

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XIII.—NO. 3.

OCTOBER, MDCCCLX.

ARTICLE I.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCH OF FRANCE AND THE PASTORS OF THE DESERT.

*Histoire Des Églises Réformées de Pons, Gemozac et Mortagne
En Saintonge, Précédée d'une notice étendue sur L'établiss-
ment de la Réforme dans cette Province, L'Aunis, et L'An-
goumois.* Par A. CROTTET, de Genève, Pasteur à Pons.
A Bordeaux : 1841 ; pp. 263, 8vo.

*Histoire des Églises Du Désert chez les Protestants de France
depuis la Fin du Règne de Louis XIV., jusqu'à la Revolu-
tion Française.* Par CHARLES COQUEREL.

“ Plus á me frapper on s'amuse,
“ Tant plus de marteaux on y use.”

THEODORE DE BEZA.

Two vols. Paris : 1841 ; pp. 564, 616, 8vo.

*Histoire des Pasteurs du Désert depuis la Revocation de L'édit
de Nantes jusqu'à la Revolution Française, 1685–1789.* Par
NAP. PEYRAT.

“ Ils tenaient devant le trône, en présence de l'Agneau, vetus
de longues robes blanches ayant à la main des palmes.—D'ou
sont-ils venus ?—De la grande tribulation.—Ils ont lavé leur
robe dans le sang de l'Agneau ; voilà pourquoi ils sont devant
le trône de Dieu, et le servent dans son temple.”

Apocalypse, Chap. vii.

Two vols. Paris : 1842 ; pp. 516, 552, 8vo.

two Christian countries can observe the same *absolute* time as a day of rest. The whole spirit of the command must be found, therefore, in the right proportioning of the time to the duties enjoined, and not in any fancied imitation of God's creative periods. We can imitate God in this, as well as in every thing else, only on a scale proportioned to the vast difference between us;—only as an astronomer can map out the stars that fill the regions of infinite space upon the surface of a ten-inch globe. When it is said, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," is it expected that man shall equal the infinitude of God's perfections? We are commanded to work and rest as He worked and rested; but, for aught we know, His times *may have been* almost interminable ages—ours *must be* of short duration.

Our task is done: and we have learned for ourselves, if our readers have not, that humility becomes all who would approach God in the study either of His works or His word. "His thoughts are not as our thoughts, nor His ways as our ways."



ARTICLE VI.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW ON THEORIES OF THE ELDERSHIP.

Two articles on "Theories of the Eldership," in the *Biblical Repertory* for April and July of this year (which are to be followed by a third), demand our individual attention, and that of some other persons, by the direct attack (we do not use the word in the offensive sense of it) which is made on us by name. These articles have also attracted, and may very justly claim, the attention of the Church. Appearing in the pages of the oldest, and, we will add, also, the

ablest, Presbyterian Quarterly (which has always been the organ of our first established and most trusted school of Theology, and is still published under the distinguished name of Dr. Hodge)—they certainly have come forth under auspices which bespeak for their doctrines and their statements the most respectful consideration. They bespeak the same for themselves by their *paternity*, which could not be concealed for a moment from any educated Presbyterian in the United States. The pen which wrote these pages has written too long and too largely upon these questions of the Church, not to be identified immediately in any one of its productions. Nature designed this author to be an orator, and endowed him splendidly for that office. But, “coveting earnestly” what appeared, no doubt, to him “the best gift,” he has always seemed to aspire at speaking to future generations, rather than the present. And so, preferring to the triumphs of an almost matchless eloquence the toils and pains of authorship, he has given to the Church he loves “the precious life-blood of his master-spirit,” in many a volume and many a page, which have been read, and, we trust, will be read, with profit, long after he shall rest from his labors. What he has written on this particular subject, however, we believe, never has been accepted by our Church as being thoroughly or soundly Presbyterian; and was not formerly endorsed at Princeton. Dr. Miller, if our memory deceives us not, so expressed himself, with characteristic frankness, and, at the same time, kindness, to the author. But now we find him admitted to speak through the pages of the Princeton organ, and not only admitted there, but expressly, yet (in deference, no doubt, to Dr. McGill’s sentiments regarding this article, so manfully declared in the late Assembly,) somewhat moderately endorsed, also.—(See *Repertory* for 1860, p. 562.) “*Tempora mutantur*,” etc. This change is certainly significant, and the Church may well give heed to it. The time was when Princeton, at the hands of the venerable Dr. Miller, repu-

diated the doctrines about eldership of this "respected contributor" of the present Repertory, instead of endorsing them, as now. We are thus reminded of a certain remarkable theory of the eldership, published in 1845, "On the name, nature, and functions of Ruling Elders, being temporary," which was, indeed, fit preëminently to be ranked amongst "*theories*," because the author of it himself acknowledged (pp. 111, 112,) he was "contending against the arrangement and the language and the order laid down" by his own Church, which has "stamped the same perpetuity and sacredness upon the office of Ruling Elder which it attaches to the ministry;" and because, accordingly, the author has never ventured, during a ministry of nearly thirty years, to carry his own views into practice in his own Church. Remarkable, however, as this theory was, and was considered on all hands to be, it has very remarkably been left out of the formidable list of "*theories*" here discussed—it has been strangely omitted from this category of "all the works on the subject of ruling powers, from Dr. Miller's work to the present time," which it was proposed to notice in this "Constitutional argument." * That work made the Elders mere *temporary* office-holders, to give place every year to new "*assistants of the Bishop*," unless reëlected by the people. It made them simple *laymen*—mere lay representatives of the people. It struggled hard to destroy all proof for the Ruling Elder's office from 1 Tim. v. 17: "The Elders that rule well," etc. The Princeton of that day objected to these doctrines, but the Princeton of this day endorses a series of articles from the same pen, although every one of these opinions appears in them with greater or less distinctness, and although, also, it is denied that the Ruling Elder is the Presbyter of the New Testament, or that he has any clear right to the name of Ruling Elder, or

* Another strange and unfortunate omission is that of the little work of Dr. Hodge, "What is Presbyterianism?" We wish all our readers, especially those who are Ruling Elders, to be better acquainted with that address.

even to that of Elder itself!—(Biblical Repertory, 1860, pp. 196, 209, 215.)

We reciprocate, with perfect cordiality, the kind expressions of the Princeton reviewer, and we enter on the discussion to which he has challenged us, as a discussion “not by foes, but friends.” “There is,” indeed, as he says, “no rivalry among us, but for the truth and order of Christ’s blood-bought Church. There is nothing personal or private.” We take up the gauntlet thrown down for us, not in the spirit of a struggle for victory between one man and another man, or between one school of Theology and another school of Theology, but in the spirit of earnest contention for the truth. If we know our own hearts, we love the truth, and, so far as we have attained to any knowledge of it in respect to the doctrine of Church government, we desire to see what we believe to be the truth vindicated and established. We repeat what was said before in this journal: “It is a disreputable fact, that there are many Presbyterians, and Presbyterian Ministers, who are very imperfectly acquainted with the characteristic principles of their own system.” A temperate and kind discussion of the important question respecting which we differ from the Repertory will be, we are persuaded, acceptable, as well as useful, to our Church. In this persuasion we enter on the argument, and in this spirit we hope, with the Master’s aid and blessing, to carry it on. We shall speak always very plainly and distinctly, but never with any design to offend.

Before we proceed to the main discussion, it may be well to signalize some of the many flagrant errors into which our contemporary has been led, in these articles, upon “Theories of the Eldership.” We place foremost amongst these, as being of the least public importance, the misrepresentation, of course undesignedly made, of our own personal opinions in this subject. The Repertory says:

“Dr. Adger, therefore, simplifies the analysis, by denying ‘one order subdivided into two classes,’ and by rejecting, altogether, any office or order of the ministry of the word and sacraments to be of divine institution, and admits only the *work* and *function* of the ministry by such presbyters as are gifted for it. The ministry, therefore, is not a permanent, divine office, having spiritual relation to the whole employment of the ministry, in a person qualified and specially called and ordained thereto, but a work performed by those who were ruling elders, etc. This is a very simple theory, and very confidently set forth by Dr. Adger.” (See Rep., p. 190.)

Other similar statements occur elsewhere. Now, all we care to say is, that this is a theory we never did set forth at all. All this is but unfair and unfounded *inferences* made by an opponent, and ascribed to us as our opinions. This is an old fault of controversy. It does no honor to the pages of the Repertory. We will try and meet the responsibility of all that we have written or said as well as we can, but we cannot answer for what our brethren may put into our mouths.

But from this little personal matter we pass to some errors of the Repertory regarding our standards. Denying that they set forth “one order of Presbyters divided into two classes—the teaching and the ruling Presbyter,” it says:

“They also declare that ‘the ordinary and perpetual, officers in the Church are of *three orders*, and *not one*, viz: bishops or pastors (or presbyters—see chap. IV.); the representatives of the people usually *styled* ruling elders; and deacons.’—Form of Gov. Chap. III.” (Bib. Rep., p. 195.)

We give the italics, marks of quotation and all, as used by the Repertory. Now let the reader turn to his copy of our book, and judge with what fairness this quotation is made. Words are interpolated, unhesitatingly, to suit the “necessities of a theory.”

Again, the Repertory says:

“The order of *presbyter* and its collateral terms, bishop and *pastor*, which the advocates of this theory apply to the ruling elder, and to this class of officers, primarily, our standards restrict to minis-

ters, exclusively, and never apply to ruling elders. They recognize, therefore, but one order and one office of presbyters and bishops, and call it emphatically 'the pastoral office.'" (P. 195.)

Now, is it not intended that the reader shall understand that it is *the habit* of our standards to use the term Presbyter in reference to Ministers—that that is the name *commonly given* in them to Ministers, but not applied to Ruling Elders? Does not the Repertory design to make this impression, when it says "our standards restrict it to Ministers, exclusively, and never apply it to Ruling Elders?" But the reader will find, if he examines the whole of our ordinary standards, from one end to the other, that they do not use the term *Presbyter* at all, except in one single case, and that is in the Form of Government (Chap. IV.), where it is employed as synonymous with Elder.

Again, the Repertory states that our standards describe the Ruling Elder as one "*commonly so called*," but do not "*authoritatively define him to be such*."—(See p. 196.) Let the reader turn again to his copy of our Form of Government, and see if chapter fifth does not say that the Ruling Elder is "chosen for the purpose of exercising government and discipline," and that this office has been understood by most of the Reformed Churches to answer to the scriptural title of "governments, and of them that rule well, but do not labor in the word and doctrine."

But all this is not enough to satisfy the Repertory's zeal for taking away the honor of the ruling eldership. Having asserted that they are not defined to be rulers, but only *commonly called* such, it now proceeds to nibble away even their right to the smallest part of the name. On page 196, speaking of the standards of the Church of Scotland, from which ours were derived, it states that in those Scotch standards Ruling Elders "are not even called *Elders*, but other Church governors." But this is another mistake. Let the reader look into the Second Book of Discipline, (printed at the end of that work of Stuart Robinson on

“the Church of God,” which we are right glad to see in these articles that the Repertory is willing to commend so highly, and which we hope all its readers will now buy and study,) and he will find the name Elder constantly employed for this class of officers. It is, in fact, the only name given to them, except in, perhaps, four places; in one of which they are called “Elders or Governors;” in another “Seniors or Elders;” in another “the Presbyter or Elder;” and in another “Presbyters or Seniors.”

Again: the Repertory asserts that

“All the Presbyterian standards regard presbyters to be, in 1 Tim. v. 17, as elsewhere, defined to be those who especially, as their chief business, labor in word and doctrine, and yet, also, rule or officiate, and administer ordinances.”—(See pp. 196, 197.)

This means, of course, that, in the judgment of the Repertory, 1 Tim. v. 17 refers only to one kind of Elders, who both rule and teach, and does not relate at all to mere Ruling Elders. This is now the Princeton doctrine! And the assertion is, that all the Presbyterian standards do so understand this text! We ask the reader just to notice the assertion, and then to compare with it our “Presbyterian Standards,” chapter fifth, and see for what purpose they quote, and in what manner they apply, that text. We ask him, also, to look at the Second Book of Discipline, chapter sixth, section ninth, to see how those “Presbyterian Standards” understand and apply that text.

Now these five errors, regarding our own standards and those of the Scotch Church, occur in the space of *one page and a half* of the Repertory’s argument. They are calculated, certainly, to weaken our confidence in the carefulness and accuracy of its other statements and quotations. Let us refer, briefly, to some of them.

The Repertory says: “The theory which identifies Presbyters and Ruling Elders” is “a novel theory of the eldership.”—(pp. 210, 211.) Is this correct? It is as old, at least, as the days of James Guthrie of Stirling, the first

Scottish Martyr for Christ's Crown and Covenant, and he died in 1661, although it is one of the little mistakes of the Repertory to give 1726, that is, sixty-five years after he was executed, as the date of his producing that short treatise of his which is prefixed to Lorimer's work on the Eldership. (See Repertory, p. 234.) We would quote Guthrie's statement of the doctrine of Ruling Elders in full if we had space. Suffice it that, for the special edification of the Princeton Review, we transcribe his reference to the mistake of those

"Who, either out of ignorance or disdain, do call them *lay* Elders, as if they were a part of the people only, and not to be reckoned amongst the officers of the Lord's house, whom the Popish Church, in their pride, and others following them, calls the 'clergy,' that is, the Lord's inheritance, in opposition to 'the laity,' or people, etc., etc."—(p. 16.)

This theory, yet further, is as old as Gillespie and Rutherford, which carries it higher than 1643, when they urged it so hard in the Westminster Assembly, for the Repertory itself tells us (p. 203),

"They labored long and earnestly to introduce their views into the Assembly. Their first form of proposition was, that beside those presbyters who both rule well and labor in word and doctrine, there be other presbyters who especially apply themselves to ruling."

Nay, this theory is as old as the time of Calvin; as old as the time of the Bohemian Brethren, before him, during all their long night of persecution; and, what is equally capable of proof, and with us of infinitely greater consequence, as old as the days of the Apostles.

But the theory is not only "a new theory;"—the Repertory becomes more specific, and declares, to our amazement, that "the theory of one order of Presbyters with two classes was originated by Neander," and that "Dr. Miller accepted and adopted it from him."—(p. 205.) And yet, on page 215, we are told, by this same reviewer, of a portion of his theory which "Dr. Miller received from Owen." And then, finally, on page 217, we find Neander

placed, in respect to the authorship of this theory, "next to Owen, if not above him." Now, taking this Princeton reviewer for our guide, respecting the true origin of this novel theory, what does the reader at length conclude upon the subject? *

* Confused as these statements of the Repertory are upon this point, there is no doubt at all of their entire correctness, as to the fact that *Dr. Miller did hold* this "theory which identifies Presbyters and Ruling Elders." Now, let the reader notice that, in April last, the Repertory goes so far as to state, on page 211, that "the opinion that the reference to a plurality of other officers in the Churches besides Deacons was in every case made to ONE general class with two orders, was, we think, first published by Dr. Miller;" also, on page 225, that, "on Dr. Miller's principle of interpretation, the term Presbyter is *appellative*, and not official;" also, on page 233, that "the *πρωτον ψευδος*, the source of all the difficulty, is in the adoption of this *appellative* interpretation of Presbyter;" also, on page 229, "we regret to find that Dr. Killen has also adopted Dr. Miller's premises, and, with equally unsatisfactory and inconsistent results. No genius—no erudition—no logic—no eloquence—no dogmatism, however authoritative, can bring order out of confusion, unity out of diversity, or harmony out of discord; the premises being fallacious, the conclusions must be untenable, and the building unsound." All this said the Repertory, in April last, about Dr. Miller, and yet, in July last, in the article on Presbyterianism, it delivers itself as follows: "There was no man in the Church more opposed to this theory than that venerable man, whose memory we have so much reason to cherish with affectionate reverence. We do not differ from Dr. Miller as to the value of the office of the Ruling Elder. The only point of difference between him and us relates to the method of establishing the divine warrant for the office. He laid stress on one argument, we on another. That is all. (See Repertory for July 1860, pp. 561, 562.) This is, indeed, amusing. What has become of all the "confusion, diversity, discord, and other equally unsatisfactory and inconsistent results of Dr. Miller's fallacious premises"—what of "his untenable conclusions," and his "unsound building," spoken of in the April Repertory? What are we to think, moreover, of all the objections made to this theory, in the Repertory for July last, (see pp. 560, 561,) as that, 1st. It is entirely contrary to the theory and practice of all the reformed Churches, and especially of our own. 2d. It destroys the value of the ruling eldership, and makes him ridiculous. 3d. It reduces the government of the Church to a clerical despotism—(an objection, by the way, got up only by first misstating the doctrine, to the effect that it makes *Ruling Elders* and Ministers, *all alike* Bishops and Teachers.) 4th. That it is completely revolutionary, depriving the people of all substantive power; what, we ask, are we to think of all these objections, made in April, and then, in different form and style—and, of course, by a different hand—made again in July? The new theory is chargeable with all these bad consequences, according to the Repertory in July, and, according to the Repertory in April, Dr. Miller is responsible, to a

But we find other statements in this Review, about Dr. Miller, which are not correct. It is said (p. 211):

“No man could more correctly and powerfully sustain, in all his arguments against prelacy, the fixed and full meaning of the terms presbyter and bishop, as referring to the office and work of the ministry.”

The cases then referred to, in proof of that Dr. Miller always so employed the term, are taken from his work “on the Primitive and Apostolical Order of the Church Vindicated,” (incorrectly referred to by the reviewer, as his work “on the Christian Ministry,”)—but what all these references, taken together, do prove, is, merely, that Dr. Miller often applied Presbyter—as he well might, and as we all do—to the Teaching Elder. But, repeatedly, Dr. Miller, in that very book, speaks of Ruling Elders as Presbyters. Let the reader look at pages 63, 66, 80, 81, and see for himself with how little warrant the reviewer’s assertion has been made.

Again, it is said that “Dr. Miller’s able and conclusive argument,” and, indeed, every other “standard writer’s argument,” against prelacy, is based, always, upon such a use of the term Presbyter.

“A fixed official application of the terms presbyter, etc., to ministers of the Gospel, in the New Testament, and by the apostolical, primitive and ancient Church, is the chief corner-stone of the whole argument for the claims of Presbytery to be the scriptural and primitive polity of the Churches. It was only, therefore, when Dr. Miller turned his attention to independency, and to the very defective condition of the eldership in our own Church, he was led to adopt Neander’s interpretation, though completely subversive of his prelatic arguments. In his work on the eldership, therefore, we could scarcely know that such a word as presbyter occurred in the New Testament.”—(p. 212.)

According to Princeton, therefore, as she now speaks, Dr. Miller’s book on the Eldership was based on that

great extent, for all these consequences of his “fallacious premises,” and yet the same Repertory, in July, “does not differ from Dr. Miller, as to the nature of the office of Ruling Elder.” *Risum tenentis amici?*

which completely subverted his (we suppose it should have been *anti-*) prelatric arguments. Alas, for "the venerable man, whose memory we have so much reason to cherish with affectionate reverence," one of the best books he ever wrote is completely subversive of another of his best books! Tell it not in Gath! Publish it not in the streets of Askalon! It is not true. It is only another of the numerous mistakes of the reviewer. Dr. Miller's argument on the Christian ministry is not based on the fixed, official application of the term *Presbyter* to *Ministers of the Gospel*.* He says:

"The true meaning of the word *presbyter*, in its official application, is a *Church ruler or governor*."—(See *Prim. and Apos. Christianity Vindicated*, p. 63.)

He goes on, immediately, to quote numerous passages about *Elders*, and, amongst them, 1 Tim. v. 17, and he says:

"Here, we find officers of the Church who are not recognized in the Episcopal system, but who are always found in the Presbyterian Church, viz: Ruling elders, or those who are appointed to assist in governing the Churches, but who do not preach and administer sacraments."—*Ibidem*, p. 65.)

And in his former work, of which this is "a new and abridged form," Dr. Miller thus expresses his own views respecting the place in the anti-prelatric argument which belongs to the Ruling Elder.

"In several passages in my former letters, I adverted to the office of ruling elder, and offered some considerations to show that it was instituted in the primitive Church. Dr. Bowden, perceiving that this position, if maintained, would be fatal to his cause, has endeavored, with all his force, to drive me from it, and to persuade his readers

* The reviewer himself, only three pages further on, quotes (p. 215) Dr. Miller as saying to the Episcopalians that in the apostolic age there was so little disposition to stickle about rank or titles, that "the names of office were used without scrupulosity, and with much license;" and yet he here asserts that Dr. Miller bases his argument on the *fixed, official* application of one of these names to *Ministers*! Alas, for Dr. Miller's reputation in such hands.

that no such officer was known in the Christian Church till modern times."—(Miller's Letters on the Cons. and Order of the Christian Ministry, p. 292. Phil. Ed. 1830.)

Such was Dr. Miller's idea of the force of the Ruling Elder, as against prelatists. And surely Dr. Miller was right! It is idle and absurd for the Repertory to say that our strength, in that contest, lies in proving that Presbyterian always means Minister; for, *first*, it is not true, and, *secondly*, what Presbyterian does mean is much more a barrier against prelacy. From whom did prelates come originally? From ambitious Ministers! Who now are converting (we will not say consciously or designedly) Presbyterian Church government into a hierarchy, by degrading the Ruling Elder into something less than a Presbyterian—into a mere "layman"; in the meanwhile, talking continually, just like prelatists, about "Clergy" and "Laity"?—(See Repertory for July, p. 559.) They are Ministers, and some of them, be it observed, Ministers that never have been in active ministerial service, of any kind, amongst the people. Prove that Ministers are in the New Testament, and what harm have you done to prelacy? She holds to Ministers herself. But prove that, according to the New Testament, the government of Christ's Church is in the hands of rulers, many of whom are not necessarily public teachers at all; and prove, too, that, according to the New Testament, these rulers must always meet together and act in a body in their ruling, and you have cut up the hierarchy of prelates by the roots.

The same inaccuracy which characterizes the reviewer's references to Dr. Miller, is to be found, also, in his use of Owen. We cannot stop to quote any thing in proof of our assertion. But we simply remark, that the representation is not just which makes out that we build on Owen, Neander or Calvin.—(See p. 220.) How could this be true, we ask the Repertory, of men who hold to the *divine right* of Presbytery? In its eyes that is bad enough, and it

should not seek to add any other charges to that one. To that one we are willing enough to plead guilty, but let not the Repertory be so hard on us as to make the severe and cutting charge that we build on the authority of great names. There are those who are continually quoting (and sometimes inaccurately, too,) "the Church of Scotland," and "all the Presbyterian standards," and "all the standard authors," but the Repertory knows we are not of that class. We hold to the *jus divinum*.

But well is it for *jure divino* Presbyterians that they are thus independent of the authority of any great names, for the Repertory solemnly and deliberately announces, after long argumentation and quotation combined, that

"No authority, therefore, can be pleaded for any one feature of the theory of the Eldership now put forth under great names and with confident boldness, from Calvin, Neander, or Dr. Miller."—(p. 224.)

And, as to Calvin in particular, we are told by the reviewer that he

"Established an order of Presbyters, who were ALL, as he declared, preachers, and coequal, and upon this is based the Presbyterian character of his polity. His elders were not spiritual officers appointed in and by the Church, and could not possibly have given the name of Presbytery, first introduced by Beza,* to the Presbyterian system."—(p. 223.)

Again, the reviewer says:

"From all we have stated, it is evident how very different were the views of Calvin from that theory to sustain which his authority is pleaded. His presbyters were our pastors or ministers. His elders or *anciens* (for he never uses the title of *ruling elders*) were laymen and appointed by laymen, † etc., etc., and so far from attaching to them the name or Scriptural character, qualifications, functions or responsi-

* We *jure divino* Presbyterians have always supposed the name Presbytery was introduced long before Beza had birth or being, and that the Apostles themselves had some hand in "introducing" it.

† The reviewer here, and in the subsequent extracts, is confounding (apparently without noticing it himself, and without any warning to his readers,) the institution of Elders as Calvin was able to carry it out amidst much opposition and difficulty at Geneva, and as he teaches the doctrine of it out of the Scriptures in his Institutes.

bilities, claimed by this theory for *ruling elders*, he attributes them exclusively to the pastors."—(p. 223.)

Still further: we are told that Calvin

"Always restricted the term presbyter, in its proper official designation, to pastors (who were preachers), as we might largely show."—(pp. 220, 221.)

The reviewer proceeds (quoting, carelessly, of course, what Calvin says expressly of the *Primitive Church*, as though he were speaking of the *Apostolic Church*):

"All, therefore, to whom the office of teaching was committed, they call presbyters, and in each city these *presbyters* selected one (a presbyter) to whom *they* gave the special title of bishop.' It is in this sense he uniformly uses the term presbyter in the *Institutes*, that is, as synonymous with bishop and pastor, as they 'who receive a commission to preach the Gospel and administer sacraments;' who are ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God, 'holding fast the faithful word,' etc."—(p. 221.)

Let the reader notice the positiveness with which these assertions are made, respecting Calvin's *uniform* use of the name Presbyter. Let him also notice how, with equal confidence and positiveness, our contemporary, in its article on Presbyterianism, in the July number, (in which it would seem that Dr. Hodge replies a second time, and in writing, now, to the speech of Dr. Thornwell in the last Assembly, to which he then also employed his privilege of *the reply*)—let the reader notice there how corresponding statements about Calvin's use of the term Presbyter are made with similar positiveness.

"We hold, with Calvin, that the official presbyters of the New Testament were bishops, for, as he says, 'To all who discharged the ministry of the word it gives the name bishops.' But of the ruling elders he adds, 'By these governors I understand seniors selected from the people to unite with the bishop in pronouncing censures and exercising discipline.' * This is the old, the healthful, the conservative doctrine of the Presbyterian Church. Ministers of the word are

* Our contemporary quotes the Latin original of these passages, but we give the English translation of them, as we wish to be read and understood by others in our Church besides Ministers.

clergymen having special training, vocation, and ordination; ruling elders are laymen, etc.”—(See Rep. for July, 1860, p. 562.)

Thus our contemporary, at the mouth of two distinct witnesses, asserts, most positively, that Calvin sustains no one feature of our views—that with him, and in the Institutes particularly, Presbyterian is always Preacher or Minister exclusively—and that Elder is only a layman, that is, no high spiritual officer. And, to make good these assertions, some passages are quoted from the earlier chapters of the fourth book of the Institutes. But why did these two learned authorities not look further, and observe Calvin’s language in other portions of that fourth book? For example, what clearer testimony could be given to our whole doctrine, than is to be found in Chapter XI., section I.?

“To this end, there were established in the Church, from the first, tribunals which might take cognizance of morals, animadvert on vice, and exercise the office of the keys. This order is mentioned by Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, under the name of ‘Governments’—(1 Cor. xii. 28.); in like manner, in the Epistle to the Romans, when he says: ‘He that ruleth with diligence.’—Rom. xii. 8. For he is not addressing magistrates—none of whom were then Christians—but those who were joined with pastors in the spiritual government of the Church. In the Epistle to Timothy, also, he mentions two kinds of presbyters, some who labor in the word, and others who do not perform the office of preaching, but rule well.—1 Tim. v. 17. By the latter class, there is no doubt he means those who were appointed to the inspection of manners, and the whole use of the keys.”

Here is Calvin finding, in the New Testament, *one order and two classes of Elders*—Presbyters that are not *preachers*, on the one hand, and, on the other, are *not laymen*, but have a high spiritual function and office, carrying the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and exercising all binding and loosing powers.

Again, what can be a clearer testimony than the following, from Calvin, describing the polity which prevailed in the primitive Church?

“The common and usual method of exercising this jurisdiction was by the council of presbyters, of whom, as I have said, there were two classes. Some were for teaching, others were only censors of manners.”—(*Ibidem*, Sec. 6.)

Here, then, Calvin, who was said to give no support to us, is found tracing up to the primitive Church our *novel* theory of one order and two classes, and of a kind of “Presbyters” that were neither ministers of the word nor yet laymen.

We will produce but one more testimony from the Institutes against the Repertory’s erroneous statements about Calvin’s use of “Presbyter.”

“Here, especially, is there occasion for the vigilance of pastors and presbyters, whose duty is not only to preach the Gospel to the people, but to exhort and admonish from house to house,” etc., etc.—(Book IV., Chapter XII., Sec. 2.)

Thus, at some length, we have pointed out a few of those flagrant errors of statement, and of quotation, into which our contemporary has fallen, with a view to enable the reader to judge for himself how safe a guide is there furnished him in tracking his way through all the difficulties which have been thrown around this subject. The reviewer laments “the confusion, diversity and discord,” which he perceives in all our attempts, even “to state the theory in words.” “Every prophet who expounds it has his own utterance, different, as well as distinct, and, in some cases, even contradictory and antagonistic.” He is quite pathetic about “the confusion worse confounded in which the best men and the brightest minds have involved themselves, and would involve the Church.” Yet, for their personal consolation, “there is palpable evidence that the failure is not in the theorists, but in the theory; not in the analysis, but in the facts.”—(pp. 229, 233, 450.) Similar was the trouble and distress to which Dr. Hodge, also, in the last Assembly, confessed. He also found us “without any consistency or agreement amongst ourselves;” and so, also, he “could not pretend to state our

doctrine." Now, we suppose, the reader who has had patience to follow us all through the foregoing pages, must have discovered where some portion, at least, of all this "confusion" lies. We think he will hardly expect us to return the reviewer's compliment, and say the fault is with the subject, and not those who have undertaken to expound it. We acknowledge our views are confused and contradictory, as these expounders set them forth. Is there not proof enough in the revision just made of the reviewer's statements, that he is not remarkable for accuracy when he quotes the language of others? It is not our design to impugn his honesty of purpose. The "*perfervidum ingenium*" will sufficiently explain all these errors about the Presbyterian standards; and respecting Neander, Owen, and Calvin; and respecting, also, the views of the "theorists" it was intended summarily and absolutely to demolish.

Having thus sought to remove, at least to some extent, the violent presumption against ourselves and our brethren, as mere "theorists" regarding the Eldership, which so eminent an authority as the Princeton Review had raised, by exhibiting how possible it is for that authority sometimes to make mistakes, we are now, at length, prepared to take up the main point in this controversy, viz: the question whether the Ruling Elder is or is not the Presbyter of the New Testament. To this question the reviewer turns our attention at the outset of the discussion. Let us first state, as briefly, but as fairly, as we know how, the positions assumed by him. We begin with the substance of the reviewer's first paragraph, somewhat condensed.

It is not intended to raise the question of the scriptural warrant of ruling elders in the Church—nor of the propriety of the designation ruling elders, in the general meaning of both terms. But it is maintained that the name ruling elder is applicable *only* in the general sense. And it is insisted upon that there is an official sense affixed to the title of presbyter, both in the New Testament and by the early Church, and, indeed, by the Church universal, until long after the Reformation, which official sense of the term is not to be

applied to any but the ministers of the word. And that the true basis of the ruling elder's office is to be found in other terms contained in the Scriptures.—(pp. 185, 186.)

Yet, further:

“The reiterated dictum is not true, that our standards teach that there is one order of presbyters, divided into two classes, the teaching and the ruling presbyter. This is not their doctrine. They recognize but one order and one office of presbyters and bishops, and call it, emphatically, the ‘pastoral office.’”—(p. 195.) “The ministry, according to the Presbyterian system of doctrine and polity, is a distinct ORDER, and not a CLASS under an order.”—(p. 451.) “‘Ruling elders are, *properly*, the representatives of the people, chosen by them for the purpose of exercising government and discipline, in conjunction with pastors or ministers.’ Such is the *definition*. The *description*, as given in chapter three, is that they are those officers who are *usually* (not *universally*) styled (not *are so by divine calling*, and, hence, not by divine right,) ruling elders.* In chapter five it is: ‘This office has been *understood* by a great part of the Protestant Reformed Churches, to be designated in the Holy Scriptures by the title of governments, and (*described in their works as*) those who rule well, but do not labor in word and doctrine.’ We have here, therefore, a formal definition and a full description of ruling elders, and a candid admission that, in regard to the name, and the application of that name, of 1 Tim. v. 17, there has only been a ‘*common understanding*’ (or *opinion*) by ‘*a great part*’ of the Churches. In the definition they are not called ruling elders, and they are not—*here* nor any where else—called *presbyters*, which title is exclusively given to the bishop or pastor.”—(p. 453.)

But, not only they may not be called “Presbyter,” but the very name itself of

“Ruling elder, is neither a scriptural, nor a patristic, nor an original, nor a constitutionally Presbyterian title.”—(p. 209.) “In the standards of the Church of Scotland they are not even called elders, but other Church governors.”—(p. 196.) “Ruling elders are not officially, and by divine assignation, the presbyters of Scripture, who are ministers.”—(p. 462.) “Each session shall send one elder, *only*, to represent that session, and so to represent that Church or people. Dr. Adger, however, is entirely mistaken in adding ‘with the minister,’ as if the people sent the minister to presbytery.”—(p. 454.) “In the case of the minister, the personal call is from Christ, and when recognized and ratified by His existing ministers and elders in

* We are particular here, as always, to give capitals, italics and parentheses, exactly as used.

solemn convention, he is by them recommended to the people. But it is very different with the ruling elders. They are instituted for the special purpose of representing the people. This is the essential character of the ruling elder."—(p. 456.) "The fundamental relation of the ruling elder is, therefore, to the people."—(p. 454.) "He can do nothing officially which the Churches, if supposed to be acting directly, the Church, as a body, could not rightly do."—(p. 457.) "They represent, and cannot transcend, the power ultimately inherent in the people, to whom and for whose benefit they are instituted."—(p. 462.) "They are not, as ministers are, *ex-officio* necessary and constant members of any superior court. They never have been ordained by imposition of hands, nor considered as officially capable of uniting in imposition of hands in the ordination of ministers, by the constitution of any Presbyterian Church in any part of the world."—(p. 462.) "Neither elders, nor deacons, nor people, nor all combined, can, in the ordinary organized condition of the Church, call or ordain to the office of the ministry. They may call a man to be *their minister*, but, if not already in the office, then other ministers must ordain him and install him, with the imposition of their hands."—(p. 457.) "Ruling elders are laymen, that is, they are distinct from the clergy—they are individuals of the people who are not in orders."—(pp. 462, 463.) That they are laymen, simply, is the necessary consequence of their being representatives, for "a representative is one who bears the character, is clothed with the power, and performs the functions, of others."—(p. 463.) "Ruling elders have always been considered laymen in every branch of the Presbyterian Church."—(p. 465.) "The lay character of ruling elders is fundamental to the Presbyterian system. It is this which brings the lay element into our form of government, and imparts voice and power to the people."—(pp. 465, 466.)

This, we hope, will be acknowledged as a fair exhibition of the substance of what is maintained by our opponents. We have not, of course, quoted every position assumed respecting Ruling Elders, but only such as might shew the substance of their theory. For example, when they say "Ruling Elders are not Ministers" (p. 460); or, "The ministry is the highest office, both for dignity and usefulness" (p. 451); we pass over the statement as not peculiar to them, we ourselves saying exactly the same.

There are found, therefore, in the statements copied by us, the following principles, constituting the theory of Eldership now maintained by the Princeton Review.

1. Ruling Elders are not the Presbyters of Scripture.

2. They are not entitled to the name of Ruling Elders, except in the *general* sense of the terms, nor have they a perfectly clear right to be called even Elders, nor is the name Ruling Elder itself either scriptural or constitutionally Presbyterian.

3. Ruling Elders are laymen—individuals of the people not in orders—and can do nothing but what the people might themselves rightly do. They perform those functions which belong inherently to the people.

4. This is the sense in which they are the representatives of the people. It is in this way, and by this means, that the people's voice and power is felt in our Church government. For the special purpose of thus representing the people in the exercise only of powers which it is quite supposable the people might themselves directly exercise, was the office of Elders instituted.

5. There is no two-fold order of Presbyters. There is but one kind of Presbyters, and they are Ministers of the word. These are a distinct order, and are rightly called *clergy*. They alone are *ex-officio* necessary and constant members of the superior courts. There needs not a single Ruling Elder present, in order to make a perfectly regular as well as valid Presbytery or Synod; so many as may be present may sit as individuals of the people, representing the people, but they are by no means indispensable, like the Ministers.

6. Moreover, Ministers must not be viewed as representatives when they meet in the Church courts. It is not the voice of the Church which is heard through them, but their own voice. They go to those courts unsent by any Church in particular, and, of course, not by the Church as a whole. They go thither in their own right. They do not represent any Church in Presbytery or Synod, but exercise a power of their own, and the people take part in this government by the clergy, through those *individuals of*

the people not in orders, whom they send there to represent them. The "Clergy" get their personal call, not from the people, as the Elders do, but from Christ.

7. Accordingly, none but Ministers can make a Minister. The imposition of the hands of Ministers is essential to the ordination of a Minister or "Clergyman," but the imposition of the hands of the Ruling Elder, in the ordination of one of these "Clergymen," would be an unheard-of, unconstitutional and profane thing. Ruling Elders are incapable of such an act—it is above their sphere. Ordination is not the act of the Presbytery, but of the Ministers in the Presbytery. The Ruling Elders can take part in all the preceding acts of the body, respecting the candidate, but in the imposition of hands upon a "Clergyman" it is not to be allowed them to participate.

Now, in controverting these principles (which are all more or less definitely set forth in the article on Presbyterianism, in the July Repertory, and in various other articles of that quarterly, and, also, in Dr. Hodge's little work, "What is Presbyterianism?") we differ altogether from the reviewer as to the standard by which all these principles are to be tried, when he says, "the question between our respective theories is not what is most scriptural and most authoritatively maintained."—(p. 470.) Being *jure divino* Presbyterians, the question for us is precisely what he says is not the question. And this he will find is the question with our Presbyterian readers. The Church, in so far as her quiet has been or may be disturbed by this discussion, will not rest till it can be settled what is the testimony, on this subject, of the word of God? Let the Repertory venture to distinguish, if it so please, between "*what is scriptural* and most authoritatively maintained," on the one hand, and, on the other hand, "*the Presbyterian system*, as it regards Ruling Elders, which Presbyterian Ministers and Elders are, under solemn and covenant engagement, bound to maintain and preserve."—(p. 470.) We

can make no such distinction, nor will the Church make it. The Presbyterian system is what the Scriptures teach about Church government, which is set forth in our book. Confident and positive, and sometimes as untrustworthy as they are confident and positive, appeals to "the Westminster Assembly and the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, of Ireland, of England, and the numerous branches in Canada, in the United States, and elsewhere," will avail very little against the clear testimony of the Bible. Nor can the decision, even of "large majorities in three of our own General Assemblies," settle this question against the Scripture and our standards, which are drawn out of the Scriptures. It is not "majorities" that are the rule of our faith, but God's words. It is not "majorities" that we have "solemnly covenanted" to follow in all their wrong interpretations of our constitution, but it is that constitution itself, fairly and justly interpreted. An appeal will always be allowed to Presbyterians from the accidental majority of any Assembly to the constitution they have misinterpreted. This is the birthright of us all. The Repertory well knows that Presbyterian General Assemblies have sometimes erred, just like other councils of fallible men. Moreover, the good seed sown in the controversy of 1842-'44 have taken root in many minds, and a new decision by the Assembly might reverse those made twenty years since.

If, then, the Repertory is now willing to abide by "what is scriptural, and may be most authoritatively maintained," we will proceed to prove out of the Scriptures:

First: that there is a two-fold order of Presbyters, and that under this two-fold order, the Ruling Elder is one class of scriptural Presbyters, and that, as such, their presence cannot be ordinarily dispensed with in any court which is a true and regular Presbytery of the Church of Christ.

Here we shall save some time and space by referring to the admissions of the reviewer: "It is not intended

to raise the question of the scriptural warrant of Ruling Elders in the Church." "The true basis of the Ruling Elder's office is to be found in other terms contained in the Scriptures." This means, we suppose, that it is acknowledged the Scriptures refer to some kind of Church officers besides preachers, when they talk of "governments" and "them that rule." Our brethren admit "governors" and "rulers" that are not preachers. How they can afterwards maintain that these "rulers and governors" are mere "laymen," "individuals of the people not in orders," who "can do nothing but what the people might themselves rightly do," and that "they are not *ex-officio* necessary and constant members of superior courts"—how they can reduce so low the "rulers and governors" they have acknowledged to be given in the Scriptures, is more than we have sense enough to comprehend. But the point is yielded by them that the Scriptures do ordain rulers that are not preachers. And what they would deny is, that these rulers are Presbyters. "Presbyter," they say, is properly "Preacher," and those rulers not being Preachers, are not Presbyters. But Paul shows, in 1 Tim. v. 17, that there were a class of Elders or Presbyters who did not labor in word and doctrine, yet ruled well, and so were worthy of double honor; and, therefore, it is clear, from this one scripture, that what makes the Presbyter is not preaching, but ruling. It is clear, from this one scripture, that the Elder who only ruled is a scriptural Presbyter, and, also, that there are two classes of Presbyters; such as rule, and such as with their ruling connect also their labor in word and doctrine.

What is the meaning of the New Testament Greek title *Presbyter*, denied to Ruling Elders? It means an *Elder*, or an *old man*. What is most naturally suggested by that title? It naturally suggests the idea of the wisdom that counsels, that reflects and decides, that authoritatively rules through its native, its unquestioned, its hereditary, and its prescriptive influence and weight, rather than through its

labors to enlighten others by teaching them. It naturally suggests, not a teaching, but a counselling and ruling wisdom. Moreover, it is a title almost always used in the plural number; it is the *Elders* that are continually found using their wisdom in overseeing and directing others. We can trace the title back through the Synagogues that existed in the beginning of the Christian Church, far away to the remotest period of the Jewish Church, and every where it seems always to have signified, not the office of singly or severally teaching or persuading the people, but of jointly counselling together, and then making known the decision to obedient and submissive followers. And yet the Repertory undertakes to twist this title into Preacher, which it never did mean, in any age of the Church!

Were the Elders of the Jews in our Saviour's days the teachers of the people? One in every Synagogue was a teacher as well as a ruler—sometimes more than one in a Synagogue—but the essence of the Jewish Eldership, that which made the Jewish Elder, was *ruling*.

Were the Elders ordained by Paul and Barnabas "in every Church," and by Titus "in every city," teachers? The Apostles and Evangelists, it would seem, in their missionary tours, generally succeeded in converting at least a few souls in every city, and before leaving the little flock to go to regions beyond, they would organize them into a Church, by ordaining Elders over them. What is it most natural to suppose these Elders were? Is it more probable they would be men gifted with the higher and rarer gifts, or with the lower and more ordinary gifts? Is it more likely they were teachers and preachers, or mere rulers and headmen? Does it not seem most probable that in every little company of thirty or forty disciples, the first ingathering of converts in each town, all that generally could be found when the missionary was ready to pass on, were simply some sober-minded, prudent, humble men, to whom the

oversight or pastorship of the little flock might be left? Is it to be supposed that such a lavish bestowal of the highest gifts was then enjoyed as that in every such little company of neophytes there would be found *several* who were fit to be Preachers? The expression is "*Elders* in every Church and in every city (or village)"—not one, but *several*. We ask if it be the most natural supposition that in every little Church several Preachers would be found or would be needed at the beginning?

Look at the list of qualifications for an Elder or Bishop, prescribed by Paul to Titus and to Timothy, and it will be seen that it is most especially applicable to the ruler, and not the preacher. He must be blameless; the husband of one wife; having faithful children; vigilant; sober; of good behavior; given to hospitality; not given to wine; no striker; not greedy of filthy lucre; patient; not a brawler; not covetous; not accused of riot, or unruly; not self-willed; not soon angry; a lover of good men; just; holy; temperate; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection, with all gravity, for if he cannot rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God; not a novice; having a good report of them that are without. Here are three-and-twenty qualifications of the Presbyter or Elder. Are they descriptive of a teacher, or of a ruler? Are they descriptive of a man more or less separated from ordinary life, that he may give himself to reading and reflection, so as to teach the people publicly, or of a man in the very midst of all the avocations of life, and mingling with all kinds of people, exposed to brawlings and fightings, and every kind of temptation and trouble, yet called on by his office to lead a blameless life in the midst of it all, and be a good under-shepherd of the sheep? Along with these three-and-twenty, we find two other qualifications mentioned—one in Timothy, the other in Titus—which are the only ones in the whole combined list having any applicability to Teachers, as such, and they

are not, by any means, exclusively so applicable. The first is, "apt to teach;" the second is, "holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." These gainsayers are such as opposed Titus' doctrine, and he is commanded by Paul to rebuke them sharply, and to speak the things which become sound doctrine. Now, the Presbyters must be men holding fast what they have been taught, so that they may be able to withstand, and also to exhort these gainsayers; they must be apt to teach, going from house to house, and applying the preached word to every individual of their flock.

There are various offices, the names of which are used interchangeably in the epistles of the New Testament, as Presbyter, Bishop, Pastor, etc., all of them described as offices of rule and oversight, but not offices of public teaching. Indeed, so far from its being true that Presbyter and Preacher are synonymous in the apostolic, or even in the primitive, Church, the fact is, that the latter officer soon drove out the former from almost all place and being in the Church. The preaching Presbyter soon grew to be so great, that he left no room for the mere Ruler. The name Bishop, originally common to all Rulers, becomes, at an early period, peculiar to the teaching Presbyter. As early as the commencement of the second century we find this distinctive application and use of a title which certainly was common to all Presbyters in the Apostles' time. Thus came in Prelacy, by the driving out of the Ruling Elder. And yet our brethren flatter themselves that they best contend against Prelacy by insisting on the Preacher only as the true and proper Presbyter, and leaving the Ruler out of the presbyterate! Strange, that they should not discover how they are actually doing the very same thing with the title "Presbyter," which the Prelatists of the second century did with that of "Bishop," viz: confining it to Ministers, and thus robbing the Ruling Elders of what

belongs to them. Instead of their best knowing how to defend our cause in the controversy with Prelacy, they are themselves actually building up a hierarchy amongst ourselves.

We think that we have now proved out of the Scriptures that the Ruling Elder is a true and proper Presbyter, and, in fact, the aboriginal Presbyter. Apostles and Evangelists preceded these Presbyters in the Christian Church; but these Presbyters, Bishops, Pastors, preceded Teachers. After the extraordinary gifts came the ordinary; and of the ordinary gifts, the lower preceded, generally, the higher. Accordingly, we read, when He ascended He gave some Apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers. Upon the first organization of every little Church, it got pastors, bishops, presbyters, head-men, rulers. Afterwards, gradually these little flocks were supplied with teachers.

Now, our form of government says: "We hold it to be expedient, and agreeable to Scripture and the practice of the primitive Christians, that the Church be governed by congregational; presbyterial, and synodical assemblies."—(See Chap. VIII.) The very object, of course, of the ordination by the Apostles of several rulers in every little Church, was, that they might thus, as a *council of rulers*, govern and direct them. It was not the government of Independency which the Apostles set up—a government by the people directly; or by the deputies or creatures of the people; or by individuals of the people charged by the people, for convenience' sake, with doing what the people could themselves do. Neither was it, on the other hand, the government of Prelacy which the Apostles set up—a government of "Clergymen," either one or many—a government by men separated, as a distinct class, from the people, and to be called *clergy*, or the *inheritance of the Lord*, which all the Lord's dear people, in fact, are. The Church government which the Apostles set up in all those

little Churches, was before Teachers were given to them all, and so it could not have been a government by Teaching Elders. It was a government by Rulers sitting in assemblies and counselling together. These things being so ordained of the Apostles, who had any right, subsequently, to change the government into a government by "*Clergy*," as it certainly did afterwards become? The Rulers being put in charge at first, each company of their own little flock, when afterwards, gradually, the scattered flocks came to be joined visibly together, in one great Church of each different country or nation, meeting together in the assemblies of their Bishops, how was it that the original right of rule had all been taken out of those hands in which the Apostles placed it? Who was it that had found means to hinder these same Rulers from composing the presbyterial or classical, as they had, from the first, composed the congregational, Assembly? Or, who had found means to thrust them out from the synodical Assembly, where they had the same right to sit as in the classical? Every student of Church history knows how it was done. It was, as Ambrose says, "the *pride* of the teachers, while they alone wished to appear something." Our brethren who now maintain that "only Ministers are *ex officio* necessary and constant members of the superior courts," must beware whose steps they are treading in. They are on prelatie ground. If Ruling Elders are true scriptural Presbyters, they have a right to be in all our courts, for all those courts are assemblies of Presbyters. If the session is necessarily open to them, so is the Presbytery, the Synod and the Assembly, and no one of these bodies is regular without Elders of both classes. But, still further, if these courts are assemblies of Presbyters, none can be in them but Rulers, for Presbyter means Ruler, and not Preacher. As Preacher, merely, no man may sit in any one of these bodies.

We marvel very much that our brethren, even such emi-

nently sensible and learned ones, fail to understand the theory of Eldership they are combating upon this point, of the aboriginal presbyterate of the Ruler. The reviewer, for example, seems to think we thus exalt the Ruler over the Teacher. Not so. He seems to think we deny the Ministry to be a permanent "*office*," and make a mere "*function*" of it.—(p. 190.) But the terms "*office*" and "*function*" are synonymous, in our use of them. We hold Ruling Elders to be Presbyters, with all the rights of the office of Presbyters who rule; but we hold that there is another class of Presbyters, who labor in the word as well as rule. It is matter of record that at first, and for a long time, the Teaching Presbyter was selected from amongst the Ruling Presbyters. Now, he was a Presbyter before he became a laborer in the word and doctrine. It was not his teaching which made a Presbyter of him. It was not his teaching that gave him a place in the Church assemblies, from the lowest to the highest, but it was his being a Ruler. The scriptural Presbyter, Bishop, Pastor, was less than the Teacher. Ruling Elders are less now than Ministers, for the same reason. But, in the beginning, and to this day, they are equal as *Presbyters*, or *Rulers*. Neither of them fills more than one seat, or gives more than one voice, in the courts, and there, in the courts, the Elder may lift up his voice as high as any Preacher of them all. Where the Preacher can *outvoice* the Elder, is in the pulpit, and there only. But to *outvoice* him there, surely, ought to be enough. The theory of the Repertory disparages the Ministry as well as the Eldership, for it implies that no difference at all is put between them by us, when we put between them the mighty power of the office of preaching the Gospel. Let the Repertory but consider carefully the distinction of *several* power and *joint* power, of *potestas ordinis* and *potestas jurisdictionis*, (which, it appears to be intimated on page 228, is a distinction originated by Dr. Breckinridge, but which is as old as the Second Book of

Discipline,) and it must discover that when we ascribe to all the Presbyters of both classes the joint power of rule, we do not make Elders equal to Teachers, because to the latter belongs, as individual Ministers, the *several* power of their teaching office, which does not belong to the former. Every man of these Teaching Elders has the whole of this several power committed to him, and he teaches, as he is taught himself, alone by the Spirit. But the rulers only share between them the power of ruling and governing the Church in her different courts. In all our assertions, therefore, of the rights of Ruling Elders, we are speaking always of their rights in the secondary office of ruling. When we say that ruling is the essence of the presbyterate, and that the Ruler is the aboriginal Presbyter, we only assert that this office arose first in the order of nature and of time. We have never made Rulers greater than Teachers, nor yet their equals—we have never said *Ruling Elders are Teachers*. We complain of this charge as an injustice often done us by the Repertory, (pp. 449, 561, and elsewhere,) and done us, also, by Dr. Hodge, in the last Assembly, when he said the doctrine had been advanced and strenuously maintained by us, that “Ruling Elders and Ministers, being alike Presbyters, have the same office, all are bishops, pastors and teachers, as well as rulers.” We do not believe Dr. Hodge can prove this statement. At least we may, with confidence, demand, on behalf of all the prominent advocates of the “new theory,” where did any one of them ever say the Ruler is a public teacher? What are we to think of such statements from such a quarter? The reader must answer the question for himself; we do not know how to answer it.

We cannot dismiss this first topic of our argument without considering briefly an *objection* of our opponents to this whole reasoning from the Scriptures in favor of the Ruling Elder's right to the name and functions of a Presbyter. It is the very specious objection that the name Presbyter

is applicable to the Ruler only in "a *general* sense," "an *appellative* sense," "a *wide* sense," and not in "the *official* sense." The Repertory says:

"When this theory assumes that, because, in a *general* sense, the term *Elder* may be given as a warrantable translation of the Greek word *Presbyter*, in its official sense during the apostolic age (when the names of office were, it is said, used without scrupulosity, and with much license), that, therefore, it includes ruling elders as now understood, there is a glaring *non sequitur*."—(p. 215.) "Based upon the English or modern version of the Scriptures, and the frequent use in them of such words as *Elder*, for the original words *Presbyter*, and upon the now established use of the official title *Ruling Elder*, it has all the advantage of apparently carrying with its premises its conclusion."—(p. 449.)

Dr. Thornwell himself, in the last extremity, said that he did not hold the new theory.* Then he has no controversy with us, nor we with him, so far as the eldership is concerned. The dispute is reduced to a mere logomachy, if the only question is whether the ruling elder is a presbyter. Dr. Thornwell asked, 'If he is not a presbyter, what right has he in the Presbytery. You might as well (he said) put any other good man there.' It is on all sides admitted that in the New Testament the presbyters are bishops—how, then, are we to avoid the conclusion that the ruling elder is a bishop, and, therefore, the same in office as the minister, and the one as much a clergyman as the other? This is the dilemma in which, as we understood, Dr. Thorn-

* Here we must take the liberty of correcting our contemporary. Who, in fact, was "in the last extremity" at the time referred to, let those present say—but this we affirm, that Dr. Thornwell said, not that he "did not hold the new theory," but that *Dr. Hodge's statement* of the theory (which we have just been complaining of) was "not his theory."

Yet, further: it is our impression that the conversation, subsequently referred to above, neither began nor ended as our contemporary represents. It did not begin by Dr. Thornwell saying what is ascribed to him about the Presbyter. He did not, at that time, certainly, say what is ascribed here to him. This conversation began when Dr. Hodge interrupted Dr. Thornwell, at a particular juncture of the debate, and earnestly declared (what he does not seem now to *stand up to*) that he "could agree to every principle set forth by Dr. Thornwell here to-day." Then it was that Dr. Thornwell asked if Dr. Hodge "would be understood to say that he held the Ruling Elder to be a Presbyter," and Dr. Hodge replied, "I will answer that question, if you will tell me whether you hold the Apostle to have been a deacon." Dr. Thornwell answered, "No." Dr. Hodge rejoined, "But the Apostle says he was a *διάκονος*." And then, the Moderator insisting that the hour of adjournment was come, Dr. Thornwell said, "O, well, we shall see about that to-morrow."

well endeavored to place Dr. Hodge, when he asked him, on the floor of the Assembly, whether he admitted that the elder was a presbyter. Dr. Hodge rejoined, by asking Dr. Thornwell whether he admitted that the Apostles were deacons. He answered, no. But, says Dr. Hodge, Paul says he was a *διάκονος*. O, says Dr. Thornwell, that was in the general sense of the word. Precisely so. If the answer is good in the one case, it is good in the other. If the Apostles being deacons in the wide sense of the word, does not prove that they were officially deacons, then that elders are presbyters in the one sense, does not prove them to be presbyters in the other sense.”—(p. 562.)

Now, whether we “base our theory on the English or modern version of the Bible,” let the reader of the foregoing argument, from the Greek Scriptures, say. The reviewer, when making this charge, seems once again to have strangely forgotten that he is dealing with men who give to nothing else any weight in this controversy but to the testimony of the very Word of God. The charge comes with an ill grace from one who had admitted that “the term Elder may be given as a warrantable translation of the Greek word Presbyter, in its official sense”—and had yet, in the same sentence, disparaged *the Apostolic age*, as a time “when names of office were used without scrupulosity, and with much license!” The expression is quoted, indeed, from Dr. Miller, but it was not employed in this sense by that venerable Father.

But, let the reader observe that the Repertory says (page 562), that if the only question is, whether the Ruling Elder is a Presbyter, (that is, whether, in some large or loose sense, he is a Presbyter,) then the dispute is reduced to a mere logomachy; for it admits that, in this large sense, he may be called a Presbyter, just as the Apostle is, in the large sense, called a Deacon. On page 450, however, it had said that the controversy, though about words, “is not a mere logomachy, but involves all that is vital in the relations of the Eldership, the Ministry, and the Deaconship.” We agree with the last quoted statement of the Repertory, in so far as concerns the Eldership and the Ministry. The controversy between us is no logomachy; nor yet is that an

unimportant difference which prevails between us, as to the point of the *general*, the *large*, the *wide*, the *appellative*, or, on the other hand, the *official*, application of the title Presbyter to Ruling Elders. All that is vital in the relations of the Eldership and the Ministry to one another, and of each to the Church, is involved in this dispute about the sense of Presbyter, as applied to the Elder. If our brethren can make out their case, and show that only in a general, and not in the strict and proper, sense, that title belongs to the Ruling Elder, then, in our humble judgment, the office becomes a mere human expedient, and may as well be struck out of our Church constitution, and the hierarchy set up at once.

Let us, then, carefully notice what is alleged by our opponents on this subject, for it is, indeed, their chief refuge and their stronghold, to which they flee when pressed by our Scripture proofs. Their position is, that the Apostles were, in a wide sense, *Deacons*, or *Servants*, of the Lord and his Church;—the Prophets were such Deacons; so were the Evangelists; so the Pastors; so the Teachers; and so the official Deacons given by Christ to his people; so, indeed, every particular Christian; all were Deacons of the Church and her Lord in the general sense of the term *diakonos*, or *servant*. Now, it is just in a like general sense, and it only in this general sense, that Presbyter is applied to the Ruler. The Apostle, the Prophet, the Evangelist, might all of them be called *Presbyter*, in this general sense of *aged man*, as a respectful appellative, and so the Church “governors,” and they “that rule,” received the name in the sense of a respectful appellative, merely, and not a title of office. But as a title of office, it was given always to preachers of the word only. They only were, officially, the Presbyters.

Now, must not our brethren have been hard pressed when they resorted to this invention to escape from the power of the plain teachings of Scripture? Let the reader mark what consequences this hypothesis must involve for

them. Here is a title, *Deacon*, which has an official sense in five places in the New Testament, where the Christian officer of that name is named, (viz: Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 10, 12, 13,) and which in four-and-twenty other places has the general or appellative sense of *servant*, as in 1 Cor. iii. 5, "Who were Paul, and who Apollos, but ministers, (servants, *διδάκονοι*,) by whom ye believed?" or, 2 Cor. xi. 23, "Are they ministers (servants, *διδάκονοι*,) of Christ? (I speak as a fool,) I am more." Here, on the other hand, is a title, *Presbyter*, which has been generally understood to have an official sense in seventeen places in the New Testament, where the Christian officer of that name seems to be referred to, (viz: Acts xi. 30; xiv. 23; xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; xvi. 4; xx. 17; xxi. 18; 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, 19; Tit. i. 5; James v. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Jno. 1; 3 Jno. 1;) and which in barely two or three other places has been considered usually to have the general or appellative sense of old man, namely, Acts ii. 17, "Your old men (*πρεσβύτεροι*) shall dream dreams," and in perhaps 1 Peter v. 5, "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves to the elder, (or old men, *πρεσβύτεροις*,) and perhaps 1 Tim. v. 1, "Rebuke not an Elder" (or old man, *πρεσβυτέρω*). Now, *our position* is, that the common opinion is correct, and that in these seventeen places the title *Presbyter* is official, and not appellative. But *our brethren say*, on the contrary, that in whichsoever of these seventeen places it refers to the Ruler, it is appellative; is applied in its wide or large sense, and, of course, may be substituted by *old man*. And what is their proof that this is the sense to be given to this title whenever used of the Ruler? Why, it is barely and simply this: *Deacon*, although sometimes an official title, is, nevertheless, frequently applied in the general or appellative sense to Apostles themselves. The reviewer deals very freely in assertions about the large sense of *Presbyter*, as applied to Rulers, but there is no proof and no argument, except this argument from the two-fold use of the word *Diakonos*. But our brethren were under no necessity to

argue from this two-fold use of Deacon, for we were ready to grant such a two-fold use of the name Presbyter, itself. The question is not, whether there be a two-fold use of this word Presbyter, one *general*, the other *official*. We agree on that point. But the question between us and the Repertory is, whether, in these seventeen cases, or any of them, the word Presbyter is to be taken in its general, appellative sense, of old man? What proof, then, we ask again, does the Repertory produce for its statement, that the word, in any of these seventeen cases, is to be so understood? There is none furnished. We are satisfied none can be furnished. Let our brethren make the trial, and undertake to substitute either "Teacher" or "old man" in either of those places, and they will soon see in what difficulty their hypothesis has involved them. Will they say the disciples sent relief "by the hands of Barnabas and Paul to the *Teachers*, or to the *old men*, at Jerusalem?"—(See Rom. xi. 30.) Will they say, "When they had ordained them *Teachers*, or *old men*, in every Church?"—(See Rom. xiv. 23.) Will they say, "Paul and Barnabas should go up to Jerusalem to the Apostles and *Teachers*, or to the Apostles and *old men*, about this question?"—(See Rom. xv. 2.) Will they say, "Let the *Teachers*, or the *old men*, that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine?"—(See 1 Tim. v. 17.) If the position assumed were a correct one, our brethren might surely make either the one or else the other substitution properly and fairly. It is in this way the word *ought to have been translated*, if our brethren are right. What propriety was there in our translators putting in a title where a common noun substantive was found in the original? They did not so in any case of all those four-and-twenty, where the word *Diakonos* has the general or appellative sense of servant, but in all those cases they translated it servant. This hypothesis, therefore, involves a charge against our English Bible, of having frequently made a title out of the word Elder, or

Presbyter, used only in its general or appellative sense of old man. Our brethren, we repeat, were surely hard pressed, when they fled to this refuge. Let us throw their argument into the form of a syllogism, and its true value will be made clear.

1. The words *Deacon*, and *Presbyter*, as employed in the New Testament, are sometimes appellative and sometimes official, in their signification.

2. Out of twenty-nine cases where *Deacon* occurs in the New Testament, five cases are of the official use, and four-and-twenty of the appellative use, of the word.

3. Therefore, out of the twenty places in the New Testament where the word *Elder* occurs, it is never once used officially, in reference to the "Church governors," or "them that rule."

One word more about this objection of the Repertory, and we pass from this topic of our discussion to the next. The reader has observed that it is admitted the Scripture expressions, "Church governors," and "he that ruleth," do denote some kind of rulers in the Church who are not public teachers. Such rulers being admitted by our brethren, how can they make any question that the Apostle is referring to them, when he speaks of the Elders that rule well, but do not labor in word and doctrine? Admitting the existence of such officers, how can our brethren stop short of acknowledging two classes of Presbyters, as referred to by the Apostle in that same passage? They have already made the acknowledgment, and no such futile distinction as that between the *appellative* and the *official* use of Presbyter can help them to escape the consequences.

We shall now attempt to prove from the Scriptures,

Secondly, That these two classes of Presbyters are both appointed by the Lord, to do such acts of ruling as the people have no power of right directly to do; they are both alike spiritual office-bearers; both representatives of the

people in the very same sense, namely, of rulers chosen by the people to administer amongst them the laws of Christ, by meeting in parliamentary bodies vested with divine authority to rule, and by acting in those bodies for the Church, to whom the Lord gave them as His and her ministers, or servants.

We find a part of the Scripture proof of these positions in all those passages which have been already quoted as setting forth the history of the first organization of the Church. Rulers are ordained in every little Church from the beginning, and then, subsequently, some of these rulers are also ordained to the work of public teaching. Only one of these two classes teach publicly, but both rule by the same authority. The one has precisely the same power of rule as the other. And to both it is given by the Lord, and not the people. They are both set over the people by the Lord, who did not give the people the right of direct self-government, but ordained, from the beginning, officers to rule them. The rule, however, is plainly set forth in the Scriptures, as that of deliberative parliamentary assemblies. Our Saviour says to his twelve disciples (Matt. xviii.), "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," etc.; and, in the same connection, he ordains that after private efforts at removing offences have been tried in vain, they must be referred to those who bind and loose in each particular Church. "Tell it to the Church, and if he will not hear them," etc. Here is Scripture warrant for the congregational assembly, or Church session. So, for the classical assembly, which we call the Presbytery, we have Scripture warrant in what is said of Timothy's ordination by the Presbytery (1 Tim. iv. 14), and in the many different congregations which there must have been in Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus and Corinth, being called *one Church*, as in Acts viii. 1; xiii. 1; xx. 17, and in 1 Cor. i. 2. How else were these different congregations one Church, in any sense, segregating them from all the other saints in the

world, as they are segregated in these passages, except in that they were represented and ruled in *one Presbytery*? So, we find Scripture warrant for the synod in Acts xv. Yet, are all these rulers and bodies of rulers* the Ministers or servants of Christ and his Church. All are his ascension gifts to her, and for her service and edification. They serve her in ruling her. The Church is one body, but all the members have not the same office. There are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. No one can say to the other, I have no need of thee; nay, much more, those members of the body which seem to be feeble are necessary, and so God tempers the body of his people together, that there should be no schism in it. Some are to rule, others are to be ruled, but all are members one of another, and this organization of the body is not of human expediency, but of divine authority.

That both classes of Presbyters have the same right of rule is further proved from Scripture, by divine commands to the Church, of her obedience, in which both seem to be included. "We beseech you (says the Apostle, in Thess. v. 12, 13) to know (that is, to acknowledge,) them that labor among you and are over you in the Lord, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." What work? That of laboring in the word, and, also, of ruling, or being over them in the Lord.

Both classes are to be counted worthy of double honor (in comparison of the widows indeed, whom he had commanded them just before to *honor*,) if they rule well.— 1 Tim. v. 17.

Both classes seem to be included, since neither is excepted, in the command (Heb. xiii. 17), "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account," etc.

Still further, both these classes of office-bearers that rule in parliamentary assemblies, must be referred to (because both were existing and acting by divine authority in the

apostolic Church) in all such passages as 1 Cor. v. 4, 12, 13: "In the name of our Lord Jesus, when ye are gathered together," etc., etc. "Do ye not judge them that are within? but them that are without God judgeth." And, 1 Peter v. 1-3, "The Elders that are among you I exhort; * * * feed (or govern) the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof; * * * neither as being lords over God's heritage," etc.

Once more: the history of the Synod or Council of Jerusalem, proves that both classes of Presbyters are Rulers, in the same sense, and on the same ground, for Elders as well as Apostles imposed the necessary things upon the Churches, and authoritatively determined the decrees. The only reason which can be conceived why the teachers then present, who were actually inspired men, did thus put themselves on an equality with the Rulers, was, (as the London Ministers in their "Divine right of Church government" suggest—see p. 271, American edition,) that they might exhibit a pattern to after ages; otherwise, all this was unnecessary, for how needless for inspired men to reason and dispute on the subject, when the sentence of one inspired man was sufficient for decision. This council, then, is a pattern for our Church courts, and Rulers are to act in them with the same authority as Teachers, and the Teachers appear there only because they have the right to rule, as well as to labor in the word and doctrine.

We think ourselves warranted, therefore, in concluding that the Princeton Review errs grievously, when it proclaims the Ruling Elder to be nothing but a layman. He is, on the contrary, a high spiritual officer in the house of God. It gives us great pain, as Presbyterians, to have our brethren express themselves on this point as they do, both in the second article on Theories of the Eldership (pp. 462, 469), and in the article on Presbyterianism (p. 539), of the Repertory for July, 1860. In the one place Elders are pronounced to be "laymen, individuals of the people not

in orders, laymen just as Deacons are laymen." In the other place, it is said, "There are but two radically different theories in this subject. According to the one, the Ruling Elder is a layman; according to the other, he is a Clergyman." What would the London Ministers, who, in those days of old, when the controversy ran so high between the English Presbyterians and Independents, wrote the great defence and exposition of our Church government, just now referred to—what would they say, to hear from such a seat of orthodox Presbyterian learning issue forth what they used to call "Dr. Field's scoffing term of lay governors, or lay elders?" What would they say to hear so continually employed by this leading Presbyterian authority what they called "the groundless distinction of the ministry and people into the clergy and laity, which is justly rejected by sound orthodox writers, as not only without, but against, the warrant of Scripture?"—(See page 130.) With these old-fashioned Presbyterian Divines, we scout the use of all such prelatie distinctions. We object to all attempts, from whatever quarter, to make the Deacon a Ruler in the House of God—yet is the Deacon also an office-bearer, and as such, even he is not to be dishonored by such names and such distinctions as these. He, also, like the very people themselves, is of the Lord's inheritance, as well as the most gifted Teacher. Nor do we acknowledge that, denying the Ruling Elder to be a layman, we must needs make him a Clergyman. The Repertory's analysis is defective—there is another theory, radically different from both those it names, and it is the theory of the New Testament and of our Presbyterian Fathers. It is the theory which the Repertory is endeavoring to confute, that *they* are true Scriptural Presbyters *who only rule* in God's house, and, on the other hand, that some Presbyters not only rule well, but likewise labor in the word and doctrine.

We think ourselves, also, warranted in saying that the Repertory errs grievously, when, denying this true scrip-

tural theory, it really makes the Elder a mere expedient to get the people's voice and power felt, after a Congregationalist fashion, in our Church government. That plain passage of Scripture, 1 Tim. v. 17, respecting which Dr. Owen says, "that on its first proposal, a rational man, who is unprejudiced, and never heard of the controversy about Ruling Elders, can hardly avoid an apprehension that there are *two sorts of Elders*, some that labor in the word, and some that do not;"—that plain passage, where the London Ministers say (page 268) that "the divine warrant for Ruling Elders shines with more peculiar brightness than any where in the Book of God;"—that plain passage of Scripture it seeks, with the most earnest efforts, to expound in some other sense, denying its pertinency at all to this office. But it acknowledges a representative of the people, in the sense of a deputy of the people—one "clothed with the power and performing the functions of the people"—"instituted for the special purpose of representing the people, and, therefore, necessarily one of the people;"—it acknowledges such an officer, "by whom the lay element is brought into our form of government, and voice and power in it are imparted to the people." Where, in the Scripture, does it find this arrangement, there being denied to be any class of Presbyters who only rule, and do not publicly teach? It is found, says the Repertory, in the term "governments," and "he that ruleth." Strange, indeed, that these should refer to some office to whom 1 Tim. v. 17, has no reference or applicability. But, where does the Repertory find, in the Scriptures, the principle that the voice of the people, as such—of the people, *not as an organized body, with its officers*, set up in that organized form by our Lord, but *as people, in distinction from their officers*—where, in Scripture, does it find the principle that this kind of popular voice, this lay element, is to be introduced into our form of government? The Repertory, in its article on Presbyterianism (p. 555),

maintains, indeed, the divine right of the people to take part in the government of the Church, on the ground, (1.) That the spirit of God, who is the source of all power, dwells in the people, and not exclusively in the Clergy; (2.) That we are commanded to submit ourselves to our brethren; (3.) That the people are commanded to exercise this power; (4.) That the gift of ruling is a permanent gift; (5.) That in the New Testament we find the brethren in the actual recognized exercise of the authority in question. *As to the first ground*, we say the spirit of God has ordained no direct exercise of the popular voice in Church government. The election of whom they will for Church rulers belongs, of course, to the people, by divine right, but that is not a *popular voice* in the actual government, for these chosen rulers or representatives are not instructed by the people in any form; are not deputies, but representatives, and exercise their high office as unto the Lord, and this election of Church Rulers as really occurs in the case of Ministers as Elders. No man can be a Minister any more than an Elder, without the popular call. *As to the other four statements*, we say they are just, only in the sense that all the doings of the courts are the Church's doings, because they act for the Church. There is no lay element, whatever, in any part of our government, in the Repertory's sense of it. Nothing of the kind is provided for in the Scriptures. Nothing of the kind is held by our Presbyterian Fathers. The whole theory is a novelty, indeed—an invention of our brethren. The Scripture doctrine, and that received by Gillespie, Rutherford, and our other Scotch Presbyterian Fathers, and held forth in our book (Form of Government, Chaps. IV. V. VII.) is, that the Church is governed—that she is governed by congregational, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies—that those assemblies are assemblies of Presbyters, who are all rulers—that the Pastor (or Minister) is a Presbyter or Elder, as he governs well in the house of God (not as he labors in the word and

doctrine)—that the Ruling Elder is properly (simply) the representative of the people, and not also a teacher—and that he is a representative because he is *chosen to govern*. He is one of that assembly of Presbyters who act for the Church in the government and direction of her affairs. He is her servant and the Lord's servant, to rule the Church for her edification. But he is not elected that he may do the bidding of the Church, nor yet of that portion of the Church which is called *the people*. He represents, as *ruler*, the whole Church and her Lord. He acts for all the interests of the Church, whether they concern office-bearers or people. He labors, of course, in a special manner, for the good of some one Church—but as often as he acts in the higher courts, he considers not the good, much less the pleasure, of his own particular constituency—whether they be regarded as people, or session, or presbytery—but he considers the well-being of the whole body, including all sections, and all orders, and all classes. We think it would puzzle the Repertory to state definitely what it means by its representatives' speaking *the popular voice*, or introducing a *lay element* into our government, in any other way than as we have now described. Surely, it does not mean to say that popular prejudice or passion is to sway the Elder; that he is to be the organ of an individual, or of a clique, or of a mob; that he is to be directed by the will of one man, or of twenty men, or of all the crowd of men, women and children that belong to the Church of which he is a Ruler, so that their voice may directly reach the Presbytery. If this be the Repertory's doctrine, do let it speak it out distinctly, that the Church and her Ruling Elders may understand! And do let it prepare a clear and thorough exposition of the rules and regulations which may be best observed by our brethren of the Eldership in the discharge of these, their new and hitherto unheard-of duties!

We believe it cannot be doubted by any candid examiner of these representations of the Repertory, that they contain

an element which is Congregationalist, and not Presbyterian. In fact, this is, in so many words, its own statement—a *lay element* is to be introduced, by having *laymen, of the people*, members of the courts. “It is precisely because the Ruling Elder is a layman that he is a real power, a distinct element, in our system.”—(pp. 466, 560.) In Dr. Hodge’s little work, “What is Presbyterianism?” this idea is set forth with equal definiteness. The people, as such, as distinguished from the Clergy, are to have a substantive part in the government of the Church. They send men to the Church courts from amongst themselves, who are still laymen; who are invested with authority to do only what the people themselves might directly do; who exercise only the powers of the people, as distinguished from rulers of the people. We say, this is not Presbyterian Church government, either as expounded by Presbyterian authorities, or as set forth in the Scriptures. We say, the Scriptures teach, and our Fathers held, that the Lord Jesus set up His Church as an organized body, with officers appointed by Him to rule her, not according to the popular will, in any direct sense whatever, but only in the indirect and secondary sense, that they, being taken from amongst the people, would fairly consider their real and true interests. They were to do for the people, not whatever the people should wish, but what they might judge, in the fear of God, and in a paternal love for the Church, that the people *ought* to wish. Christ made no promises to the people, in a separate capacity, but all to *His Bride*, as she is an organized body, with divinely appointed office-bearers. Churches were from the beginning, and are now, always organized with Elders over them, and the whole right of the people, as respects government, is to choose whom they will to rule them. Nor can they proceed to this choice of themselves, independently of their existing rulers. They cannot do any thing, as people, apart from their office-bearers—least of all can they take men from themselves, being still mere

individuals of the people, mere laymen, and not ordained to be high spiritual office-bearers, and send them to the Church courts, to exercise "the people's part" of the Church government. We say, this whole doctrine of "the people's part in the government" is unpresbyterian. Our Board of Publication has issued Dr. Hodge's book by hundreds and by thousands, as we were told by him, but we believe that the Church will, upon examination, repudiate this, as a new and unsound addition to the system of our Fathers.

But, if the Presbyterian Church cannot possibly digest this *Congregational* principle, what will it do with a principle introduced by the Repertory, which is the very antipodes of this? The people have a part, a substantive part, of the government; who has the other part of it? *The Clergy*, is the answer given. Dr. Hodge is earnest in his denial "that the Clergy have *all* the power;" part of it, as we understand his book, he will cheerfully yield to them, as Clergy—as of an independent order, and not representatives of the people—but the people must have a substantive part of it.—(See "What is Presbyterianism?" pp. 9, 15, 21.) This, it seems to us, no one can deny, is a prelatie principle. It sets up a hierarchy who exercise powers of rule in their own right, and not as representatives, or chosen Rulers of the people. "It is an entire mistake (says the Repertory, for July, p. 454,) that the Minister is sent to Presbytery by the people. Every ordained Minister is *ex-officio* a member of Presbytery," etc. Granted, of course, that such is the law, but as to the principle of the law, the Presbyterian idea is, that Ministers go to the assemblies of Presbyters because they, also, are Presbyters, or Rulers, all chosen by the people to rule them. In this only true sense of representatives of the people, they, also, are representatives, that is, *rulers chosen to rule the people*. But the idea held forth in the Repertory, and in the little work referred to, is, that the Clergy are, in some sense, an independent body of men, and there is no difficulty in allowing this indepen-

dence, nor in submitting to the rule exercised by them in their own right as Clergy—the only point to be insisted on is, that they do not possess *the exclusive rule*—they have not the *whole government*, but the people must have a part of it, which they are to exercise by sending laymen, like themselves, to deliberate and vote with the Clergy. The Church is governed by a *hierarchy of Clergymen*, yet *individuals of the people, not in orders*, sit with the Clergy, and exercise the people's part of the government! Thus, the theory of Princeton makes our Church government what was well described in this work twelve years ago, as “an odd mixture of an elective aristocracy, the Clergy—and a pure democracy, the people.”—(S. P. R., Vol. II., p. 51.)

It is perfectly logical, that those who hold these prelatie, or semi-prelatie, views, should deny the right of Ruling Elders to lay on hands in the ordination of a Clergyman. For, of course, “the Clergy” are, upon this principle, as truly a separate order of men as Rome herself can make them; the peculiar inheritance of the Lord; his *κληρος*; holier than the people; a priesthood apart by themselves. *Laymen*, of course, can take no part in the ordination of such. Only Ministers can make a Minister—only those who have orders can communicate them to others. There is a mysterious influence which oozes out of the sacred persons of Ministers through the tips of their fingers, when they lay on their holy hands upon the head of any man, and then he, in his turn, can hand down and finger down this *virus* to others after him; and thus, only, is the apostolical succession of true Presbyterian Clergymen to be preserved! If those “individuals of the people,” who have been “introduced” amongst “the Clergy,” only to do “what the people themselves can rightfully do;” if those “individuals not in orders,” were to take part in ordination, which is a sacrament, since it pertains only to the Clergy, it would be a presumptuous and profane intrusion—a dreadful sacrilege!

What we have had space to say in this number has all related more or less directly to the argument from Scripture, by which we sustain our views against the tremendous onset made on them in this leading organ of our Church. In our next number we shall, with the leave of Providence, pursue the reviewer into those Presbyterian authorities he so confidently refers to. And we are not without some faint hope that these favorite weapons of his, which he is somewhat careless in handling, may be wrested from him, and even turned effectually against himself and all who stand with him in this struggle.



ARTICLE VII.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Land and the Book, or Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and Scenery, of the Holy Land.* By W. M. THOMSON, D. D., twenty-five years a Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in Syria and Palestine. Maps, Engravings, etc. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square: 1859. 2 vols., 12mo.

We have strangely neglected, in previous issues, to notice this work, which had every good claim on our attention. We will now only say, at this late day, that if intimate and thorough acquaintance with his subject, and the most lively interest in it, can fit an author to discharge his office well. Dr. Thomson may be presumed to have performed, to the full satisfaction of his readers, that which he undertook. His style is animated, his descriptions graphic. For the traveller in Palestine, this work is a complete *vade mecum*,