of the Committee of Foreign Missions, then "it shall be good and effectual to pass" to that Committee. It will be lawful. The Trustees are not justified in refusing to pass it. It is part and parcel of the powers of that Committee to go and demand it of the Trustees, the donor having mentioned the object of his charity—Foreign Missions—who will say that the Board of Trustees shall not pass it over to that Committee? If there is a supposable state of case in which funds donated may be withheld, it is not touching the funds committed to the Board of Trustees, whenever the donor shall mention the object of his charity. For when the particular charity is mentioned, then it shall be good and effectual to pass to the Committee of that charity. There can be no good reason for withholding it, and whenever the reason ceases, the law ceases. By the passage of that fourth resolution, the General Assembly has done what we believe she did not intend to do, and what we think will be rescinded, changed, or modified very soon by another Assembly, or if not, our Committees are crippled and hampered and their

usefulness very much impaired. That resolution places the Board of Trustees above the Executive Committee, and establishes a state of case not contemplated by the position originally taken by the General Assembly of the Church. It would have been far better to incorporate the Committees—all of them separately—than to have thrown such cramping restrictions around them, touching the use of the funds donated to their several fields of action, simply because the manner of that use was not designated by the donor. We are not so certain any way if that would not be the better and most effective method of carrying on the real work of our Church. For, in our mind, it has never been a question, as to whether the Committees should be incorporated? but whether there should be another body between the Committees and the Assembly, and whether the Committees should be responsible to that third body, or whether they should be directly responsible to the Assembly upon its floor and before its bar. To set up between our Committees and the Assembly any third body, is precisely and exactly to go back to the old Board system.

We say we are of the opinion that the Assembly did what it was not its intention to do. For it appears to be a conceded fact, that the settled policy of the Church is not to accumulate endowments, but to depend for the supply of each year upon the charitable gifts and donations of the Church during the year. No General Assembly has ever presumed to make any express provision for the expenditures of the year to come, since we have been a separate Church, for the simple reason that it was understood to be in the power of the several Committees to use the funds in their wise and prudent discretion as rapidly as they came in. When money is left for purposes of endowment, of course it passes directly to the object for which it was left by the donor. Now, whether we trust the Committees with one dollar or three thousand dollars, the principle is the same, and in proportion as you cramp the principle involved in this matter, you cramp the Committees. It was argued by the Rev. W. J. Keith, of the Synod of Georgia, that we had better go back to the old Boards than to have a constant agitation of these mat-

ters, but he must know that the old system would be no remedy, for that would keep up perpetual agitation. He must further know, that the system of the Assembly's Committees can produce no agitation or jar, but it is only when an effort is made to cramp that system that such is the result. The whole discussion showed that the Assembly was sensitive about a permanent fund of any kind—they feared it. The advocates of this fourth resolution used and pressed that argument against the incorporation of the Committee of Publication. And yet this resolution establishes a *tertium quid* between the Committee and the Assembly—the very vice of the old Board system, and squints also at *permanent funds*, when it subordinates the Committees to the Trustees, and empowers the Trustees to invest the funds and pay over only the accruing interest instead of the principal. The true theory of our Church is this: 1st, never to have a permanent fund from which to supply a demand arising out of contingent wants; 2d, to have as far as we can a permanent fund, or endowment, for the supply of those wants constantly arising, but which are of such a permanent nature as to be subordinated to some settled rules, and which are capable of being ascertained in advance. All the enterprises of our Church fall naturally, and readily, under the one or the other of these two conditions. If every General Assembly will keep these facts before their minds and properly classify the various enterprises of the Church, none of that danger and constant agitation so much apprehended will ever arise.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

In concluding this brief and imperfect review of the Assembly's proceedings, for there were *many* matters of which we would like to speak, not alluded to here, we say frankly that several things were done which we would have gladly seen left undone. But, as a whole, we think many evidences were given of the growth and prosperity of our Church, of her soundness in doctrine and vigorous activity, which are calculated to make all our hearts glad. We have made frank and open observations on the deliverances of the body just as they appeared to us, and

as it seemed fitting and legitimate to do. We have been impressed with the fact that no Assembly can do all that may be expected of it, and if this one has not come up to the expectations of some in all its deliverances, it has certainly not fallen behind many others, either in the work executed or the spirit and manner in which it was done. Those gentlemen from whom we have differed most widely, and concerning whom we have spoken most plainly, are among the number whom we learned, in the few days we were with them, to respect for their ability, candor, and courage, and to love for the many traits of character which marked, no less the honesty of their purpose, than the goodness of their hearts. Few General Assemblies have ever met, whose discussions were more earnest and animated, and few have ever parted whose members separated with more regret and tender and affectionate regard for each other.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Adoption of Sons, its Nature, Spirit, Privileges, and Effects; a Practical and Experimental Treatise. By THOMAS HOUSTON, D. D. Alex. Gardner, Paisley; Houston & Co., London; C. Aitchison, Belfast, etc., etc. 1872. 16mo., Pp. 258.

We feel like extending the right hand of Christian fellowship to our brother across the waters, and giving him a cordial grasp, for this most excellent treatise on this most precious theme. We rise from its perusal, feeling that we have been communing with one who has a deep, experimental knowledge of his subject, as well as a complete, theological mastery of it. Without being doctrinal, it is saturated with doctrine. Each chapter is like a prism, reflecting all the colors of that time-honored creed, which shines with the undimmed brightness of the sun in the firmament of truth. It is such practical works as this, presenting a great fundamental doctrine on all sides, that discloses, to the