

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXX.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, MDCCLXXIX.

ARTICLE I.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

In the remarks which we propose to make upon this subject, we have in our view the needs of the great body of private members of the Church rather than the needs of the ministers of the gospel; although we are not without hope of being able to say something which may serve to impart additional clearness to the views of some ministers who have not made the subject a matter of special study. Observation and experience have convinced us that there is not a little confusion, if not some error, in the notions entertained by many intelligent Presbyterians in regard to the nature and design of this ordinance, and to the mode in which it conduces to the sanctification of believers. Fatal errors in regard to it were taught in the Church for ages; and so inveterate have these errors become, so thoroughly had they poisoned the life of Christians, that even the great men who were raised up by Divine Providence and employed as its instruments in the work of reform in the sixteenth century, failed to reach any harmony of views among themselves concerning it; and an ordinance which had been established by the Saviour as the most impressive symbol of the union and communion of his people, became the occasion of bitter contentions and divisions. Its mission, like the mission of the Redeemer himself, seemed to be that of bringing a sword, not

error of the Papacy and of its imitators among so called Protestants, to disregard the interests of personal holiness and to attempt to put God off with a ceremonial service which would be despised if offered to themselves by their fellow-men. Holiness in his Church is the very end and purpose for which Jesus gave his body to be broken, and no man can be said "to discern" that body who does not feel this to be true. He may not be able to formulate, after the fashion of the theologians, this and other truths set forth in the Supper; but there will be a spontaneous and unreflective recognition of them. If Jesus, the holy, harmless, and undefiled One, did not die for the purpose of bringing his redeemed into the likeness of himself, then the Bible, the Church, the sacraments, have all alike been given in vain. To be left to the corruption of our nature is to be left to the worm that never dies.

THOMAS E. PECK.

ARTICLE II.

THE MINISTERIAL GIFT.

We often see persons exercising a control over others at once so subtle that it is scarcely felt and so powerful that it does much toward shaping their lives and destinies. There is no conscious wearing of a heavy yoke or of galling chains. The will suffers no very disagreeable check, yet there is another will which governs as potently, in its sphere, as that of an emperor with armies to enforce his behests.

The sphere of this power is sometimes the family, and it may be noticed that the person in whom it resides, though often one of its younger members, usually has his or her way in matters of common concern in the little commonwealth, while the rest, without any great show of rebelliousness, and generally almost unconsciously, fall into line and quietly acquiesce.

Again, we see one originating and carrying forward great enterprises, and so controlling the opinions, energies, and purses

of others, that railroads, steamboat lines, and great factories are the result.

Occasionally a man appears who can exercise this control in a much larger sphere, and we see him swaying the masses at will, moulding the political views of his countrymen, and standing at the helm of the great concerns of the State.

Sometimes the sphere is that of morals and religion, and the world is better or worse for ages because one man or woman has lived in it.

What is the secret of this power?

In many cases it may be due in great part to wealth, social position, or other circumstances exceptionally favorable to the exercise of it. Yet we often see persons with all these adventitious advantages who never in any very marked degree influence their fellows. The real cause is generally far more in the individual than in his surroundings. The answer to the question may then be made, that the cause from which such effects spring consists of certain acts, words, or looks; that, in short, there is no other way in which they can be produced by a human being except through what may be observable by the senses of those over whom the control is exercised. It may be urged that this must be so, unless we propose to call in the aid of sorcery, mesmerism, or some of those mysterious powers which, in this age, the educated, at least, suppose to have no existence except in the imaginations of the vulgar. Still we feel that this power does not reside in acts, words, or looks. These may be the channels through which it reaches us; but we instinctively refer it to a fountain which sends its streams from some point beyond and behind them. For instance, we may take what has ever been a most potent means of affecting others—the expression of the countenance. We may be told that expression is nothing else but certain changes of the form and coloring of the face; that it cannot possibly be anything else, because nothing else is presented to the senses of the observer. Still we cannot help feeling that the tremendous effects which have been produced by wrath or pity, hatred or love, depicted in a human face, must have had some other cause than the changes in form and color in a small

piece of mere matter. We could not find in this an adequate cause for the dismay or the exultation of the multitudes, the breaking of hearts, or the sweet joy of requited love.

When we see the eye brighten and the face wreath itself in smiles, we feel that there is a cause for these changes, and it is this cause which produces a reflected gladness in us. We do not rejoice with happy faces, but "with them that rejoice." When we see the brow clouded and the eyes shedding tears, if we are affected, it is because we feel assured that these are but the signals of distress in the hand of a sorrowing or suffering soul within. Our sympathy is not with the tears or the sad looks, but with the sad soul. We do not weep with the sorrowful countenance, but with "them that weep." Personal influence may be due to such things as manner of speech and action in one sense. That is, it may be dependent on them for reaching the person toward whom it is directed. One foot of wire in the telegraph may be absolutely essential to the transmission of the electric current; but this one foot of wire is not the whole cause of the effect produced by its transmission. It may be the sole cause at the point which it occupies. But this is not the only nor the most important point. A far more important point is the one behind it where the battery originates the movement of the current. The foot of wire may be a *sine qua non* for the production of the effect; but it is only an infinitesimal part of its whole cause. So these words, acts, looks, etc., through which the power of which we have been speaking reaches and acts upon others, may be a *sine qua non* for the production of its effect; but the power does not reside in them. It is merely transmitted through them. Its source is a soul beyond, so to speak, and behind them. The soul is the fountain of power as fully and solely in this case as is the battery in the other. To make this entirely clear, suppose an automaton so cunningly contrived as to counterfeit precisely the appearance and manner of a human being. Suppose it to speak just such words accompanied with just such tones and gestures as have melted us to tears. Would we be affected in the same way, knowing that a mere automaton was before us? By no means. The movements of the India rubber features would be mere

grimace instead of expression. Its tears would be to us nothing but so much water, and its lightning glance would be but common fire, and not that which flashes through the orator's eye from the lighted altar of a human soul within.

The fact that the real seat of personal influence is the soul, leads naturally to the conclusion that the character of the influence is, as a general rule, determined by the character of the soul from which it flows. There may be seeming exceptions. Some who are eminently pious are exceedingly reticent and modest, so that to the superficial observer there seem to be cases in which there is "a fountain sealed" from which no streams of influence flow out to purify and bless. But those who have a better opportunity of deciding know that the influence which comes from the meek and quiet spirit, while it may not reach a very large number, is all the more potent in the case of those who are the subjects of it, because of this very silence and quietness. The modest and beautiful life has been like the precious ointment which "bewrayeth itself" while it lasts, and afterwards the aroma lingers long where the vase has been broken. The influence of the mother of the Wesleys was as profound and powerful in them as theirs was wide-spread on others.

On the other hand, it may seem that an exception is found in the case of the ostentatious hypocrite, who, with great skill, keeps up an outward show of godliness, and becomes a leader in good enterprises. Here, it may be said, is a soul of the worst type, while the influence exerted is productive of great good. Now in order that such a person may be proven to be a hypocrite, his hypocrisy must be known to some other persons. We are incapable of taking an exact measurement in such things, but we may safely assert that it will be difficult for any one to prove that the good which such a person has done will not be overbalanced by the evil effect of his hypocrisy upon those to whom it is known, and through them upon others. The more prominent and active he has been, and the higher the position he has attained, the more baneful will be the effect of his bad character when exposed; and perhaps this effect will be worst in the case of those who have been the subjects of his supposed good influence before.

But if it be admitted that a really good influence has sometimes been exerted by one who has a bad character, we have a case of consummate acting and the possession of a skill so rare that it would be unfair to speak of it as affecting the general rule, that the character of the soul determines the character of the influence exerted on others. Even Garrick could not act so skilfully in the usual intercourse of society (Goldsmith being witness) as to perfectly counterfeit nature, and we may take it for granted that very few have the histrionic ability to live lives of a perfectly concealed hypocrisy. When the hypocrite does in unguarded moments allow his mask to slip a little aside so as to give a glimpse of his real character, his influence becomes a subtle poison that permeates the very marrow of society. Nothing perhaps has done more to sap the foundations of faith in real goodness and true religion than the occurrence of such cases.

As a general, if not universal rule, as is the soul, such is the influence. Whether the sphere be a vast one like those in which such giants as Luther, Calvin, Knox, or Wesley have moved, transforming nations and turning the current of history, or that of the neighborhood or the home, this rule holds true. The amount of the influence will be determined by the capacity, and its quality by the character of the soul.

This is a very serious matter. How it ought to send us to our knees and to our Bibles! For us who are Christians, and who know, by a sad and a blessed experience, something of what sin is and what an escape from its guilt and power is; for us who have looked over the frightful brink of that ruin toward which sin hurries on a soul, and through unspeakable mercy have had opened to us a door of hope through which we have had glimpses of a glory and happiness brighter than our brightest dreams, it should be no light question, Toward what destiny is our influence propelling those with whom we come in contact? Our influence, whether exercised in a large sphere or a small one, whether powerful or feeble, cannot be entirely negative, just as the immortal soul within us cannot be negative in its character. We are helping either to save men's souls or to destroy them. Since the character of the influence is determined by that of the soul,

how important it is that our first aim should be personal holiness—not holiness of words, professions, or even of living only, but holiness of soul!

Reflections such as these must come home with force to every Christian; but there is one class of Christians for whom the truth from which they naturally spring has a more awful and glorious meaning than for others, namely, ministers of the gospel. Not only is their sphere of moral and religious influence usually a larger one than that of private Christians, but theirs is a peculiar office. They are the commissioned heralds of the great King. They have been sent forth under a call which comes directly to their hearts from the King himself through the agency of his Spirit. They have been moved to “desire the office of a bishop;” and if motives contrary to their engaging in the work have obstructed their way and caused them to hesitate, the Holy Spirit has made the burden of obligation weigh so heavily on their consciences that they have been forced to cry out, in their hearts if not with their lips, “Woe is me if I preach not the gospel.”

The earnest desire of every true minister is not only to escape the woe impending over him if he preach not the gospel, but to save souls. When we examine the work of different ministers we find very great differences in the matter of success. Some are instrumental in saving thousands, while others labor for years, and so far as they or their friends know, lead few or none to the Saviour.

There are differences in natural ability, in learning, in the position occupied by different ministers, in the numbers they can reach, in the susceptibility to religious impressions of those under their charge, and above all, there may be differences in the sovereign dispensation of the Holy Spirit, without whom no soul has ever been born into the kingdom of grace, which may in part, and in great part, account for the difference in success. Besides this, it may be said that what is apparent success may not always be real, and that what seems to be failure at the time may prove the groundwork of great and permanent success in the sequel. What may be a grand work in the world's estimate, may shrink

to very small proportions when it shall have been submitted to the test of that fire which "shall try every man's work of what sort it is," consuming the "wood, hay, and stubble," whilst that of one who has been a wise builder and has built on the true foundation, with only "gold, silver, and precious stones," shall, in the end, charm with its beauty and astonish by its magnitude.

Still every unprejudiced observer must conclude that there is a difference in the success of different ministers which is due to a difference in the ministers themselves—and that difference in something else than mere abilities, whether natural or acquired by cultivation.

This difference may be accounted for, in great part at least, by the rule that the character of the soul will determine that of the influence exerted. There may be a measure of piety and zeal in one case which is lacking in another, and the influence exerted will differ accordingly. When these qualities are seen and felt by the people in the words and efforts of a minister, we behold the effect of a powerful magnetism which tends to lead them in the way in which he is walking. He is successful in leading souls to Christ and to heaven, because his own soul is under the constraining power of the love of Christ. He is like the pastor of the "Deserted Village" who "allured to brighter worlds and led the way." Here it may be permitted to suggest whether it would not be well for every discouraged minister to ask the question whether, after all that may be said about the hardness of heart which characterises the ungodly, and the slothfulness and insensibility of church members, a purer and stronger love for Christ on his own part and a more unselfish desire to save souls, would not be the best remedy for his troubles.

The whole world is akin. God "hath made of one blood all nations of men."

"How then should I and any man that lives
 Be stranger to each other? Pierce my vein,
 Take of the crimson stream meandering there,
 And catechise it well; apply thy glass,
 Search it, and prove if it be not blood
 Congenial with thine own: and, if it be,
 What edge of subtlety canst thou suppose

Keen enough, wise and skilful as thou art,
To cut the link of brotherhood, by which
One common Maker bound me to the kind."

There is a kindred more intimate than that of blood. There is an affinity of souls which is universal. There may be great differences and bitter animosities, but there are many points in which the most cruel foes are at one; in which the hearts of the learned and the ignorant, the good and the bad, the young and the old, show the marks of a universal brotherhood. Hence it is that the most powerful earthly source of influence on men is the soul of a brother man. Hence it is that when a soul is powerfully magnetised, those with which it comes in contact are, as if by some spiritual induction, made sharers in its magnetism.

The great need of every minister is to be drawn nearer to Him who "will draw all men unto himself," that each in his turn may become, so to speak, magnetised with the power of attraction. We need to have a profound experience of the power, glory, and blessedness of salvation. In order to this we need a new Pentecost for our own souls. We cannot attract others to heights of attainment to which we do not first go ourselves. Our preaching cannot produce in the hearts of others such an overwhelming sense of the importance of eternal things as is necessary to awaken them from their carnal dreams, and move their palsied hearts to heavenly efforts, if such feelings are strangers to our own bosoms. The loftiest eloquence, the most impassioned oratory, will be powerless in this case. Such ministrations may awaken wonder and admiration, but cannot save souls. There is in them too much of the automaton, while the soul is wanting. On the other hand, if the love of God be shed abroad in our hearts, the most quiet manner and the homeliest language will not conceal the fact, nor suppress the throb which passes from our hearts to others as we draw them about the cross of a suffering Saviour.

Here a most interesting question presents itself. Does not Christ give to his ministers, through the Holy Spirit, a peculiar power corresponding with the peculiar office to which he calls them? Ministers are among those gifts which he received, when he ascended on high, to give to men. They are by no means the

least among these gifts; for they are given "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." They have a special and important function in the economy of the "body of Christ." He calls them by a special call to the position they occupy, by his Holy Spirit. Now the question is, does he also endow them with a special fitness for the place they occupy and the duties they are to perform? The office is unique. The call to it is divine. Is there not also a unique and divine work in the soul of every true minister of Christ? In other words, is the ordinary work of grace which is essential to the saving of every soul, the only work done in the soul of one who is called to the office of the ministry? The natural conclusion from reason and Scripture alike, would seem to be that there is wrought in the soul of every man who is called to this peculiar position and set of duties a peculiar work to fit him to be an able and faithful minister of the new covenant.

We find our Saviour, after his crucifixion and resurrection, before he ascends on high, giving the following directions to his disciples: "Tarry ye at Jerusalem until ye be indued with power from on high." Luke xxiv. 49. The word here translated "power" is not *ἐξουσία*—(power, in the sense of authority), but *δύναμις*—(power, in the sense of ability).

Again, in Acts i. 8, we have the record of a promise given them during the same period: "But ye shall receive power (*δύναμις*) from on high, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me," etc.

Now, on the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit was poured out according to the promise, and the power was received. That power was manifested partly in speaking in foreign languages, but also in some very powerful preaching, such as Peter most certainly was not prepared to do before this. Was this "power" bestowed simply for the working of miracles—the use of which in the Church was temporary—or was it bestowed also for the performance of the work of preaching the gospel, which was the

“great commission” which the disciples were to execute? There can be but one answer to this question.

The Apostle Paul does not leave us in doubt as to whether the great Head of the Church did bestow upon him, in addition the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, that special charism which specially fitted him for his ministerial work. This fitness, too, was evidently not the result of mere natural endowments. Says he, “Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves. But our sufficiency (*ικανότης*, fitness) is of God, who also hath made (*ικάνωσεν*, fitted to be) us able ministers of the new covenant.” 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6.

It is also plain that this work of God, by which Paul was fitted for his office, was not the mere conferring of authority. It was an internal work. “For he that wrought effectually (*ὁ ἐνεργήσας*) in Peter to the apostleship of circumcision, the same was mighty (*ἐνήργησε*) in me towards the Gentiles.” Gal. ii. 8. The “fitness” was gained, then, through a divine work within the souls of Paul and Peter, fitting each for his special ministerial work. As far as apostles are concerned, the question is settled. There was a work within Paul and Peter which is not shared by all Christians, and is distinct from that ordinary work of grace whereby every soul is saved. Now the question is, is a special work wrought in the soul of ordinary ministers to give them a “sufficiency” for the work in the church to which they are called?

Timothy was not an apostle, and his case would seem to be like that of any other pastor or evangelist (he seems to have been both at different times), with the exception that he lived in the apostolic age. In 2 Tim. i. 6, Paul addresses Timothy as follows: “Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.” It is maintained by many, and perhaps rightly, that this refers to the confirming of the power to work miracles by the laying on of the apostle’s hands.

In 1 Tim. iv. 14, we have the words, “Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.” Now suppose that it be granted that the first named passage does refer solely to the be-

stowment of the power of miracles, does it necessarily follow that this one does too—in short, that they both refer to the same gift? It is true that the word translated “gift” is the same in both passages; but it is a word that does not designate specifically the kind of gift. This word (*χάρισμα*) seems to have been generally supposed to mean a miraculous spiritual endowment; but on examination we find that it is used in the Scriptures in a much more general sense. It occurs seventeen times in the New Testament, being used sixteen times by Paul and once by Peter. In the Epistles to the Corinthians it does sometimes refer to miraculous gifts of the Spirit; but in Romans it means the gift of justification, or of salvation in general (Rom. v. 15, 16; vi. 23); spiritual privileges and graces which accompany effectual calling (Rom. xi. 29); those gifts which fit the various members of Christ’s body for the functions they are to perform (Rom. xii. 6). In only one instance can it be claimed that it has an exclusive reference to miraculous endowments, and there the claim is more than doubtful.

It is thus evident that it is scarcely more restricted to this class of spiritual powers than is our English word gift. Indeed, it is a word of just as general application as our word “gift,” with the exception that, according to its power (*χάρισμα*) it refers to the source whence the gift comes, namely, grace (*χάρις*) in the giver. Hence, if in any passage this word has the specific meaning referred to, this is decided not from the use of the word, but from the context. The gift then which was in Timothy, “with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery,” is not the same as that which was in him “by the putting on of Paul’s hands,” by any necessity arising out of the use of this word. Does the context impose any such necessity? In the one case we have the laying on of the hands of an *apostle*, in the other of a *presbytery*. In the one case the gift is in Timothy *through* (*διὰ*) the laying on of hands, in the other *with* (*μετά*, along with) it. Besides this, in the case of the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, it is said that it was “through prophecy,” which makes this transaction look very much like another in which another presbytery laid their hands on Saul and Barnabas and sent them forth to the work for which

the Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul." This looks like Timothy's ordination—the conferring of the ecclesiastical authority to use the gift which was in him, whereby he was "fitted" for the work of the ministry. When we look further into the context, we find, in the verse immediately preceding this the exhortation, "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine," and in the one following it, "Meditate upon these things: give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear unto all." These are just the means by which his ministerial "gift" would be best cultivated and used; but we see no such appropriateness on the supposition that a gift of tongues or working other miracles is referred to.

This conclusion falls in precisely with the fact that Paul asserts of Timothy, as well as of himself, that he had his sufficiency (*ικανότης*, fitness) from God, "who also," says he (2 Cor. iii. 6), "hath made us able ministers of the new covenant."*

It seems perfectly clear that apostles and the ministers who labored with them received "gifts" which constituted their "sufficiency" for their ministry, and that these gifts were "in" them through a work of God "wrought in" them. Was this to cease after their day, and were ministers of later times to have no such sufficiency and no such inworking of God in them? Were the ministers of later times to differ from other Christians in nothing else but an ordination by ecclesiastical authority?

In a passage already referred to (Rom. xii. 6, etc.) the Church of Christ is represented under the figure of a body with its various members for different functions, and the members of this body are described as "having gifts (*χαρίσματα*) differing according to the grace that is given to us;" and it is added, "Whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation," etc.

Now this passage asserts that "gifts" are possessed by "every one" (verses 5 and 6) according to the functions to be discharged by each. Among these are mentioned "ministry," "teaching,"

*It must be remembered that Timothy united with Paul in the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians. See 2 Cor. i. 1.

and "exhortation." Prophecy has ceased in the Church since the completed revelation has superseded the necessity of it; but the other functions must be exercised as long as there are people to be ministered to, taught, and exhorted. Then surely the appropriate "gifts" must continue.

We conclude, then, that the case is made out that he who by a special and divine call introduces men into the office of the ministry, does also confer special "gifts" for making them "able and faithful ministers of the new covenant." These "gifts," though of the same general kind, vary in different individuals to fit them for the discharge of specific duties—ministering, teaching, exhorting; or for various fields of labor, as in the cases of Paul and Peter; but in the case of every true minister, it is that internal work whereby his "sufficiency," which is of God, is attained.

What are the practical inferences from such a truth? One surely is that men should be very careful about entering the ministry. It is not a mere "profession" which any pious man is at liberty to choose.

Another is that those who have been intrusted with so precious a "gift" should beware of "neglecting" it. It evidently does not supersede the necessity of effort any more than does that bestowment of divine grace whereby each soul is saved. As the communication of new life to the soul and the conferring of grace sufficient for gaining the victory, in the case of each believer, is the great encouragement to "strive to enter in at the strait gate," so this gift, instead of inclining the minister to relax his efforts, should be a spur to his energies, since this alone gives him the sufficiency which is of God, and will alone enable him to "finish his course with joy."

At once how blessed and how awful is the position of the minister of the gospel! In the mystical body he is not one of the ordinary members, but, so to speak, one of those "joints and bands" whereby "the whole body having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." He is commissioned and gifted for the purpose of taking part in that glorious work in which Christ "will draw all men unto himself." It is his life business to save souls. How blessed to be the instru-

ment in such a work! Whether we consider salvation as to its boundless wealth of blessing to a human being, and endeavor to take in its length and breadth and height and depth, or cast our eyes along its brilliant pathway through the future and try to form some conception of its limitless duration, the view is one which overwhelms with its grandeur and dazzles with its glory.

How then can one having this gift pine for earthly honors and pleasures? How can he sink with discouragement when, in answer to his cry, "Who is sufficient for these things?" he receives the assurance, "Our sufficiency is of God." How can a minister among perishing souls neglect the gift that is in him? Surely he who rows the life-boat with a careless hand, and is dilatory in laying hold on those that are sinking, is less to be blamed than he. How glorious the future of him who is faithful! What must heaven be to one, who, like another "Great Heart," has conducted many pilgrims thither! "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever."

P. P. FLOURNOY.

ARTICLE III.

THE JURISDICTION OF THE EVANGELIST.*

The Evangelist's *potestas jurisdictionis* is still a subject of discussion in the Presbyterian Church, and there is a loud call for a yet more exact definition than the Assembly's deliverance of 1876 has furnished. The justification of the writer's participation in the debate and of this present contribution towards the solution of the question, is the simple fact that it has pleased the Assembly's Committee of Foreign Missions, for some years past, to make him its chairman and thus bring him into official and responsible connexion with the practical application of the controlling principles of the work.

* This article was prepared before the meeting of the last General Assembly, but its publication was unavoidably postponed.—Eds. So. PRES. REVIEW.