

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,

other men, having no descent from ancestors and existing always, but that, *in respect to his priestly office*, he did not depend on the tracing of a genealogy, as the Levitical priests did, but had his priesthood 'continually abiding.' * * * We may believe that the writer did not intend to make any formal declaration respecting Melchizedek, for the purpose of explaining to his readers who or what the Old Testament personage was. Such a declaration was unnecessary and was hardly to have been expected. But in his setting forth of the exalted character of Christ's priesthood, as compared with the priesthood known to the Jewish system, he takes this remarkable case of a priest, who suddenly appears on the scene, in the Old Testament history, having his priestly office in its full privileges and prerogatives, and disappears again as suddenly, still having it and still in life—a priest who rests his claims on no tracing of his genealogical line and who, so far as the narrative goes, has no recorded beginning nor ending of his official life."

JOS. H. ALEXANDER.

St. Charles, Mo.

V. CHURCH ORGANIZATION IN HEATHEN LANDS.

The General Assembly at St. Louis, last May, failed to answer a question on ecclesiastical law submitted to it by seven Presbyteries, viz, Orange, Wilmington, Mecklenburg, St. Louis, Potosi, Tombeckbee and Chesapeake. Three of these had sent overtures to the Assembly of 1886, at Augusta, Ga., but for want of time to consider the question properly, "the whole matter was referred to the next Assembly." There were overtures also bearing on the same subject from the Presbytery of East Hanover and from the missionaries in Brazil. All of this shows the unsettled and troubled mind of the church at large on this subject.

The question had been before the church as one of vital importance and great difficulty for years. As far back as 1876

a committee had been appointed by the General Assembly to consider and report on the subject. When the Confession of Faith was adopted and the administrative policy of the church agreed upon, Foreign Missions was not before the mind of the church. She was contending for life. An aggressive work was not seriously thought of for years afterwards. The first efforts of the church in heathen lands were experimental and the progress was very slow. Years elapsed before the heathen were converted in numbers sufficient to raise the question of an organized church among them. When the necessity arose, in the absence of any constitutional provision for the emergency, our missionaries, going forward in the dark, fell into many errors. When application was made by them to the General Assembly for instruction as to how they should proceed, that venerable body made blunders, some of which were ludicrous enough to produce a smile from even the gravest reader. Reports drawn by the finest minds in the church were earnestly considered and adopted only to be protested against, reconsidered and then laid aside. After studying the question a year or more a chairman would resign and give place to a substitute. Or, after studying the question a year the committee would report themselves "not prepared to present any results of their labors to this Assembly, and ask to be continued and have their number increased." Again, an exceedingly able committee reports agreement on a part of the subject but adds that "after two years of conference they are unable to agree" on the rest. Again, one member of committee on the subject reported orally, (to the Assembly at Lexington, Ky.,) declining to make for himself and those who agreed with him a written report that would only embarrass the Assembly "with two rival papers."

At last, after eleven years, the General Assembly at St. Louis, comes to one mind on the proposition "that the views are so divergent in the church on this subject and all the efforts to harmonize them have so signally failed through successive years, that it is safe to conclude no legislation can be proposed which will settle the question."

This is most humiliating. Can it be that our church has no

constitutional provision for the organization of a church in heathen lands, and that, after so many years of profound study and earnest debate by the soundest and strongest minds in her midst, no amendment can be proposed on which a decided majority may agree? And on such a question as this: the extension of the kingdom of Christ among the unevangelized races! Is no further "legislation" to be attempted, and must the subject be withdrawn from the church courts without answering the memorials of so many Presbyteries and missionaries? This is, indeed, what was recommended and what was done at St. Louis.

The report goes on to assign a second reason for withdrawing the question from the Presbyteries, viz: "Because a practical solution has already been found in the outworking of our missionary operations in heathen lands." A practical solution has been found of this most difficult and important question, *therefore* we must not attempt to amend the constitution by showing our missionaries how to proceed in the great work. How do these things hold together as premise and conclusion?

One would expect to hear a conclusion just the opposite of this. If the providence of God has come to the relief of the church and solved this question of ecclesiastical law, then the committee should have hailed it as a God-send and framed an amendment accordingly. For this purpose the committee was appointed. All the memorials from the Presbyteries and elsewhere, bearing on this subject, were placed in their hands in order that they might have all the available light and might lay the matter before the Assembly in a form for final action. The first committee appointed on the question was charged with "the whole subject of the office and powers of the Evangelist, his relation to the General Assembly and the Presbytery at home, his relation to the church gathered among the heathen, and his relation to his fellow evangelists in the same missionary field." The said committee was furthermore charged with the duty of reporting "to the next General Assembly by a proposed additional chapter to our Form of Government, or otherwise." The committee at St. Louis, whose report we criticize, was not ignorant of these instructions, for the chairman of this committee was the chairman

of that which made the first formal report on the subject and incorporated the above instructions in its report. (See Min. 1881, p 387.) At that time it reported adversely to the addition of a new chapter to the Form of Government and moved the adoption of a paper interpretative of the law as it now stands. The report was adopted but, as we have seen, failed to satisfy the church, which has continued to seek a constitutional amendment from that time to this.

We do not intimate a charge of delinquency or unfaithfulness against the committee but criticize it for failing to embrace an opportunity to solve a problem of such importance in the light of that providence to which it calls the attention of the church. While it was a question for speculation no action, it seems, could be recommended on which the church would harmonize. But when it emerged from the cloudland of abstract thinking to stand out in history clear as the light of day, the church would have hailed the occasion with joy and thanksgiving and made the necessary change in her organic law. And, surely, no easier task could be desired than to formulate an amendment to the Constitution with a concrete case as a copy before the eye.

It is tantalizing almost to provocation to think that, when we were on the verge of such a Canaan of rest after the long wanderings, we were not signalled to cross over and take possession, but, with a backward wave of the hand, were remanded to the wilderness.

Is it not possible that the Assembly made a mistake in saying that "a practical solution has already been found in the outworking of our missionary operations in heathen lands?" To what does this declaration point? What is the fact on which these resounding periods turn? Where will we find "a practical solution" of the whole subject of the office and powers of the evangelist, his relation to the General Assembly and the Presbytery at home, his relation to the church gathered among the heathen and his relation to his fellow evangelists in the same missionary field? It must be in some one or all of those heathen lands where we have evangelists at work. Let us see.

In Brazil, our missionaries are authorized by this St. Louis Assembly to "form a Brazilian synod separate from both the assemblies in this country and constituting in Brazil a distinct and independent church free from foreign control." This was wisely and well done. But it does not solve the various questions about the powers and relations of the foreign Evangelist, nor does it furnish "the additional chapter to our Form of Government." It only sanctions the formation of a national church when the material has grown to a size that requires it. The mind of the church is laboring on the question how to plant the church; how to ordain native evangelists; how to organize sessions and Presbyteries; how to gather the material out of which a national church may be organized.

Many blunders, some ludicrous and some serious, were committed in Brazil and elsewhere years ago when our missionaries were building without a plan. We want an amendment to our Form of Government to prevent a repetition of the same or similar blunders. We have missionaries now at work in different lands where the question of a national synod is not mooted. We are arranging to occupy new territory, to break new ground, to sow the first seed. When those whom we propose to send soon to Africa gather converts enough to be organized into a church and constitute a session, how will they proceed? Where will they find a mode of operating, a clear statement of law or a precedent as their guide? It is not claimed that we have a constitutional rule. Indeed our constitution is singularly defective in this particular. It almost ignores the subject of the methods by which the world is to be conquered for Christ. There is no rule of action for our toilers among the heathen. But the act of the St. Louis Assembly seems to declare that we have precedents to go by. This is what we suppose is meant by the phrase "practical solution." If so, where shall we find them? Perhaps we may find one in China. Our church has had some experience there—and some that is very practical, from which we should learn much wisdom. Our missionaries have been there a long time; their labors have been blessed. Years ago "the outworking of our missionary operations" there

resulted in the erection of a Presbytery. We shall probably find the precedent here. What are the facts about it?

In the minutes of the General Assembly for 1874, p. 480, we read that a Presbytery was organized to be known by the name of Hangehow. At the same meeting it was resolved (p. 523) that said action "shall not be interpreted as violating that provision of the Constitution which vests in the Synod alone the power to erect new Presbyteries." Two years after this it was "resolved that the General Assembly has no constitutional power to establish or dissolve Presbyteries, and accordingly, that the brethren, of whom the Assembly of 1874 proposed to constitute the Presbytery of Hangehow, are now, and have been *de jure* members of the same Presbyteries to which they belonged at the time of such action." (Min. 1876, p. 237.)

In this abortive effort to erect a Presbytery in China our church presents the humiliating spectacle of a General Assembly's acting contrary to law and confessing that it has done so, yet insisting that its act must not be so construed. But all of this is annulled by another Assembly, two years later, which declared these acts unconstitutional and therefore null and void. Not that there was a line in the Constitution to guide in setting up a church in the heathen lands, but because the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism had been violated. If there had been such a line all these blunders would have been avoided. No Presbytery has been erected in China by our church from that day to this, to our knowledge; so then, the "practical solution in the outworking of our missionary operations in heathen lands" is not found in China.

We have had some experience also in Brazil. In the Minutes of 1871, p. 29, we find that the General Assembly organized the Presbytery of Sao Paulo. This seems to have been annulled by the act annulling Hangehow. But, as some government was needed in China and Brazil, the Assembly authorized a "Mission" under its Committee, vested with power over the missionaries. This aroused an indignation among our brethren in Brazil that finally broke out in the most pronounced opposition and resulted in irreparable disaster.

Matters dragged along until the missionaries there from the Synod of Virginia memorialized their Synod to permit them to be organized into a Presbytery composed of members from the Northern and Southern churches. Their request was declined because of the unsettled mind of the church on the powers and relations of the foreign evangelist. These same brethren memorialized the Assembly at St. Louis and were answered by the act now under consideration. But we have already seen that the "practical solution" is not found here.

We know of but one more field, where "the outworking of our missionary operations" may solve the problem—that is Mexico. Here, we have a church session and a Presbytery, built up from the ground by the Rev. A. T. Graybill "on the full tide of successful experiment." There is nothing now in the way of our evangelizing the whole of Mexico. The church there has reached such a stage of development that it can hold on its way to the highest pitch of power without any constitutional hindrance. Here, we may confidently expect to find our object. What now are the facts? How was the first church organized, and how were the first ruling elders ordained? It was done by Mr. Graybill alone, acting on the commission of his Presbytery in Virginia. How was the Presbytery of Tamaulipas organized? In like manner, with the exception, *i. e.*, that, as Mr. Hall had then come to help him, he was asked to lay hands with him on the heads of the Mexicans, whom he was ordaining. The elders of the church, whom *he* had ordained, were also asked to lay their hands on with his and Mr. Hall's, and they complied. Thus, the church, in its complete form, was set up and went on its way.

Now where was the Presbytery, by the laying on of whose hands these Mexican evangelists were ordained? Was it Montgomery Presbytery in Virginia? Had Mr. Graybill stated the case to his Presbytery, and gotten its consent? If so the fact has escaped us in reading the official record of the case. Montgomery Presbytery seems to have known nothing of it officially until it had been done. Was it a *quasi* Presbytery, composed of Messrs. Graybill and Hall, and some Mexican elders? Our Constitution

knows nothing of such a body as this. It was Mr. Graybill, acting singly or separately, and he alone that planted the church and carried it up to this stage. Is it plead in his defense that he was acting as a commissioned evangelist from his Presbytery in Virginia, vested with full power to do all this? He thought so and in his conscience is quite clear of all blame. In the absence of all constitutional rules he did right to go ahead as best he could. Too much honor cannot be shown this devoted and Heaven-blest servant of the church for his meek and gentle spirit, for his ardent love to God and the church, for his courage and self-sacrificing and indefatigable work in carrying the gospel to "the land of assassins" and planting the church there. But can his course be held up as a precedent? Has he furnishd "the practical solution" of this problem? Surely not. It was a mistake such as all men make when, full of zeal in a new work, they blaze a path untrodden before.

The Houston Assembly of 1885 sent down to the Presbyteries for adoption an overture which reads, in part, as follows: "When sent to foreign countries he may also be entrusted with power by his Presbytery to ordain ministers of the gospel as pastors or as evangelists; this grant of power, however, must be made for each specific case and may only be made previous to the organization of a Presbytery in the field where he labors." This was, in effect, to ask the whole church to endorse what Mr. Graybill had done, by authorizing a like procedure in future when the evangelist may have a special grant of power from his Presbytery to do so. But the church declined, which was the same thing as to condemn it as irregular. Mr. Graybill was driven to this irregular course by the want of any rule in the Constitution. The General Assembly approved his course no doubt for this reason. But when the church was asked to amend its organic law with a paragraph making like procedure a permanent rule, for setting up Presbyterianism in foreign lands, she declined. Presbytery is not an expedient, a device that may be modified at will to meet the ever-varying exigencies of the church, either at home or abroad. Strict construction of law, founded on the express letter of the divine word, or on "good and necessary

inference therefrom," has ever marked the history of the Presbyterian Church the world over.

We know of no other attempts at organization made by our church in heathen lands, and as none of these afford us "the practical solution" of the difficulty of ruling beyond the sea, we conclude that the St. Louis Assembly failed to answer the question on ecclesiastical law submitted to it by so many Presbyteries. The church is still without a law or policy and the same or similar blunders and difficulties are likely to arise at any time in the future as those that blot our records of the past.

Are we to leave it so? Is the Constitution to remain in this age, whose chief glory is the extension of the church in heathen lands, as it came into existence when foreign missions was hardly dreamed of and, if mentioned seriously, laughed off as a joke even by ministers of the gospel? A venerable missionary exclaimed a few years ago "the church is only playing at missions." When she begins to gird herself and come down to earnest work shall we have no rule to work by? Must this question, which burns in the hearts of so many Presbyteries and missionaries, be extinguished by the act of the last Assembly?

HOW TO ORGANIZE.

The General Assembly at St. Louis wisely decided that it is best not to extend its ruling power over the church into heathen lands. Thus, "The inherent difficulty in the case lies in the attempt to rule the church across the sea. The solution is found in recognizing the autonomy of the church as a free Christian commonwealth, and investing it with the power of self-government as soon as it is organized."

This is a grand sentence. It contains the germ and substance of the whole matter. The only phrase in it open to criticism is this, "and investing it with the power of self-government as soon as it is organized." This implies (1) that the church in the foreign field *must be* organized from without. We concede that it may be when, in the exercise of their autonomy, they ask it, but in all cases need not be, and in some, should not be; (2) that the church organizing *conveys* power to the church organized,

that is, clothes or "invests" it with power. The power of rule exists absolutely in each individual soul until he seeks that of the session; and in the mass, until it creates a session to be the depository of this power. "Tarry ye in the city until ye be endued with power from on high." Here the power (*ζύναμις*) is bestowed upon the church by the gift of the Holy Spirit to the individual members thereof. Having this inherent power, it may distribute authority (*εξουσία*) severally according to its own free will.

With this exception, the sentence quoted above from the act of the last Assembly expresses the radical idea of this matter perfectly. The difficulty of ruling beyond the sea is "inherent;" it pertains naturally to the case and, as it always has, so it always will rise up to baffle and disturb whenever it is ignored in our work. The experience of the Northern Presbyterian Church, as we have been informed by one of our missionaries long in the service, agrees with that of ours. Yet their method is less liable to abuse than that adopted by our church. The ever-varying devices of the church to overcome these difficulties are abundant proof of this fact and are not to be construed into a sign of weakness or vacillation. It is simply the experience of an earnest and mighty spirit that will not sleep when the cause is liable to harm.

According to the fundamental principles of Presbytery the *sole want* of a church, in order to adopt an aggressive policy, is *a Session*. By the distribution of the powers under our Constitution as it now is, those of the Session are restricted. But according to the Scripture the power of the whole is in the Session. When no higher court exists the Session is omnipotent. But in heathen lands there is not even a Session. What, then, is to be done? That's the question. How are we to bear rule, where no constituted authority exists? The usual answer is, Let the church at home send out an evangelist clothed with extraordinary power, with all the power of a Session and a Presbytery—power to do everything necessary to plant the church.

We confess that, to our mind, it seems reasonable that, if the church at home is to exercise any ruling power at all

abroad, it should use all that is necessary. If the Constitution may confer on the evangelist any power, it may confer all he needs to do the work, to which he is called. If the home Presbytery may entrust to him "power to organize churches and ordain ruling elders and deacons," as is now the case, it may add the power of discipline also over members and officers, until the church is completely set up. If the power of ordaining and organizing, which can be exercised only by a court, may be delegated under extraordinary circumstances to an individual, why should he not have the power of discipline also? And, as all appeal to the church at home is encumbered with difficulties insuperable to the proper administration of justice, why not make this power absolute? This view is held in the church and has been formally brought before the General Assembly for its adoption. Why should the Constitution bestow a two-thirds and not a three-thirds power? Discipline is not more delicate or momentous than organization and government. A desire to keep up the appearance of sovereignty in the Presbytery by retaining certain reserved and undelegated rights when the thing itself is already gone, is unworthy of such a body as the church.

Moreover, the law is objectionable because it is virtually prelatial. It confers ruling power upon one, while Presbyterianism retains it for a court composed of several members. It is not an answer to this to say that the Presbytery at home only uses a member to do its work and holds him responsible to itself for the manner in which it is done; that it is the court acting by a commission. This is inadequate because the essence of Presbyterianism lies, not in joint power as opposed to several, but in this, that power cannot be exercised except over those who have conferred it. Republicanism is representative. All the power in the republic comes from the people who compose that republic and must be exercised over them for their good; while our Constitution grants power to evangelists to be exercised over people *volens volens*.

It may be replied to this, But our Church owns all whom it converts; when our evangelists convert the Chinese they there-

fore belong to us, we stand to them *in loco parentis* and are in duty bound to bring them under our rule. If so, what becomes of the Christian liberty of those in whom the Holy Ghost dwells? Can he in whom the Spirit of the Lord dwells be subject to the authority of men "except so far as it represents the authority of Christ" and except he has in conscience put himself under that authority? This is surely one of the incidental forms of Christian liberty.

Why should the liberty of the heathen be abridged into a form less than that of the convert at home? Do those who are converted by our preachers belong to us? or have they not the right to say where they will cast their citizenship? When a home missionary converts a soul and baptizes him, he does not thereby bring that soul into the full communion of any particular church. This is done by a vote of the Session on his own application. The meaning of the application is, I want to be under your control as rulers in the house of God. The act of the home missionary brings the individual into "the kingdom" but not into any particular church. When the Ethiopian eunuch was converted and baptized by Philip he did not thereby become a member of the church at Jerusalem or Gaza. On his own application he might become a member of either. When the chaplains in the Confederate armies, during "the war between the States," baptized soldiers, these soldiers did not become members of any particular church until voted in by the Session. When Mr. Graybill baptizes a Mexican in a ranch he reports his name to the Session of the church at Matamoras or some other convenient centre.

For the Presbyterian Church in the United States to *assume* jurisdiction over souls converted by her missionaries, is a violent stretch of authority. The dogmatic power of the church does not involve, as a necessary correlative, the diacritic power. To convert a soul to God only brings him under the power of the Holy Ghost. His self-will and accountability are still intact. He may join the Presbyterian Church or the Episcopal, or he may join neither, and thus deprive himself of all the benefits of church order. When this soul converted is a heathen, in a land

where no church is of any denomination, he may, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, choose to seek the care of a church in the United States or in Scotland. But it will still remain with that church to say whether it is for the glory of God to bring this convert under its power.

Rome claims power over the whole world and every individual in the world by express and exclusive grant from the Lord Jesus. Autonomy is nowhere found in her borders or in the world, according to her doctrine. All power is given to her on earth over human wills and human souls. But surely Presbyterianism sets up no such claim as this. Prelacy also claims her power through Rome. She is consistent in claiming authority over those whom she regenerates. Her power does not come from the people but from Rome. Along the line of the Apostles from Peter down to those of the present day in her fold, the Great Head transmits it.

It is urged, in support of the policy we oppose, that the Scriptures authorize it. Is not the evangelist an extraordinary officer, clothed with extraordinary powers for an emergency? Is it not so written in Titus, 1: 5,—“Ordain elders in every city?” Was not Titus an evangelist?

If the Apostle had been here stating the peculiar duties of the evangelist and had mentioned ordination as one of them, then the inference would have been reasonable. But such is not the case. He is giving him instructions or orders as to his work and *emphasizing one thing of prime importance* that must be done by all means. In setting in order the things wanting in Crete he must see to it especially that the power in the individuals be joined in representatives who shall exercise it for the good of the mass. But it is not said *how* this is to be done. When done under his direction, according to the principles of government in the church, he does it himself, by an idiom common in many if not in all languages. Titus *must* ordain elders, and to interpose his influence and show the people from the Scriptures how they were to proceed in the election and ordination, would be in strict compliance with his orders. To all but Prelatists this interpretation must be entirely agreeable.

Seeing then that the Scripture cited does not authorize the exercise of such power by one man and that the principles of our government require a Session to be the depository of all the power in the congregation, the question arises

HOW IS THE SESSION TO BE FORMED IN HEATHEN LANDS ?

The first step is an election by the votes of the people. In the home church the case is settled by law. "Ruling Elders, the immediate representatives of the people, are chosen by them." This should be so among the heathen also.

In a republican government, whether civil or ecclesiastical, all power resides primarily in the people. Their will is the supreme law and their good the supreme end. They are to be the judge of their highest good and the way to attain it. All power proceeds from them, however it may be exercised. Sometimes it is exercised by their immediate representatives, at other times by those more remote. When the immediate representatives act the majority is one of numbers. When the remote representatives act the majority is one of power. But the ruling power, in both cases, is the people. In the Session, Presbytery and Synod, they rule by their immediate representatives. In the General Assembly, they rule by the remote. This principle is acknowledged in the civil government which is republican. The people elect immediate representatives to rule in the Legislature. These elect others to rule in the Senate. It is therefore not only "inherently difficult" but contrary to all just ideas of republican government, for the church at home to send rulers to those who live beyond the sea, and who had no voice in their election.

That rulers must be elected by the votes of the ruled is clearly taught in Scripture. The principal reliance of Prelatists for an appointing power is that, already examined, in Titus 1:5. Without referring to what has already been said on this, we may rest on the opinion of Neander to set it aside. His impartiality, learning and judgment will not be questioned on this subject. In his Church History (Vol. I. p, 189) as cited by Hackett on Acts 14:23, he writes thus: "When Paul empowers Titus to set pre-

siding officers over the communities who possessed the requisite qualifications, this circumstance decides nothing as to the mode of choice, nor is a choice by the community itself *thereby* necessarily excluded."

In Acts 6:5, 6, deacons were elected by the people. We may infer from this that all offices should be filled by a popular election unless a clear case of another kind is produced. With this instance in our favor the burden of proof falls upon those who would dispense with such an election.

In Acts 14:23, we read, "And when they had ordained them elders in every church." Dr. J. A. Alexander writes, in his commentary on this verse, as follows: "The use of this particular expression, (*χειροτονήσαντες*), which originally signified the vote of an Assembly, does suffice to justify us in supposing that the method of selection was the same as that recorded in 6:5-6, where it is explicitly recorded that the people chose the seven and the twelve ordained them."

In II Corinthians, 8:19, the people elect a travelling companion for the Apostle Paul, and this fact is cited by him as a sufficient reason for the confidence of the people in him as one suitable to take charge of the money collected for the poor saints. The voice of the people in popular elections was entitled to much weight, according to his mind.

The second step in constituting a Session is the ordination of those elected. In the Book of Church Order of our Southern Church, this is required to be done by "the minister with prayer and the laying on of the hands of the Session." But in the foreign field there are no elders to lay on hands and no commission from a Presbytery across the sea can do so. We hold that the people who elect should ordain by laying on their hands with prayer.

The Form of Government of the Northern Presbyterian Church dispenses with the laying on of hands at the ordination of elders. With them, it is a mere method that may be modified at will.

The sum of our argument in favor of ordination by the people in heathen lands is this: (1) It is in accordance with the

Scriptural doctrine about the source and nature of church rule. (2) Every attempt to organize in any other way yet made, has been virtually in accordance with prelatical or unrepublican ideas and in violation of the settled order of our church. (3) It is perfectly simple and practicable under all circumstances and in every part of the world. (4) The amendments to our Book of Church Order, founded on this doctrine, need be only three and they very simple.

H. M. WHITE.

VI. PRESBYTERY VS. EPISCOPACY.*

The General Council of the Episcopal Church which met last fall in the city of Chicago, addressed an overture to their "fellow Christians of different communions" on the subject of *Church Unity*.

In their declaration they recognize as "members of the Holy Catholic Church" "all who have been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost;" express an earnest desire "that the Saviour's prayer, that we all may be one, may, in its deepest and truest sense, be speedily fulfilled;" disclaim any desire "to absorb other communions;" and propose "to forego all preferences of their own," "in all things of human ordering," and to co-operate with other Christians "on the basis of a common faith and order." But, in further explanation of their position, they affirm that Christian Unity can be restored only by a return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Cath-

*1 "Declaration and Resolutions adopted by the House of Bishops and House of Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, convened in the city of Chicago, October 27, 1886." Journal p. 79.

2. "Some Thoughts on the late General Convention. An extract from the Bishop of Alabama's address to the Council of his Diocese, May 11, 1887."

3. "The Recent Past," by Bishop Wilmer, Chapter on "The Presbyterian Communion."

4. "An Open Letter (addressed by Rev. J. H. Stringfellow to Mr. W. C. Clarke) adopted 'as his own' by Bishop Wilmer, July 19, 1887."