

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW,

VOL. XXXII.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXXI.

ARTICLE I.

OUR CHURCH POLICY—SHALL IT BE PROGRESS OR PETRIFICATION?

ARE THERE TO BE NO CHANGES?

Of the five grand divisions of revealed truth—Theology, Anthropology, Soteriology, Ecclesiology, and Eschatology—it is well known that the faith of the Church as to the first three has been definitely settled. As to the latter two, it is different. Questions of eschatology have furnished the basis for the wildest vagaries and speculations: while in church polity the deviations from the scriptural standard were early and are radical.

The mind of the Church is not yet determined even as to the fundamental questions of ecclesiology; for we have the monarchic, aristocratic, republican, and democratic policies, all maintained and practised to-day. Within the limits of these radical theories there are variant and discordant opinions. This is seen in our republican Presbyterianism. The mother Church of Scotland has never had but one theology; she has had, however, two books of discipline. In this country we adopted neither of the Scotch formularies, but took the English Westminster, and modified it. Under this we had repeated, prolonged, and bitter controversies. We have revised, developed, pruned, and greatly improved it in our present Book of Church Order. But

it is manifest that the thoughtful and progressive element in the Church is not yet satisfied. No one wishes to change our Confession of Faith or Catechisms; but there are many who believe that we have not yet succeeded in developing and perfecting a pure scriptural Presbyterianism.

The reason for this unsettled state of belief as to ecclesiastical questions is not difficult to find. Matters of theology, anthropology, and soteriology, are fundamental and essential to salvation. They are therefore fully and clearly revealed. Church polity, while important to the perfection of belief, is not of the essence of saving faith. It has pleased the inspiring Spirit accordingly to make it less fully the matter of direct revelation, and to leave it largely to the sphere of "good and necessary consequences."

The issues involved in Retrenchment and Reform are partly of principle and partly of expediency. The former are the more important, and require the more careful discussion, because they are fundamental and determinative of the practical issues involved. Moreover, these theoretical points lie at the root of the ecclesiastical tree, and their determination involves the perfection of our Presbyterian system.

There are questions here of order, and questions of jurisdiction. The first relate to both of the orders of church officers, the deacon and the bishop.

As to the DEACON, there are issues as to his functions and as to his sphere. As to the *functions* of the deacon, is he merely an almoner? Do his duties relate exclusively to the care of the poor? Or, on the other hand, is he the financial officer of the Church, to whom all of its secular affairs are to be committed?

I. The teachings of the Scriptures are to be first consulted. There are probably but three passages in which the deacon, as an officer of the Church, is distinctly referred to. Two of these are Phil. i. 1, and 1 Tim. iii. 8-13. As bearing upon the issue now before us, these texts teach an important truth, that deacons and bishops are *distinct* officers. The pertinency of this will appear as the discussion proceeds. In accordance with this, the Westminster Form of Government, Chap. VI., declares that "the

Scriptures clearly point out deacons as distinct officers in the Church." There are two orders of officers in the church. It is not a mere distinction of grade, but of order or office.

The classic passage, however, is Acts vi. 1-7. 1. That the officers here chosen were deacons, is the traditional, the catholic, and the present interpretation. Moreover, the word deacon is twice used in the original. "The daily ministration" is the daily deaconing. "To serve tables" is to deacon tables.

The passage may not have been primarily designed to set forth the institution of the office, but merely as an introduction to the martyrdom of Stephen, as Olshausen and others contend. Indeed, this may not be the original appointment of deacons. It is most probable that it was not. Who was it that, prior to this, had done the daily ministering, and of whom complaint was made to the apostles? Surely it was not the apostles, as some think. The murmuring was by the Grecians against the Hebrews. It is therefore decidedly probable, as the new deacons were Gentiles, that the distribution had before been made by Hebrew deacons. However all this may be, the passage is the divine record of the appointment and functions of the deacon.

2. The text teaches, as do the others where the deacon is referred to, that deacons and bishops are distinct officers. No truth can be plainer than this. Here they are set forth not only as separate, but as strongly contrasted offices.

3. The *raison d'être* of the deacon is here clearly stated to be to relieve the bishops of duties which they could not properly discharge.

4. The reason why the bishops required this relief was not simply, nor mainly, because they had not sufficient leisure. It is not merely because they had other duties, but because those other duties were not germane. The contrast is between the duties. Their calling was a different and a higher one. They could not leave it for the serving of tables.

5. The functions appropriate to the bishop, as distinct from the deacon, are prayer and the ministry of the word.

6. *The whole passage is typical and representative.* The apostles here confessedly represent all ministers. The deacons

here represent all deacons. The congregation represents all congregations. The election of the deacons by the people represents the republican principle in the organisation of the church. Ordination of the deacons by prayer and the laying on of hands, represents the ordination of all church officers. The neglected Grecian widows represent all the needy Hellenists. The needy Hellenists represent all of God's poor of every age and country. No one will dispute any of these statements. If, then, in these seven particulars, this passage is typical, are we not bound to believe that the care of the poor is itself a typical, representative, illustrative function? That it was the purpose of the divine Spirit in this to embody and represent all similar work; to set forth the deacon as the relief of the bishop from all financial or secular concerns of the Church? The conclusion seems irresistible.

7. The object of the appointment of the deacon was to relieve the other officer of the Church. This is clear. Is not the management of the finances of the Church as incompatible with the duties of the ministry as the care of the poor? Is it not even more so? Must not the deacons therefore be intrusted with it?

8. There are manifestly two classes of officers in the Church. There are also two classes of ecclesiastical functions, the purely spiritual, and the secular or financial. Now, can it be the divine arrangement that the bishop shall discharge all the purely spiritual functions and a large share of the secular also? Or, can it be, as asserted by Dr. Lefevre, that no provision has been made for the discharge of these necessary ecclesiastical, secular functions, outside of the care of the poor? Is it not as clear as light, that the two classes of functions correspond to the two classes of officers; that the bishops are to attend to the spiritual, and the deacons to the secular, affairs of the Church?

9. The same conclusion may be reached on the very ground of those strict constructionists, who would limit the diaconal functions to the care of the poor. Who are the Lord's poor? Are widows, orphans, the destitute, alone? Are not the Lord's ministers—candidates, licentiates, ordained—who have consecrated themselves to his service, and have surrendered all earthly

avocations or means of support? Are not the Lord's missionaries, foreign and home, who have denied themselves the comforts as well as the luxuries of life, and who are dependent for their bread upon the sustenance of the Church? Are not all the Lord's churches and enterprises which, in the very nature of the case, can be sustained only from the contributions of his people? In a word, are not all of the Lord's people and causes that are destitute of secular means of support? If, therefore, the deacon was appointed to administer the finances of the church for the benefit of the Lord's poor, to him must be committed the collection and distribution of *all* the charitable contributions of the people.

II. So far in discussing the functions of the diaconate, we have had constantly in view the teachings of the Scriptures. We now turn to the standards of the Church. In the masterly report made to the Synod of South Carolina on THE DIACONATE, and published in this REVIEW, January, 1880, pp. 130-133, will be found extracts from The Discipline of the Reformed Churches of France, The First Book of Discipline and The Second Book of Discipline of the Church of Scotland, and from the Acts of the Free Church of Scotland, all asserting the common belief, as substantially stated in the Second Book of Discipline: "Their (the deacons') office and power is to receive and distribute the whole ecclesiastical goods."

The record of our Church is not so satisfactory. It shows growth, however. Every intelligent Presbyterian knows that the state of opinion and the practice of the American Church, on the diaconate, are not at all what they ought to be. There are large sections of the Church which are corrupted with Congregational views and practices. This was manifest in the discussions of the Peoria Assembly, 1863, as to the Old School Presbyterian Church of the North at that time. Trustees and committee-men occupy the place which properly belongs to the deacon.

Both our old Form of Government and our new state that, to the deacons "may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the church." While this language is not

what we think truth requires, yet, if the deacons may properly manage the temporal affairs, and it is no where said that any one else may, it surely indicates that they are the officers for the work. To those who believe that what is not commanded is forbidden, these compromise expressions are out of place in a book professedly founded on the word of God.

Our new Form of Government has made an advance on the old in the statement, Chap. IV., Sec. 4, § 2. that the duties of the diaconal "office especially relate to the care of the poor *and* to the collection and distribution of the offerings of the people for pious uses, under the direction of the Session." Here it is distinctly asserted that the functions of the deacon are not limited to the care of the poor, but extend to all offerings for pious purposes.

III. It is shown by extracts from their writings, in the Report to the Synod of South Carolina, before mentioned, that the standard theologians and ecclesiastics have been agreed upon this point, that the deacons are the divinely ordained financial officers of the church, and that their functions are not exhausted in the care of the poor. Such were the views, as there set forth, of Eusebius, Origen, Sozomen, Calvin, Steuart of Pardovan, Alex. Henderson, Dickson, Jno. Owen, Lightfoot, Ridgeley, Samuel Miller, Thos. Smyth, and, *facile princeps inter pares*, Thornwell. Says Thornwell, Vol. IV., p. 201: "It must be perfectly obvious to every candid mind, that the entire secular business of the Church was intrusted to the deacons."

As to the *sphere* of the deacon, the question is more interesting, because it is newer and more warmly contested. The one party asserts that the deacon's sphere is exclusively congregational; that he can be officially employed by the Session, but not by the Presbytery or any of the higher courts. The other view contends that, while his work is primarily and mainly congregational, he can and should be used, if needed, by any of the higher courts.

I. We Presbyterians have always contended that the Church, under all dispensations, has ever been essentially the same. This is our unanswerable argument with the rejectors of infant

baptism. When, however, we have gone back of the Christian era to find the officers of the Church, we have sought for them in the synagogue, and not in the temple service. This has been done to strengthen ourselves in opposing the papal priesthood. This is unnecessary, and puts us to a great disadvantage in the argument. The temple service was manifestly the service of the old economy for at least fifteen centuries. Indeed, its essentials go back to our first parents. The synagogue is not known nor recognised in the Old Testament; at any rate, not until the return from the captivity. To plant ourselves, therefore, on the synagogue exclusively, and in opposition to the temple, is to admit that our system is not countenanced by the leading features of the old ecclesiasticism.

It is doubtless true that the synagogue is the connecting link between the temple and the *ecclesia*; and that the *ecclesia* is more like the synagogue than the temple. Still there is such a general correspondence between the *ecclesia* and the temple as to justify a reasoning by analogy from one to the other.

Timid brethren will say, No, and start back affrighted; but there is no danger. Let us stand by our fundamental position, that the Church has ever been essentially the same. But this, it is said, makes the modern minister a priest; for the bishop of the New Testament must correspond to the priest of the Old. This is even so. What then? The altar, a victim, transubstantiation? By no means. The priest of the temple was the official leader of its worship. The chief act of worship in the temple was the offering of sacrifices. These sacrifices were typical and prophetic. As soon, therefore, as the prophecy was fulfilled in the appearance and sacrifice of the Antitype, then, of course, they became an anachronism. But the worship of Jehovah has not ceased. The temple has simply become the church, and the priest the minister of the sanctuary. There is nothing dreadful in this.

If the bishop had his prototype in the priest, who, under the old economy, represented the deacon? If there were no diaconal functions to be discharged, then there was no deacon. If there were, then he must be in the old Church as well as in the

new. What have we learned to be the functions of the deacon? The administration of ecclesiastical finances. Was there no such administration under Moses? Has the Church in this world ever been able to do without the purse? It has always been the law, that "they which minister about holy things should live of the temple," and "they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." Who were the Old Testament deacons? The Levites, manifestly; for, 1. They had charge of the tabernacle or temple, its vessels and its offerings. 1 Chron. ix. 23, 27-29. 2. They had charge of the temple treasury. 1 Chron. ix. 26. 3. They were the tithe-gatherers and distributors. Neh. x. 37, 38.

If the Levite of the temple finds himself in the deacon of the New Testament, then, as the Levite was an officer of the general Church, so is also the deacon.

It is an objection to this argument that it is novel. On that account it is presented with diffidence; and yet we do not see why it is not altogether sound.

II. There is a significance in the connexion between the deacons and the apostles. Acts vi. 1-7. It was not an ordinary bishop whom they were appointed to relieve, but the apostles, the general officers of the primitive Church. We do not lay much stress on this, and yet it is not without its force, as indicating that the deacons are capable of being employed in the general as well as the congregational work of the Church.

In this connexion we shall venture to make a suggestion by way of conjecture. May not Mark, Luke, Tychicus, Epaphras, and others, have been apostolic deacons, attending upon Paul in order that they might discharge diaconal functions in connexion with his general apostolic work? He says expressly of Mark, that he was profitable to him for the deaconship. 2 Tim. iv. 11.

III. This question of the propriety of using the deacon for the general work of the higher courts is settled by the fundamental fact of the unity of the Church. This is an essential element of Presbyterianism. Based upon this is the principle, that any court of the Church has a right to command the services of any member or officer within the limits of its jurisdiction. There are

only two limitations to this: the ecclesiastical capacity of the party commanded, and his conscientious convictions. A member is a member of a particular church and of the general Church. An officer is an officer of a particular church and of the general Church. A member may not be directed to do an officer's work: nor a deacon a bishop's; nor a bishop a deacon's. But a member may be directed by any church court, to whose jurisdiction he belongs, to do any church work of which he is capable. Any bishop may be similarly directed by any of his superior courts. Just so the deacon. If a Presbytery needs a deacon, it has a right to call upon any deacon of any of its churches. If a Synod, it can do the same. So the General Assembly.

IV. There is another way in which this can be as clearly seen. It is found in the principle, that sphere is co-extensive with function. If Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, are lawful courts, as we all believe, and if they have diaconal work to do, as they have, then who shall do that work? If diaconal functions go up with the courts, in their ascending series, shall not the deacon go along in order to discharge them? If the Lord gives the higher courts deacons' work to do, he certainly designed that the deacon should do it.

V. We do not call any man master, and yet in divine truth, as in scientific truth, there are great differences amongst men. Some have a talent for one branch, some for another. Some improve their natural talents to the utmost, and others neglect what little capacity they may have. There is nothing degrading in bowing to mental kinghood. There are men whom not to respect and venerate would be disloyalty to truth and to God. It is not their name, their wealth, their ancestry, their position, that we admire, but that, in the heraldry of heaven, they are written princes, kings, emperors, in the domain of truth.

In the department of ecclesiology there are two men in our American Church who tower as giants amongst their brethren. Naturally gifted, they improved their powers until such manifest superiority was theirs, that their brethren, with one acclaim, have placed the crown of royal authority upon their brows, and defer to them as masters of ecclesiastical law. The first of these

is the most venerated man that our Southland Church has ever known; whose writings on Church law are the most valuable contributions in the English tongue. The other is the hero of the Act and Testimony, of the struggle of 1837-8; the Kentucky giant, who won for the Church the great battle of the eldership. There is another, yet living, who well deserves a place by the side of these: the author of the ablest paper ever presented to our General Assembly, and who is doubtless destined to do for the deacon the same work that Breckinridge did for the elder.

Now is it not a significant fact that these three men, the leading ecclesiastical jurists of the Church, agree in considering the deacon an officer of the general as well as of the local Church? It is incredible that they could all be mistaken.

We shall quote from but one of the three; and from him only because it was denied, on the floor of the Assembly at Staunton, that he held such views. Dr. Thornwell was not in the habit of speaking or writing in an indefinite way. His convictions were clear and decided, and the expression of them unmistakable. From much more that he says on this point, we select the following: We "must either admit that the Presbyterian Form of Government is unscriptural, or that deacons may act for Presbyteries as they act for their particular congregations." Vol. IV., Page 200.

It is urged in opposition to this view, and in favor of the purely congregational sphere of the deacon:

1. That the deacon is ordained over a particular congregation, and therefore his duties are limited to that congregation. This was the objection urged by Dr. Hodge, in his famous controversy with Dr. Thornwell. It was triumphantly met by Dr. Thornwell by the simple statement, that this was equally true of the elder. We may add that the same is true of the preacher. All ordinations, as our new Book says, are "a special charge" and "to the performance of a definite work." This, however, does not prevent the higher courts from using the elders and preachers for the functions to which they are ordained. Nor should it preclude a similar use of the deacons.

It is no answer to this to say that elders and ministers are

members of the higher courts, and are, therefore, subject to their call. Because, deacons are not members of the Session, and yet are confessedly to be used by it. Nor are elders and ministers always members of the higher courts which employ them. Our secretaries and clerks, permanent and stated, are seldom members of the General Assembly. Membership is not necessary.

2. It was urged by Mr. Hopkins, before the Staunton Assembly, that our Form of Government, Ch. IV., Sec. 4, §2, places the deacons "under the direction of the Session"; and that this impliedly forbids their employment by the higher courts. Although presented with emphasis by an intelligent gentleman, this objection amounts to nothing; for it cannot be doubted that such a thought never entered the brain of the eminent revisers of our Book, nor into the mind of a single presbyter who voted for its adoption. The clause has a meaning, clear and unmistakable, and it simply affirms the subjection of the diaconate to the presbyterate; and this, whether in the congregation, the Presbytery, the Synod, or the Assembly.

3. There is, however, one objection which is so unanimously and persistently presented by the opposition, that it ought, at least, to have force. It is the custom of the Church. We are a conservative people. It is the glory of our Zion that we are such. The Presbyteries, Synods, and Assemblies of our fathers, did not employ deacons, therefore we should not do so.

We are as proud as our brethren of the conservatism of our Church. We would not be, like the Athenians, always clamoring for some new thing. Change for the mere sake of change is always to be deprecated. No change for the worse should, of course, ever be made. But are all changes evil? God is perfect, and therefore it is an element of his perfection that he does not change. This world is not only undeveloped, but it is full of evil. What greater calamity could befall it than to be petrified just as it is? No more maturing of the good! No more eradication of the evil!

"Weep not that the world changes,
Did it pursue a changeless course,
'Twere cause to weep."

The Chinese are the most conservative people on the earth. They worship their ancestors. Shall we take them for models? A true conservatism consists in a steadfast loyal adherence to the truth. For truth alone is worthy of conservatism. If we are in error, let us change to the truth. If our views or practices are crude and partial, let us seek a fuller and rounder development of our system. May the Master forbid that our Church shall ever claim for itself infallibility, or run into the ruts of a conceited unchangeableness! Let the word be, Progress not Petrification.

This argument, moreover, is shut out of this discussion by the well-known fact, that our Southern Church, at its birth in the Assembly of 1861, under the leadership of Thornwell, adopted the very principle for which we contend. In the constitution for the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions, it was then provided that it should consist of nine members, "Three of whom, at least, shall be Ruling Elders, or *Deacons*, or *private members of the Church*."

As far, then, as the deacon is concerned, it is certain that his proper functions embrace all the financial, secular, temporal, concerns of the Church; and that his sphere is coextensive with his functions, that diaconal work is to be done by the deacon, whether under the direction of the Session, the Presbytery, the Synod, or the General Assembly.

Touching the order of the BISHOPS, two questions emerge: 1. As to their functions; and 2. As to their jurisdiction.

Do the *functions* of the bishop embrace those of the deacon? Is a bishop also a deacon? Does it pertain to his order or office to discharge diaconal duties?

I. Let us consult the Scriptures. 1. Acts vi. 1-7. The language as well as the spirit of this passage is decisive. It is a direct issue as to function between the two orders or offices of the Church. There were diaconal duties to be done, and the issue is fairly made whether or not the apostolic bishops shall discharge them. If they undertake them, or if they demur on any ground than official incompatibility, then the passage is not un-

favorable to ministerial diaconates. But they refuse to perform these duties that properly belong to the deacon; and they base their refusal on the ground that these duties do not pertain to their office, that their functions are altogether different. Here are two kinds of church service brought together in marked distinction from each other, almost in contrast with each other. The one is the ministry of tables; the other the ministry of the word. Now shall the bishops fulfil both of these ministries? No, say the apostles, ours is the ministry of the word, and it is not reason that we should leave it to serve tables. "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint to *this business*. But *we* will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. Verses 3, 4. Could the separation of function between the two orders be presented in a clearer, stronger light? The bishop is to serve the word; the deacon is to serve the tables.

But Dr. Robinson, in his letter to the Staunton Assembly, having learned the language of Canaan, calls this "heresy," and seeks to evade the force of this clear text by a criticism on *οὐκ ἀρεστόν ἐστιν*. He declares that *ἀρεστόν* means simply, *pleasant, agreeable*; and his idea, as we understand it, is, that the apostles refused these diaconal duties merely because they were not pleasant or agreeable to them. He certainly deserves the honor of originality in this interpretation. No exegete before him has given it, and no one that comes after him is likely to do so. Bloomfield translates, "It is not meet or proper," and defends it from the Septuagint. Addison Alexander: "*Not reason*, literally, *not pleasing*, acceptable, agreeable, *i. e.*, to God or to Christ, and to us as his vicegerents. The idea of *right* or *proper*, although not expressed, is necessarily implied." Dr. Edward Robinson: "To be well, right."

But Mr. Hopkins said at Staunton that the pivot word in this passage is "daily" in the first verse. He thinks that the apostles did not refuse to do deacon's duty except as a regular daily business. There is some force probably in this. An apostle might discharge diaconal functions in an emergency, or in a small way, so as not to interfere with his own legitimate work.

This would be allowable, and is quite a different thing from the bishops' leaving the word of God to serve tables in a daily ministration. But unfortunately this does not help Mr. Hopkins; for he was contending for regular ministerial treasurerships, involving the "*daily* ministration" of finances.

We would suggest to Mr. Hopkins that there is another word in this passage that it may be well for him to notice. "Look ye out among you seven men * * whom we may appoint over this business; but we will give ourselves *continually* to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." 3, 4. Here the distinction between the two classes of functions is strongly marked. The seven are to attend to "*this* business; but *we*" to ours, and a different business. Let special attention be given to the word "*continually*." The ministerial work is a different work, and requires the constant uninterrupted energies of him who undertakes it.

This passage settles the question, and leaves it without a reasonable doubt that the two orders, bishops and deacons, have two classes of duties corresponding, each distinct from the other; that the deacon is not to leave the service of tables to undertake the ministry of the word, nor the bishop to leave the word in order to serve tables.

2. Let us look at Acts xi. 30 and Rom. xv. 25-28. These passages seem inconsistent with the teachings of Acts vi. 1-7, and are presented by our opposing brethren as showing that the apostles did do deacon's work. But (1), this was not necessarily a part of the deacon's duty. In both cases the apostles are the messengers by whom the charitable funds of the Gentiles are sent to the poor saints at Jerusalem. It is not a diaconal function to carry funds from one place to another. This may be done by a servant, by a private member, by one not a Christian. In our day, we use the express and the mail for the purpose. It is not difficult to understand why Paul seemed to covet this work. He was the apostle of the Gentiles; he was an apostate from Judaism. As such he was bitterly hated by the Jews and suspected by the zealous Judaistic Christians. Yet he loved his people devotedly, Rom. ix. 3. He was anxious to remove this preju-

dice against himself, and to bring about a kindlier state of feeling between the Gentile and Jewish Christians. For these reasons he took a special personal interest in these charitable collections. But the collections were doubtless made by the deacons, under his exhortation, and he carried them to Judea. (2) Again, as to these two passages, even admitting that it was diaconal work which the apostles did in these instances, it proves nothing against our position. Paul and Barnabas were preachers, earnest devoted preachers, who made full proof of their ministry. They did not leave the word of God to serve tables. This charitable work, this carrying of funds for the poor was with them merely incidental and extraordinary, and did not interfere with the regular prosecution of their apostolic labors. They certainly were not ministerial treasurers.

3. Dr. Theodorick Pryor, whose venerable form, earnest piety, genial good humor, and ready wit, no member of the Staunton Assembly will soon forget, presented what he considers an unanswerable objection to the view here advocated, in the fact that Judas was the regular treasurer of the apostolic college. To add force to his statement, the Doctor canonised the traitor and called him *St. Judas*. Never before was Judas dubbed a saint. As to this: 1. It is an unfortunate prototype that our present ministerial treasurers have. Ordinary bishops claim the eleven as their representatives, and do not object to giving up Judas to those who serve tables. 2. Judas was not a church treasurer. He was simply the treasurer of the apostles, as a band of men who had agreed to live together and to have a common purse. 3. Judas was never an apostle, in the true sense of the word. None of the twelve entered upon their apostolic ministry until the day of Pentecost. They were not apostles, because they were not qualified as such. The apostolic work was threefold: to organise the Christian Church, to complete the canon of Scripture, and to bear witness to the resurrection. Judas never took any part in any of these things. As long as our Saviour lived, the twelve were only apostles in anticipation; under his personal care, that they might be fitted for their work. Their condition was similar to that of our theological students in the Seminary; and Ju-

das's relation to them was exactly like that of a student caterer or treasurer of a mess club of theologues.

4. There is another class of passages presented by Dr. Lefevre in his article in this REVIEW of April, which are thought to militate against the doctrine here advocated. There are many of these passages. Indeed, the New Testament abounds with them. "Jesus Christ was a minister (Gr., deacon) of the circumcision." Rom. xv. 8. "Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers (deacons) by whom ye believed?" 1 Cor. iii. 5. "Thou shalt be a good minister (deacon) of Jesus Christ." 1 Tim. iv. 6. In these texts, Christ, Paul, Apollos, and Timothy are all said to be deacons. This seems very clear, and certainly presents a plausible case for the opposition.

But, 1. The apostate angels are called deacons. "It is no great thing if his ministers (deacons) also be transformed as the ministers (deacons) of righteousness." 2 Cor. xi. 15. Civil rulers are called deacons. "For he is the minister (deacon) of God to thee for good." Rom. xii. 4. Private Christians are said to be deacons. "She arose and ministered (acted as a deacon) unto him." Matt. viii. 25. Angels are said to be deacons. "Angels came and ministered (deaconed) unto him." Matt. iv. 11. Now if the first-mentioned passages prove that Paul, Apollos, and Timothy, were official deacons, these equally prove that angels, private Christians, civil rulers, and demons are also official deacons. 2. Paul calls himself the slave of Christ. "Paul, a servant (*δοῦλος*, slave) of Jesus Christ." Rom. i. 1. Christians are said to be sheep. The Master calls himself a vine, and his people branches. Was Paul a slave? Are Christians sheep, or branches? Is Christ a vine? No; every child understands these expressions as figurative; so are those above, where Paul, Apollos, and Timothy are called deacons. 3. The word "deacon" in the New Testament has two well-defined uses: as a general term, meaning *servant*; and a specific technical use, to designate the second *order* of church officers. In the former sense it is synonymous with *church officer*, and is applied to both orders. As so used, bishops are indeed deacons, or Christ's official servants. In its restricted meaning, it is applied only to the order of deacons.

II. In opposition to the doctrine of two orders with two separate and mutually exclusive classes of functions, there is the Scotch theory that the higher office includes the lower. This is a very simple and beautiful theory. The deacon is a private member and a deacon. The elder is a member, a deacon, and an elder. The preacher is a member, a deacon, an elder, and a preacher. It was stated on the floor of the Assembly that Dr. Lefevre was regarded as the ablest advocate of this theory in our Church. We therefore quote from his article in this REVIEW, April, 1881, page 349: "The meaning, taken in extension, of the proposition, 'the higher ecclesiastical order *includes* the lower,' is the one for which the writer is contending, . . . that *the presbyter, besides his own personal nature, has the nature also of the deacon.*" As man, the higher intensive conception, includes animal, the lower, so does bishop include deacon; *i. e.*, every bishop has, in addition to his own official functions, those of the deacon. According to this view and its logical illustrations, as man and animal sustain to each other the relation of species and genus, so do bishop and deacon. Bishop is the species, as the higher intensive conception, and deacon is the genus. Bishop is a species of the genus deacon, just as man is a species of the genus animal. Let it be observed that these logical technicalities have been injected into this discussion by the distinguished Baltimore divine, and that we are simply following him, using his own illustration.

We deny that there is any such relation between bishop and deacon as between species and genus, or between a higher and a lower concept of the same series. For, 1. No genus ever becomes concrete except in an individual of one of its own species. Now, if deacon is the genus, we ask for a concrete individual deacon. If the reply is, that we find him in the ordinary deacon of our churches, then we interpose the further logical objection, that no species is ever cointensive with its genus; for species must equal the genus *plus the differentia*. Now, if deacon is the genus, it cannot at the same time be one of its own species; and if it is a species, it cannot be the genus. But, according to Dr. Lefevre's reasoning, deacon is the genus. If genus, then to

VOL. XXXII., NO 4.—2.

what species do individual ordinary deacons belong? To the species, deacon? Then we have deacon both as species and genus of the same classification, which is logically absurd.

2. Again, this theory, if true, would go too far, and prove more than its advocates believe; for every species not only may have, but *must* have, the essence of its genus. When a man ceases to have the qualities of an animal, he ceases to be an animal. So, if a bishop ceases to exercise the functions of a deacon, he ceases to be a deacon. Man must be an animal, and so a bishop must be a deacon. Now what is the generic idea of the deacon? Plainly, as a church officer, it is the care of the poor and the administration of the financial concerns of the church. The bishop is said to be a deacon, an official deacon, a deacon just like the seven chosen in the 6th of the Acts. As such, he must have the generic idea of the deacon; he must officially look after the poor; he must be the financial officer of the church. Does Dr. Lefevre believe this? Do any of our opposing brethren? Is it an *essential* part of the bishop's office to discharge diaconal duties? The theory perishes by its own logical absurdities.

3. The true relation between these two orders or offices is quite simple and clear. It is not that of species and genus, but of co-ordinate species of the common genus, church-officer. It seems strange that Dr. Lefevre should have seen this, and yet at once have lost sight of it. He says (page 344): "Church-officer is the common name of presbyters and deacons." If he had held to this, he would have steered clear of all difficulties. But he immediately forgets it, and ever afterwards ignores it. Bishop and deacon are not higher and lower orders, considered as species and genus, but simply in the sense that the separate and distinct functions of the bishop are of a higher dignity than those of the deacon. As man and monkey are both species of animals, but man is the higher of the two.

III. This theory of the involution of all the church-power of order in the bishop, is an old one; as old as the rise and sway of priestly domination. In the middle ages, the priests were the teachers, doctors, lawyers, and magistrates. In the Church,

there were no scriptural elders or deacons. The priests were everything. The Reformation was a protest and a revolt. God did not intend the people to be ciphers. He has work in his vineyard for all to do. The bishops are the leaders, but only leaders. It is his wisdom not to concentrate into a monopoly, but to divide and extend his work until every hand shall find some needful useful thing to do. The Church is beginning to realise this. There are indications that, in some directions, the tendencies are extreme, as in lay-preaching and women-preaching. But the idea is a true one. It has the divine approval; and one of its most wholesome manifestations is to be seen in our Church in the lifting up of the ruling elder and the deacon to a higher and broader plane of usefulness, and the consequent disburdening of the ministry of unnecessary incumbrances, that it may give itself wholly "continually to the ministry of the word and to prayer."

IV. We present here an extract or two from Thornwell: "The generic idea expressed by the word (deacon) is that of *servant*. In this wide sense it embraces a great variety of classes distinguished from each other by the different nature of their service, but agreeing in the common property of service. The whole generic idea is found in each species, whether composed of private individuals, inspired apostles, ministers of the word, dispensers of alms, or rulers of the church; all, without exception, are deacons, because all, without exception, are *servants*. This word, however, is restricted for the most part as a title of office to a particular class, in which, however, the whole generic idea is found and very conspicuously presented. The generic meaning remains unchanged, and the definite title simply applies it to a particular kind of service." "Here an office (that of deacon) notoriously instituted for the express purpose of protecting preachers from secular affairs, undergoes a transformation," etc. Vol. IV., pp. 109, 122.

As to the *jurisdiction* of the bishop, the discussion may be more brief. To the bishop are given two kinds of power: of order, and of jurisdiction. His powers of order are distinctly set forth in our Form of Government, Chap. II., Sec. II., § 2:

“Preaching the gospel, administering the sacraments, reproofing the erring, visiting the sick, and comforting the afflicted.” Upon the principle, *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, no powers but those which may be properly brought under one of these several heads, can be exercised in our Church by an individual bishop.

All other powers that belong to the bishop are those of jurisdiction, and pertain to him jointly with other bishops, and are to be exercised by them, not severally, but only as organised into the recognised courts of the Church.

These principles are so clear and simple, that no one will gain-say them. We divide, however, as we come to apply them to the Secretaries of our Assembly Committees. The power of governing others, the power of administering the general concerns of the Church, are manifestly powers of jurisdiction and not of order. Have such powers been intrusted to our Secretaries? Are they practically exercised by them? Do they discharge the functions of metropolitan bishops? Are they overseers of the general work of the Church? It is not asserted that they wield these powers unwisely or oppressively. The Episcopal churches of this country might congratulate themselves, should they have such judicious and in every way acceptable bishops. The simple question is, Are they in reality bishops of the general Church? They may not be. But if they are, then :

1. There is no authority for them in our Presbyterian government.

2. The King of Zion has seen fit to withhold such authority from any individual bishop, for wise and sufficient reasons. We of the border States, left in connexion with the Northern Church until after the war, have had occasion to see the wisdom of this. Dr. Janeway, the Secretary of Domestic Missions, wrote to our missionaries that their appropriations should be withheld, because they did not come up to the standard of loyalty. For these acts, he is known by us as Pope Janeway.

3. If our present system necessitates the practical making of prelatical bishops, it must be erroneous.

We do not consider it a satisfactory reply to this, that the Secretaries are simply the organs of the Executive Committees.

Because, while this may be nominally true, it is not true in fact. The Secretaries, if we are not mistaken, are in reality the power of these Committees. As Dr. Thornwell said, we do not object so much to the name as to the thing.

Let us read what he said about these officers under the Board system, where they sustained, so far as we can see, the same relations to the general work of the Church that they do now. "The parity of the ministry," says he, "is a fundamental principle among all Presbyterians. Whatever differences superior piety, learning, and talents, may make in the *man*, we allow no difference in the *office*. We tolerate no official authority in one minister above another. Our system does not admit it. But the fact is unquestionable, that the various officers of our Boards are invested with a control over their brethren, and a power in the Church, just as real and just as dangerous as the authority of a prelate." Vol. IV., p. 156.

The jurisdiction of the bishop introduces us to the *jurisdiction* of the *courts*. Here it will not be necessary to do more than enunciate the general fundamental principles of our system, as there is no division of view upon these as theoretical questions.

I. Our church courts are *graded*. They begin with the parochial presbytery, the Session, and go up, through the provincial and synodical presbyteries, to the General Assembly. Thus we have Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies.

II. Our courts are *representative*, according to their grade, of all the church below them. Their authority to act is by virtue of their representative character, which Dr. Thornwell properly makes one of the essential distinctive characteristics of our system.

III. Their power of jurisdiction, as it widens, is not cumulative, but collective and appellate.

1. It is *not cumulative*; *i. e.*, the Presbytery has not the power of a Session, as well as of a Presbytery, over its constituent churches. The Synod has not the powers of a Session and of a Presbytery, as well as of a Synod, over its territory. Nor has the Assembly the aggregate powers of all the courts over

the entire Church. The most important powers of original jurisdiction are lodged with the Session and the Presbytery. Each of the courts may, as our Constitution declares, "possess inherently the same kinds of rights and powers;" but it has been found "necessary that the sphere of action of each court should be distinctly defined;" and, consequently, "the jurisdiction of these courts is limited by the express provisions of the Constitution." Form of Government, Chap. V., Sec. II., §§ 3, 4.

2. The power of the higher courts is *collective*, so far as *original* jurisdiction is concerned. David Dudley Field, in a recent article in one of the Reviews, has thus interpreted our civil government: That the individual is free in his own individual sphere, and comes under the control of social law only in his relations to others. That the States are free and sovereign in their own sphere, and have control of all affairs that pertain in common to the entire State. That the National Government is limited, therefore, to those matters which are general and concern all the States. Whether he be right or not, this general principle prevails in the relations of our graded courts. The Session attends to the concerns of the particular congregation. The Presbytery, to what is common to the churches of its district; and so with the Synod and the Assembly. The exact language of our Constitution is: "The Session exercises jurisdiction over a single church; the Presbytery, over what is common to the ministers, sessions, and churches within a prescribed district; the Synod, over what belongs in common to three or more Presbyteries; and the General Assembly over such matters as concern the whole Church." Form of Government, Chap. V., Sec. 2, § 4.

3. Beyond this original jurisdictional power of the higher courts, which is limited to what is common to their entire territory, they possess *appellate* jurisdiction. That they may be appellate, it is necessary that they shall not have original jurisdiction over the same questions. If the Assembly should attend to sessional or presbyterial business, what becomes of its appellate power over the same? The higher courts are appellate. They do not possess, and should not exercise, the powers of the

lower courts. But, possessing the power over the powers of the lower courts, they should hold themselves free to discharge the duties involved in this relation of superintendence.

In a Church covering an extensive territory, as ours does, there is need of a strong centralising influence, which shall hold the remotest parts true to the unity of the organisation. This is freely admitted. Such an influence we have in our system of graded courts. The tendency, however, of all central power, in Church or State, in every age and country, has been to magnify and fortify itself at the expense of the just rights of its subordinates. We must have strength, but not at the price of liberty. The central power will usually take care of itself. The practical need is to watch that central power, and to protect the rights of the peripheral extremities.

Having now discussed the principles of Church polity, involved in the effort which was made for Retrenchment and Reform, we are now prepared to apply those principles to the consideration of the PRACTICAL ISSUES involved.

There can hardly be a doubt that the real issues were obscurely seen, if seen at all, by the great mass of our presbyters. They were probably not presented in the press, the Presbytery, and the Assembly, as clearly as they should have been. Let it then be distinctly understood that the real practical issues were—

I. Negatively. 1. Not the personal character of the Secretaries, nor their official fidelity and efficiency. If there is a Presbytery or a presbyter who is displeased, or in any way dissatisfied, with a single one of our Secretaries, such a fact has never come to our knowledge. All acknowledge their eminent fitness for the positions which they respectively fill, and their zeal and efficiency as officers.

2. Nor was the efficiency of their official advisers, the Executive Committees, the question at issue. There was some dissatisfaction a few years since with the Committee of Publication; but it was not general nor did it continue long. If any criticism has ever been offered, it has been, not of what the Committees have done, but rather of what they have not done. Some per-

haps may have thought that the Committees should pay more personal attention to the matters intrusted to them, and not to leave them too exclusively to the Secretaries. But, however this may be, it was not the zeal, the fidelity, or the efficiency of the Committees that constituted the issues of the question. For if any brother had been at all sceptical upon this matter, the facts and figures presented by Mr. Hopkins were sufficient to convince him that the business, in all of its departments, had been economically and most satisfactorily transacted.

II. Positively, the real issues were : 1. Whether the deacons or the bishops should discharge the fiscal duties of what Dr. Leighton Wilson calls our "central financial agencies." If the work of our Secretaries and Executive Committees, outside of Foreign Missions, is, as Dr. Wilson says, "little else than financial," then, according to the powers of order as we have seen them, the bishop is not, and the deacon is, the proper officer to whom it should be committed. Bishops, as financial officers, are out of their sphere and within that of the deacon.

If, however, these duties are largely administrative and governmental, then they belong to the sphere of the bishop, and not to that of the deacon. Indeed, if they are at all administrative or political, they cannot be intrusted to the deacon, for he is not a ruler of the Church. If they are partly financial and partly governmental, then the financial portion, if it demand a separate officer, should be intrusted to the deacon, and the rest be committed to the bishop.

If Dr. Wilson's view of the matter is correct (and he ought to know, and doubtless does), then our Secretaries (except of Foreign Missions), every one of whom is a bishop, is engaged in the daily ministration, the continual service of tables ; discharging, as bishops, the functions of deacons.

2. The main practical issue was, whether the Assembly or the Presbyteries should directly manage the evangelistic work of the Church.

(1.) With regard to this, we were all agreed that the strong help the weak ; and that consequently there should be a central treasury under the control of the General Assembly. We could

not assume any other position, without ignoring the fundamental fact of the unity of the Church, and denying the force of the injunction, that they who are strong should bear the infirmities of the weak. There is more work to be done in the weaker Presbyteries than in the stronger. It would surely be the extreme of folly that the Presbyteries should be so isolated in their work that the able could not help the feeble.

Moreover, those who were in the minority actually advocated that a larger percentage of the contributions of the churches should be sent to the central treasury than did the majority. According to the present rule, every Presbytery is free to draw from the central treasury every dollar that it puts in. As proposed by the minority, twenty per cent. of the contributions of the Presbyteries should be sent to the central treasury for the benefit of the feebler portions of the Church.

(2.) The Foreign Mission work manifestly belongs to the Assembly. These missions are not conducted within the limits of the jurisdiction of any Session, Presbytery, or Synod; and are not, therefore, subject to the control of any of these courts. They are a concern of a whole Church; the outgrowth, the expansion of the entire body.

(3.) The remainder of the evangelistic work, except a part of Publication, as clearly pertains to the Presbyteries. This is true as a matter of principle; and it is true as a matter of expediency.

a. This work belongs to the jurisdiction of the Presbyteries. It is conducted within their bounds, and by men subject to their authority. What is the necessity or propriety, therefore, of thrusting the Assembly in between the Presbytery and its own evangelists, pastors, colporteurs, or candidates? The Assembly has nothing in the wide world to do with these things, except as the custodian and distributor of the percentage forwarded to its treasury for the weaker Presbyteries.

b. It is more expedient that each Presbytery should conduct its own evangelistic work, because it will develop all parts of the Church more thoroughly and rapidly, by teaching self-reliance. There will be a livelier sense of responsibility on the part of

each Presbytery, when it realises that the work within its bounds is to be done by it. A greater pride and interest will be taken as each feels that it is master of its own field.

c. Virginia's great theologian, at the Knoxville Assembly, enunciated a pregnant truth when he said, "*a concrete case is stronger than an abstract cause.*" Never was profounder wisdom crystallised into a happier expression. All the force of this apothegm is in favor of the direct management of the evangelistic work by the Presbytery. Take the case of a candidate for the ministry, or of an evangelist, or of the pastor of a weak church or group of churches, or of a congregation struggling to erect a house of worship—who does not see that in each and every one of these cases two dollars can be more readily raised for them, as specially in need of help, than one dollar can for the abstraction of education, or sustentation, or evangelistic fund? Not only do we have here the difference between a living case and a dead abstraction, but also the benefit of a home case as distinguished from a foreign one. The Education cause is an abstraction. The Assembly's Executive Committee is hundreds of miles away. But here is a Presbytery, one of whose young men offers himself to the ministry. He is known, loved, appreciated. He is one of us. It is clearly our duty to stand by him. Would not the case of that young man bring five dollars where the Education cause would bring two?

The writer of this was a pastor for fifteen years, the happiest of his life. Part of that time was when we in Missouri were not connected with any Assembly, North or South. The whole responsibility of cultivating our field was thrown upon us. It was fight or die, work or starve. During this period, the church which he served undertook to supplement the salaries of two brethren who were cultivating the missionary fields of the Presbytery. It was done with far greater ease and pleasure than one-half of the amount could have been raised for the Sustentation cause. Here are the Minutes of the Synod of Missouri for the years 1869 and 1872, while we were isolated and independent. They show that this Synod raised in 1869 for the various evangelistic causes, outside of congregational, the sum of \$44,331, a large

portion of which was for Westminster College. In 1872, when there was no such special call, and when the times had become stringent, the Synod raised, for purposes outside of the particular congregations, an aggregate of \$16,281. The Minutes of the Assembly of 1878 show that this same Synod, now connected with the Assembly, raised for the same purposes only \$4,180; in 1879, only \$3,642; and in 1880, only \$6,099. The Synod of Missouri raised less for the evangelistic causes during the three years of 1878, '79, and '80, when connected with the Assembly and working under its Committees, than in the single year of 1872, when the work was done immediately by the Presbyteries. Less in three years on the Assembly plan by over \$2,000 than in a single year of the Presbytery plan! Truly a concrete home case is more potent than an abstract foreign cause.

d. Economy is urged in favor of the home plan of evangelistic work. It has been unfortunate, perhaps, that this point has been allowed undue prominence to the ignoring and banishing of far more important considerations. Economy, however, is always a virtue, and, in the Lord's work, it is clearly a sacred duty. In a sense we may do what we will with our portion of the goods that the Lord intrusts to us; but his share, small as it is, must be administered with the most scrupulous care. Just here we note a great mistake made by Dr. J. L. Wilson in his excellent review of the Minority Report. He charges that the main purpose of the Minority seemed to be to spare the people from giving to the Lord. In this he has misapprehended completely the point made by those whom he criticises. The economy urged was in the administration of the Lord's funds, in order that they might yield the largest possible results, and not for the purpose of lessening the contributions of the people. The Minority believe that the people do not bring more than half the tithes into the storehouse; that they should be urged and encouraged to bring them all in; and that one strong inducement to this end would be the most careful and judicious expenditure of what is contributed. If the people see that their money (as they are prone to regard it) is used economically and productively, they will be encouraged to give it more freely. Evangelically,

sation by the direct management of the Presbyteries would be more economical than the present plan. We, therefore, urge it as one of the reasons, not the main one, why the Lord's plan, as we believe it, should have been tried, at least in the department of Education.

e. Analogy leads us to favor the Presbyterian management. How are the poor of our communities supported by the civil government? It is not by every man putting all his earnings into the public treasury, that each may receive back what the central treasurers shall think wisest and best. Each family takes care of itself, and pays a definite tax, so much per cent., for the support of the poor. How is it in the Church itself? If it is necessary or wisest that all the church evangelistic funds should go to the central treasury, to be thence distributed, why not carry out the principle and demand that all church moneys shall be thrown into the common fund? No, you say at once, let each congregation support itself so far as it can; for it will save expense and labor to the central treasury. Just so with the evangelistic work; let each Presbytery take care of itself, and it will manage its own funds more wisely, and will save much cost and trouble at the Committee rooms.

We believe that the way in which our Committees manage these matters is without a parallel in the financial administrations of the civilised world. Here we are, a border missionary Presbytery, twelve hundred miles from Baltimore. Every dollar we give must be returned to us. Yet our evangelist, as he takes up the collections, which are really for his own support, is required to send them to our Presbyterian treasurer at Kansas City, who in turn forwards them to Baltimore; whence they are returned, on a backward trip of over a thousand miles, to the very place from which they came!

"The king of France, with forty thousand men,
Went up a hill, and so came down again."

Surely common sense business men ought to avoid such folly as this.

f. We shall close this review by some extracts from the published writings of Dr. Thornwell. We do this, not only because

of the profound reverence which our Church has ever felt for the views of this great man, but also because a well known divine in the Staunton Assembly, as we are told by the papers, "warmly and tenderly defended the memory of the lamented Dr. Thornwell, whose name has often been used in this debate, and asserted that, if that silenced voice could be heard, no word would be uttered in favor of any change in our present plans. Our scheme of Foreign Missions is strictly the work of Dr. Thornwell, well done and thorough." One would suppose that such a speaker was quite familiar with the views of Dr. Thornwell. But it is easy to show that he either never knew them, or is blessed with a very treacherous memory. There is not an important position in this paper which cannot be sustained by copious and unmistakable quotations from Dr. Thornwell. Indeed, upon the important controverted points, we have been at pains to show that we had the backing of this great name. We are now, however, upon the practical issues involved, and we propose to prove that here Dr. Thornwell went *further* than we have dared to go.

We accept the issue presented by his defender (?), and shall set forth, in his own words, Dr. Thornwell's views as to the manner in which he thought the Foreign Mission work should be conducted. It was his view that it should be *directly by the Presbyteries*. The first question was as to the appointment of the missionary and assigning him his field of labor. This he contended should be done by the Presbytery. Says he: "Look at the following grant of power to the Board of Foreign Missions in the 4th Article of its Constitution. 'To the Executive Committee, etc., shall belong the duty of *appointing* all missionaries and agents; of designating their fields of labor; to authorise all appropriations and expenditures of money,' etc. [Exactly the same now granted to our Executive Committee.] * * Here is unquestionably the power of judging of the qualification of ministers—their fitness for particular stations; and here is a right conveyed to control and manage and direct their labors. Turn now to the Constitution of the Church, Ch. X., Sec. 8, Form of Government. * * Here the same powers, in part,

are evidently granted to two different bodies—in the one case, they are granted by the Constitution, in the other by the Assembly. The Assembly unquestionably had no right to take from the Presbytery its constitutional authority, and to vest it in any other organisation.” Vol. IV., pp. 152-3.

The next point he considers, is the support of the missionaries; and he maintains that this also shall be done directly by the Presbyteries, without the intervention of any central Assembly treasury or Committee. “In the first place, the Constitution expressly provides that the judicatory sending out any missionary must support him. In the second place, the Book provides that our churches should be furnished with a class of officers for the express purpose of attending to the temporal matters of the Church; and these deacons might be made the collecting agents of the Presbytery in every congregation, and through them the necessary funds could be easily obtained and without expense. For transmission to foreign parts, nothing more would be necessary than simply to employ either some extensive merchant in any of our large cities, who, for the usual percentage, would attend to the whole matter, or a committee of deacons appointed by the Assembly for the purpose.” Vol. IV., p. 154.

A third point with Dr. Thornwell was, in contributing to a central fund and leaving the appointment of missionaries to a central committee of the Assembly, unsound men might be sent forth as missionaries, and he be compelled to support them. “It is idle to say that we must have confidence in all our Presbyteries: the experience of the past teaches us too plainly that we should have no confidence in the flesh, and that Presbyteries are sometimes as mischievous as any other bodies. This difficulty would be obviated by carrying out the provisions of our Book. The Presbytery that sends a man *would know him*; the churches within its bounds would know him, and consequently would know what they are supporting. If the Presbytery that sends him should be unable to support him, it can call upon a neighboring Presbytery, to which it is perfectly well known, for assistance.” Vol. IV., p. 166.

Perhaps the reader is wearied with these quotations. We

shall present but one more. "Before closing this article, I wish to present a few additional considerations showing that the Presbyteries ought to take the whole business of missions into their own hands." Vol. IV., p. 212. He then gives and elaborates four arguments in favor of this view.

We now appeal to the judgment of the Church and of all candid men, to decide whether "the defender of Dr. Thornwell" knew of what he was talking at the Staunton Assembly. We wish it to be understood, moreover, that we do not quote these views of Dr. Thornwell as approving of them, for we do not. We believe that Foreign Missions is properly the work of the Assembly, and not of the Presbyteries. But if Dr. Thornwell thought that the Presbyteries ought to conduct Foreign Missions, *a fortiori* he believed in remitting the rest of the evangelistic work to them.

We were in the minority. So was Dr. Thornwell at Rochester. Dr. Breckinridge was in the minority in opposing the reception of committeemen as delegates to the Assembly. We were in the minority in advocating our new Book of Church Order, when it was first presented to the Presbyteries. The opposition had the majority of votes; we content ourselves that we had the majority of the truth.

J. A. QUARLES.