

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1864.

No. II.

By D. E. Bohn

ART. I.—*Platonis*, et quæ vel Platonis esse feruntur, vel Platonica solent comitari, Scripta Græce omnia, ad Codices Manuscriptos recensuit, variasque inde Lectiones diligenter enotavit IMMANUEL BEKKER. Eleven volumes, 8vo. London, 1826.

The Works of Plato, viz., his fifty-five Dialogues and twelve Epistles, translated from the Greek, by FLOYER SYDENHAM, and THOMAS TAYLOR, with occasional Annotations and copious Notes. Five volumes, quarto. London, 1804.

The Works of Plato; a new and literal version, chiefly from the text of Stallbaum. By HENRY CARY, M. A., HENRY DAVIS, M. A., and GEORGE BURGESS, M. A. Five volumes, 12mo. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1848.

To most of the editions of the works of Plato are prefixed brief sketches of the philosopher's life. The edition of Bekker contains four of these biographies in Greek, viz., those by Diogenes Laertius, Suidas, Hesychius the Milesian, and Olympiodorus. The edition of Taylor has the sketch by Olympiodorus, translated into English. The translators of Bohn's edition propose to give, in an additional volume, what they call, "the three existing lives of the philosopher, and the introduction of Alcinous, all for the first time translated into English." Some of these have certainly been translated into English; whether all, we are not able to say.

By S. John C. Loomis.

ART. V.—*History and Ecclesiastical Relations of the Churches of the Presbyterian order at Amoy, China.* New York, 1863.

THIS pamphlet treats of a somewhat novel case in the work of Christian Missions, and one that teaches lessons of general interest. We need not enter into the history of these churches, nor of the discussions to which they have given rise in a respected body of our Presbyterian brethren—this publication showing that the questions at issue are hardly yet settled; but we may state that the peculiarities of the case grow out of the fact, that the missionaries concerned belong to two different ecclesiastical bodies, one American, the other English, though these bodies hold the same views of doctrine and church order. It was to be expected that these brethren would labour together in a spirit of Christian harmony, and their labours, by the blessing of God, have resulted in the gathering of several churches in Amoy and its vicinity. Should these churches be connected with the churches in England or America, or be independent of foreign control? This is the main question here discussed. A connected question is also discussed. Should the missionaries at Amoy become members of the ecclesiastical organization, which embraces these native churches, or retain their connection with their presbyteries at home? The writer of the pamphlet, who is a respected American missionary of Amoy, contends earnestly for the separation of the churches from all foreign ecclesiastical relations, and for the missionaries remaining in their church relations at home. A particular point which he endeavours to make is, that these native churches should not be so connected with the American Synod, whose missionaries are on the ground, as to separate them from equal connection with the English brethren. And the conclusion of his argument is, that “all the branches of the great Presbyterian family in the same region in any heathen country, which are sound in the faith,” should “organize themselves, *if convenient*, into one organic whole, allowing liberty to the different parts in things non-essential.”

The subject has received the consideration of the chief judicatory of the church with which the author is connected, and we do not feel called to review their decision in the case, which was adverse to his wishes. We may respectfully suggest, however, that as both the home churches can endorse each other's soundness in the faith and general ecclesiastical position, some method might perhaps be devised by which the native churches could remain in the same presbytery, and yet sustain relations to the churches at home sufficient for needful purposes; while the missionaries of both bodies might be members of the Amoy presbytery, but with unbroken relations to their home churches respectively. We see how complex this looks, and yet if both these respected churches could adopt some well considered *joint* regulation on the subject,¹ it might be found that no serious practical difficulties would be met with. Considering the past course and present status of the case, taking it as it stands, as described in this pamphlet we suppose correctly, and not as it might have been if the missionaries had pursued a somewhat different course, we are disposed to think it would be expedient to sanction now what cannot well be changed at this late day. We express this opinion, not only with deference to the views of others, but with some hesitation, because it may appear to uphold the arguments of the pamphlet. Some of these are just and weighty, but others are the reasonings not of Presbytery, but of Independency. We found our suggestion on grounds of Christian expediency, no true principle of Presbyterianism seeming to be involved, and this expediency as shown by the facts here reported.

We pass from the case of these churches at Amoy to the general subject of the superintendence of foreign missions. This will lead us to consider the relations of missionaries and of mission churches to each other and to the mother church, as these relations affect the question of supervision. We may have occasion to refer to some things in this pamphlet, but our topic is one not of local, but of general interest. We shall look at it from the point of view occupied by our church. Other churches have their respective methods of superintending the work of missions, methods formed or modified by doctrinal or ecclesiastical views; with these we have no quarrel. Christian

union is nowhere more important than on missionary ground, and it is nowhere more practically exemplified; while yet denominational preferences are manifested there, as they must be everywhere else so long as men are not agreed in their views of doctrine or church order. It is not possible to give the gospel in the abstract to the heathen; men can no more disregard questions of church order and of doctrine in China than in America; they present themselves whenever a child is to be baptized, a church to be organized, or a minister to be ordained. Christian union is not to be promoted by throwing down denominational lines, but in the good old way of spreading the truth as it is revealed—doing this more and more in the loving spirit of the great Teacher, and then when men are agreed they will walk together.

In the meantime our missionary work must, from the nature of the case, conform to the views of truth and church order which are held by those who engage in it. Missions are but the outgrowth of Christian piety in the churches at home, streams from fountains in distant countries, and the distance to which they flow will not make them rise higher than their source. It will be found unwise for missionaries to adopt measures that are much in advance of the home position of their churches on union with other churches. It is doubtful whether Christian union has been promoted by the course pursued at Amoy, the brethren there having outrun their churches at home, or at least one of these churches, causing not a little painful feeling, of which we do not yet see the end. We are indeed warmly in favour of the union of all Christians, and especially of all Presbyterians, but we see clearly that it must be union founded on agreement in the truth—in the doctrines of grace, and agreement also, though not so completely, in respect to the order of the church.

The work of missions needs superintendence of some kind. It is, indeed, a work divinely simple in its objects and resting on the principle of faith; but it is vast in its extent, and it is carried on in different countries, and among people of various languages; it relates to preaching, teaching, translating the Scriptures, organizing churches, transforming the moral elements of society; it involves a considerable expenditure of

money, which is given by numerous and widely separated donors, each of whom is entitled to be well assured that his gift is expended to the best advantage of the great object in view; it includes many details, and often it must be accomplished in new and perplexing circumstances. The missionaries are at first usually young men, necessarily possessing but little experience, needing counsel; and they are mostly men of such excellence that they welcome, within proper limits, the assistance and direction of their brethren. It is never the best and ablest missionaries, so far as our observation goes, who say, "Send out the best men, supply them with all the funds they need, and then let them do all the good they can." It is not any missionary of our church, we have reason to believe, who could make the remark of a letter writer in this pamphlet, "that your Boards at home should be content to consider themselves a committee to raise and send on the funds." It is not necessary to dwell longer, however, on the importance of the superintendence of missions. It should be properly regulated, and by no means irresponsible; it should be intelligent, wise, considerate, and eminently forbearing; but that it should not be real and sufficient, we see no more reason for believing in the work of missions than in the work of the ministry at home. Indeed, our church system is pervaded with this salutary influence in all its parts. Sessions watch over the members of the church, and these over each other in a brotherly spirit; presbyteries watch over churches and all persons under their care, and so of all our church courts. Congregations watch over their pastors, informally but really, with sympathy, kindness, and prayer it ever should be. Our professors, secretaries, and committees, are all men under law, and not independent; and we see not why missionaries should be considered an excepted class, and, so far as we are informed, it is not the missionaries of our church who would covet an independent position.

How then shall this superintendence be conducted? In a full reply to this inquiry, the home and the foreign aspects of the subject might be separately discussed, but we need not pay much attention to this division; the principles involved are of common value in the home or executive administration of the work, and in the performance of the work on missionary

ground, as will be apparent further on. Our reply to the question is, that so far as the supervision of the work of missions is official, it should be made through our church courts, and through such committee of missions as the General Assembly may appoint. To the former part of this answer no Presbyterian will object. In practice, the missions of our body are conformed to our theory; both missionaries and churches are connected with the church at home, amenable to its authority, and fully enjoying the benefits of its supervision. Where there are ministers enough in the mission they are organized as a presbytery, and it is an object of desire to have presbyteries formed in every missionary field as soon as the number of ministers will permit. We need not dwell on the subject of presbyterial superintendence, the same substantially in all parts of the world, and familiar to our readers. So far as the work of missions is concerned, it includes whatever is necessary in the relations of missionaries and their churches, both to each other and to the church supporting the mission.

While this supervision of presbytery is not repudiated in discussions such as we find in this pamphlet, it suffers loss from two opinions; indeed these virtually set aside the home superintendence of our Presbyterian system. One of these opinions maintains that the missionaries should not become members of presbyteries in the mission field, but should retain their connection with presbyteries at home; the other maintains that the native churches should be independent of our churches. According to one of these opinions, the church at home could exercise no ecclesiastical supervision whatever over the native converts of her missionaries; and according to the other, the missionaries would be virtually irresponsible to the church at home in their ecclesiastical relations, for no presbytery in this country could exercise much more than a nominal supervision over brethren living on the other side of the world. The situation of the native churches in this matter is in some respects peculiar. Too far distant to send commissioners to the General Assembly, speaking a different language, mostly in very straitened pecuniary circumstances, it is obvious that these native brethren cannot enjoy the full benefit of our presbyterial system; nobody claims this on their behalf. But this should

not preclude their enjoying such advantages as may be within their reach—the sympathy, care, and appellate jurisdiction of our synods and assemblies, so far as the nature of the case permits. Practical matters of great moment may be brought before the higher church courts from the missionary presbyteries without personal representation, and from individual members also in many instances, just as in similar cases at home. It is not to be conceded that a native appellant or memorialist would not receive justice at the hands of the distant court of his brethren; and we are surprised at the reference in support of this imputation, on page 61 of the pamphlet, to a native pastor in India, as finding “some insuperable difficulty in getting his case before the General Assembly.” This is a mistake. The reference is, not to the “but one native pastor” of our church in that country, but to the only one out of three who felt aggrieved for a time, having been led to think that his ordination made him a member of the “Mission,” as distinguished from the presbytery. The former in its theory is but a sub-committee of the home executive committee, entrusted with certain business matters, and no more including all the missionaries in a particular field than the executive committee includes all the ministers in the presbytery of New York. Our native brother, who is now entered into his rest, did forward a complaint to the General Assembly touching this matter; but our information is that it was not received in time to be laid before that body, and before its next meeting he had become convinced of his error. It is certain, however, that he laboured in harmony with his brethren many years thereafter, even until his lamented death.

The relation between the native churches and their far distant mother church, moreover, is only temporary and transitional. While they are children, let them enjoy whatever benefits they may be able to derive from their friends in another land; it will be the prayer of all that they may soon be able to dispense with aid from abroad. Happy for them and for us, the hour when they can stand alone as a native church! In the meantime, we are glad to think of the native church members and office-bearers, at Corisco, at Ningpo, at Lodiana, and at other missionary stations, as Christian brethren of our commu-

nion, holding the same doctrines, worshipping God in the same order, and represented more or less completely in the same ecclesiastical system.

The other opinion would keep the missionaries in connection with the presbyteries at home, and separate them from any ecclesiastical relations with the native churches. This view seems to us objectionable on various grounds, while we can see hardly anything to be gained by it. If, indeed, the local presbytery were not connected with the General Assembly, it might happen that the foreign members, being outnumbered by the native members, would suffer inconvenience from being subject to brethren less educated and less qualified to judge than themselves; but this is to suppose an improbable case. It is altogether likely that the missionaries would always possess quite as much influence in presbytery as they ought to have; indeed, the practical danger would be that of their having too much influence. They would need to guard against overshadowing their native brethren, and to be watchful to put honour upon them in presbyterial proceedings; and if irregular measures should be adopted by them against the voice of the missionaries, a corrective influence might be drawn from the appellate action of the church in this country, and at any rate the missionaries could easily be shielded from serious injury.

Let us take a good example, as to both these points and others also. We see a company of missionaries landed on the island of Corisco, brought together from different presbyteries at home. After some time they can preach in Benga, and they are called to organize churches, to train and license candidates for the ministry, to ordain ministers of the gospel, some as evangelists, others as pastors of churches. Here is presbyterial work to be done. Let the missionary presbyters constitute themselves into the presbytery of Corisco for its orderly performance, under the rules of the General Assembly which provide for such cases. *Minutes of General Assembly*, 1838, p. 42; 1848, p. 21. *Baird's Digest*, book v., sects. 122—125. The membership of this presbytery will consist of all the ministers and an elder from each church in a certain district, agreeably to the well known order of our standards. We would not restrict clerical membership in this body to native ministers; we

would not exclude the foreign ministers, the founders of the churches, because, 1. According to our theory, these ministers are all of official parity—no matter for their diversity of gifts, or their difference of race. We repudiate the idea that the missionaries have some quasi episcopal functions as evangelists, or any official superiority over their native brethren, and that they are to stand aloof from them, and to be regarded by them as of a superior order. Presbyterians have not so learned Christ and his church. These ministers at Corisco, as the ministers of Christ, occupy the same grade in his house, neither higher nor lower, because some of them are Americans and others Bengas.

2. These ministers can, as members of the same presbytery, best watch over each other's ministerial character and conduct. Obviously this is true as to the native ministers, who are as yet inexperienced, but partially educated, in need of counsel and coöperation, and whose wants in these respects can be supplied as occasion requires in the wide circle of circumstances and duties which occupy the attention of presbytery. The deliberations and proceedings of this body will afford to them an excellent school of ministerial training, and its fraternal intercourse will prevent or remove misunderstandings between the foreign and the native ministers.

The benefits of this common presbyterial union of the missionaries must not be considered as only one-sided. The foreign minister may derive much advantage from membership in the local presbytery, especially as compared with membership in a presbytery in a distant country. He may learn much from being thus brought into close official contact with his native brethren; he may be shielded sometimes from reproach; excited to greater fidelity, and comforted by brotherly sympathy; he may be aided in overcoming the peculiar temptations which assail him. An example may be cited here, without impropriety. An ordained missionary, not at Corisco, but in another part of Africa, was permitted to fall before temptation. He was connected with an interior presbytery in the southern part of our country, and after long delay, owing to the difficulty of action by a presbytery so far distant, he was eventually suspended from the ministry. Probably this minis-

ter might have been kept from falling, if he had been surrounded by the kindly restraints and benefits of a presbytery on the ground. It is pleasant to add, that the suspension was subsequently removed by a new presbytery formed in that country.

3. In this manner the best supervision of the native churches can be secured. It would be difficult to say whether the foreign or the native element could be eliminated from presbytery in respect to this supervision with least injury to the churches. The questions of casuistry, the cases of discipline, the measures for the spread of the gospel, all need the united action of both. Each may be helpful to the other, not only in private unofficial intercourse, but in presbyterial proceedings. We do not believe, however, that the foreign ministers should long act as pastors of the native churches. At first they must do so from necessity, but the continuance of this relation is not to be desired. In too many respects do the foreign ministers differ from their native brethren—in previous training, in social habits and usages, in all interior associations; besides, they have other and wider spreading work, which precludes their being long restricted to the care of a native church. On the other hand, the native minister is well qualified to be the under-shepherd of the flock; and only with such a pastor can any native church learn the duty of supporting the ministry of the gospel. Yet in many things the native pastor will long need the counsel and assistance of his foreign brethren, and it may be their protection also, as members of the same presbytery. In all these matters the aim of the missionaries should be so to mould and direct the native Christian community, clerical and lay, as to dispense with foreign dependence and assistance at the earliest possible period.

We need not dwell on this point, though we must add that it is not an objection to the foregoing outline, to say that these missionary presbyteries are and will be mainly American in their membership. At first, of course, they are; but will they so continue? Surely not, if God be still with his servants in their work. How soon these temporary relations between the churches in Africa, India, China, and elsewhere, and our General Assembly will be dissolved, by their advance in growth

and strength, we do not venture to predict. In some cases it will be at an earlier day than in others. If the intercommunication of nations continues to increase in speed and facility, the difficulties of the present relations between the missionary churches and their mother church will diminish; but nevertheless both parties should pray for the day of their happy separation. In the meantime, while our church will still be the church in the United States, its representation may include her sons and their spiritual offspring in other countries, as the civil government of the country extends its protection over our citizens and their children in foreign lands. It would be no impossible thing for a distinguished leader of one of our great armies to be elected as our chief magistrate, though he was born in Spain; neither do we see any insuperable difficulty in the way of a venerable Chinese or Hindu minister of the gospel, speaking our language as well as do many of his countrymen, being called thirty years hence to preside in our highest Assembly, and doing this with dignity and grace.

We shall not enter at any length on the second official way of exercising missionary supervision, through such committee or board of missions as the General Assembly may appoint, and subordinately through what are called missions—or sub-committees of the executive committee—in the missionary fields. This kind of supervision is regarded with jealousy by some. We may readily concede that an irresponsible committee, or one amenable only to public opinion, might wield its superintendence injuriously, while those who suffered thereby would have little hope of redress; and we also concede that any committee may make mistakes, even though it be composed of men who are under law, and who are governed by the best motives. But on the theory of our church, these committees do not supersede in any way our regular church courts, nor in the least degree interfere with their proper action; in fact, these committees or boards are but business organizations, created by the General Assembly, subject to its modification, and liable to be dissolved at its pleasure. All their proceedings, moreover, pass annually under the review of the Assembly; and it is easy for any missionary, or even for any member amongst the hundreds of thousands of our communicants, to obtain in an

orderly way an examination of alleged grievances or misuse of power. Let application be made in a Christian spirit to those who are intrusted with the oversight of the work of missions—first, to the executive officers; next, if need be, to the Board. If further examination is needed, then let application be made to the General Assembly, through the usual forms. It speaks well for the Board and its executive committee and officers, and for the missionaries; or rather it speaks well for the correctness of our missionary system, that in the period of more than thirty years since the work of foreign missions was entered upon in its present methods by the Synod of Pittsburgh, no complaint has been laid before the General Assembly touching the administration of the missionary interests of our church.

Let it be remembered that the Board, as appointed by the General Assembly, is not an ecclesiastical body, but a kind of permanent or standing committee of that body, “to which, for the time being, shall be entrusted, with such directions and instructions as may from time to time be given by the General Assembly, the superintendence of the foreign missionary operations of the Presbyterian church.” *Minutes of General Assembly* 1837, p. 452. This board or committee might be dispensed with, and its functions performed by the General Assembly itself, if requisite attention could be given by that body to many matters of business which are involved in the missionary work. Or a presbytery, two or more presbyteries, a synod, or several synods, might engage directly in this work; but they would soon find great inconvenience in attending to its business matters, and to the superintendence of missionary affairs in the field of labour. These would be found indeed so onerous as to prove a fatal hinderance in most cases to the prosecution of the work by such bodies, in their formal action as church courts—at least so we are persuaded. The Board becomes an indispensable part of our agency. This Board might be appointed or constituted in different methods. The simpler these are, the better; and the more closely the Board is connected with and dependent on the General Assembly, undoubtedly the better it will prove for all parties, and all the interests of the cause of missions; but we need not here enter further into the consideration of these points.

We take the Board as it stands, charged with "the superintendence of the foreign missionary operations" of our church. These include the choice of missionary fields, the appointment of missionaries, making provision for their support and that of their work, the general oversight of their proceedings, as well as of many matters of detail connected with the welfare of families so far separated from their friends and country. A more singularly miscellaneous class of duties and interests can be found in no part of our commercial metropolis than is found to centre at the Mission House, and many of these interests are of the highest importance. Besides the various matters abroad which require supervision, the home department of the work must receive due attention; this includes the care of missionary funds, the preparation of annual reports, the publication of missionary intelligence, a remarkably varied correspondence, &c. The least inspection of this list will suggest questions concerning details, which we must pass by with the remark that these administrative affairs are so performed and made matters of record, as to admit of being readily understood. The accountability of those engaged in these things is complete.

Looking now on the duties entrusted to the Board with particular reference to the superintendence of the missions, we note, 1. It is not ecclesiastical; it does not take into its purview any ecclesiastical questions whatever. 2. It follows mainly the line of pecuniary outlay. Is it proposed to send out a new missionary, to establish a new mission, to occupy a new station, to erect a dwelling-house, to open a school? All of these are things calling for the expenditure of the missionary funds of the church, and in all of them the committee not only may with propriety, but must of necessity, if they would be faithful in their "superintendence," be satisfied as to the expediency of such expenditure. Were there but one mission, or but a single missionary, the funds of the church might be devoted to the work in progress with less need of minute supervision. It would then be practicable to transmit the money without much scrutiny of the way in which it would be expended—though even then inquiry, deliberation, and judgment on the part of the home executive officers could do no harm;

but the case is different when several missions and numerous missionaries are supported by the church. The apportionment of the missionary funds becomes then a question of relative importance, and one that, from the nature of the case, must be decided by the central committee, after viewing the whole field of labour; the appointment of missionaries to different missions must be made also from this same central point of view. As to their posts of labour, however, the missionaries are always consulted, and usually the reasons which lead the executive committee to propose to them the occupancy of a particular field, will be found to be such as will satisfy their judgment; besides, none are appointed to any mission without their consent. All this has much to do with the future supervision of their work, as from the beginning the relations between the missionaries and the executive officers are those which should exist between Christian brethren who are engaged in a common enterprise.

The distribution of funds among different missions, and to each mission separately, is also conducted on the basis of a common interest, though here a somewhat different responsibility attaches to the labourers in the missionary rooms and those in the fields abroad. In usual practice, the subject is found to be arranged without friction. The missionaries make estimates of the expenditures of the coming year, giving details specifying their own support, that of their native assistants, and the expenses of the various departments of the work. These estimates from all the missions are considered by the home committee, acting with such particular knowledge of most if not all the matters concerned, as enables them to form an independent judgment of their expediency; in this way a wise conclusion is reached as to the amount of funds that should be transmitted to each mission, or rather the amount that can be sent in view of the probable income of the Board. Two things are obvious here, 1. That there must be a central or home committee to take the executive charge of these matters; and 2. That this committee and its officers stand in a twofold relation—on one side, to the churches at home; on the other, to the missionaries abroad.

It will readily be seen that in the oversight of matters of

such moment, and particularly of a somewhat large pecuniary outlay, in so many different countries and ways, there is need on the part of the home agents of a wise discretion; of firmness also, coupled with self-distrust and a reliance on the guidance of Divine grace. But inasmuch as all engaged in the missionary work, at home and abroad, are men actuated by the mind and spirit of Christ, as they hold the same views of doctrine and church order, as they have had very much the same religious and social training, they will probably adopt the same views of missionary procedure; and thus the supervision of the work of missions will usually be a matter of quiet and pleasant duty, involving no unreasonable exactions on the one side, and complied with on the other in that spirit of good regard for order which characterizes our body. And on both sides, it is of course well understood that the General Assembly is a common appellate and controlling body—the true Board of Missions in our church, whose decisions of all questions are open, conformed to well-known rules, and as likely to be fair and correct as could be expected in view of the imperfection of all things in this world. This statement of the subject will tend to show that the superintendence of the missionaries and the mission churches, or the relations of these to the church at home, will in most cases be conducted in a manner that will prove acceptable to all parties; and this, as we have already remarked, is the result as attested by the history of thirty years. Excepted cases will occur, and such have occurred, and as extreme cases test the principles involved in ordinary routine, let us glance for a moment at one referred to above. It was a case of scandal. There was no presbytery on the ground to deal with it; for various reasons the action of the presbytery at home could not be had without much delay. The facts were placed before the executive committee on testimony that could not be reasonably doubted; but this committee, not being an ecclesiastical body, could take no steps of judicial process. They could, however, protect the interests of the mission and the missionary funds of the church, by dissolving the relation of the offending missionary to the Board; and this was done, while the facts of the case were transmitted to his presbytery. It was a grave proceeding on the part of

the committee, one not taken without full consideration, and one for which they stood prepared to answer, if necessary, at the highest tribunal of the church. The subsequent action of the presbytery fully sustained that of the committee; but if it had not, then the case would have necessarily been transferred to the decision of the General Assembly. All this proves clearly that the ecclesiastical, and the business or executive, supervision of the missions are, 1. Distinct from each other; 2. Substantial and real; 3. Harmonious; or if not in the first instance, in agreement, then 4. In the end all will be ordered aright by our highest church authority.

We have said nothing of the other methods of keeping the missions under proper supervision, and of regulating the whole missionary work, methods of which some profess to make exclusive use—such as the appointment of men as missionaries who are of the right stamp, trusting to the piety of the church, depending on public opinion, relying on the grace of God. Assuredly, we do not undervalue nor disparage any of these things, when we put honour on the ecclesiastical and executive arrangements of our body. It is our happiness to enjoy all that the most “voluntary” of our Christian brethren could claim in these respects, and in addition thereto the settled and wise order of our church. But we hesitate not to avow that our chief trust for harmony and efficiency, in all our missionary labours and the superintendence thereof, in the intercourse of missionaries with each other and with the executive committee, and in the care of the churches, is found in the fulfilment of our Lord’s gracious promise, “Lo, I am with you always”—a promise given expressly to encourage the missionary work of his people. It is the mind of Christ in his servants, that lowly mind so wonderful in the Lord of glory, that disposition not to please himself, that humility and love which led him to wash his disciples’ feet, that devotedness which made him account it as his meat and his drink to do the will of his heavenly Father; it is these gracious dispositions that will best guard both the missionaries and their brethren at home against occasions of offence, just as it is Divine aid and power that will give sure success to this work of their hands.