

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 4.

-----◆-----  
OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXI.  
-----◆-----

## ARTICLE I.

### THE REFORMATION IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, CONTEMPLATED IN SOME OF ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS.

When we speak of second causes, it must never be forgotten that the concurrence of at least two of them is necessary to the production of an effect. Hence we speak of the *causes*, not the *cause* of the Reformation, because we are here concerned with secondary causation only. The first cause we of course acknowledge to be God. The Reformation was a great work of his holy spirit, a mighty revival of the work which he had been doing ever since the utterance of the first promise in the garden of Eden. It was a re-form-ation, a restoration of the Church to the word of God, which constitutes its form, as the Holy Ghost constitutes its life. But the work of God amongst men is performed under the conditions of time and place. And there are very many circumstances attending and concurring, in regard to some or all of which we might confidently affirm that they were causes *sine qua non*, conditions without which the great event would not have taken place, or if it had taken place, would not have been the same event, or been followed by the same results.

Our Saviour, in his parables, frequently likens the processes of the kingdom of heaven to the processes of vegetable and  
VOL. XXII., NO. 4.—1.

## ARTICLE V.

## SUSTENTATION.

The sustentation scheme, a term with which our readers are now perfectly familiar, was inaugurated by the General Assembly at its meeting in Memphis, Tennessee, in the winter of 1866, and was intended to take the place of what had previously been known as the Committee of Domestic Missions. It was not intended to do away with the work of domestic missions by any means; but as the control of that work was thereafter to be recognised as under the exclusive management of the presbyteries and their committees of missions, and as it was to be chief office of sustentation to furnish the means by which it was to be carried on, as well as to help in the support of feeble churches, there was great propriety in adopting this new term. As it proposes to help in sustaining feeble churches and carrying on the missionary work, it is simply an agency for sustentation. Presbyterian committees, inasmuch as they control and direct the work of missions, are not properly committees of sustentation, as they are sometimes called, but committees of domestic missions.

The Sustentation Committee is a central financial and advisory agency, intended to receive all the funds raised throughout the Church to sustain feeble churches, to aid in the work of missions and church erection, and to disburse the same for the benefit of the whole Church in accordance with rules and by-laws given by the General Assembly for this purpose, and in concert and coöperation with the presbyteries or their committees of missions. By this arrangement the most intimate relationship is established between the Central Committee and the various presbyterial committees throughout the Church. The chairman of every presbyterial committee is a corresponding member of the Central Committee; and in this way the latter committee is made intimately acquainted with the wants and condition of every portion of the Church, and can therefore disburse the fund committed to its care, not only in the most equitable manner, but so as to pro-

mote the best and highest interests of the whole Church. It is difficult to see how any wiser, more scriptural, or more effective scheme could possibly be devised; and if our people will only have the patience, the perseverance, the wisdom, and the confidence in each other, to carry it into full and practical effect, it must, under the favoring hand of Almighty God, not only place our beloved Church on a solid and broad foundation, but make it one of the most harmonious and effective bodies in the Christian world.

The sustentation scheme was called into existence by the peculiar circumstances of the great body of our churches at the close of the war. Previously there had been no need for any special agency of the kind. Such churches as then needed help were those that had not risen above the *missionary status*, and were provided for by existing missionary organisations. But at the close of the war one-half, if not two-thirds, of all our churches were left in a completely prostrated and helpless condition, so that the great want of the time was an agency that could sustain and keep alive these churches through the trying crisis they were called to pass. The missionary or aggressive work had to occupy a secondary and subordinate place for the time being; and to a limited extent, this has continued to be the case up to the present time. The general scheme, however, looks forward to the time when the aggressive work shall occupy the most important position; and the Committee has spared no pains to get all our prostrated churches on their feet as speedily as possible, that the united strength of the whole Church may be directed mainly to assaults upon the kingdom of darkness. It will be a long time, however, before we can withdraw altogether, or even lessen materially, our efforts in the way of sustaining feeble churches. We must strengthen every post as we advance, or our conquests will be of questionable advantage. Unless our settled ministers are sufficiently well supported to enable them to devote all their energies to the welfare of the churches, all our aggressive movements must necessarily be irregular and ineffective. Many untoward circumstances have combined to retard the recuperation of the Southern country generally; and until a

more favorable day dawns upon the land, our crippled and impoverished churches will not be able to support their pastors as they ought to be supported.

The powers confided to the Sustentation Committee by the constitution are strictly financial and advisory. In the exercise of the latter, it may, when requested to do so, aid presbyteries in procuring ministers and missionaries; afford aid in transferring ministers from one field of labor to another; keep the churches informed of the condition and wants of the work; and report to the Assembly from year to year the state and progress of the various departments of labor committed to its care. But the chief function of the Sustentation Committee is to decide, in view of all the claims brought before it by the various presbyterial committees, how the general fund may be so disbursed as to promote the highest interests of the whole Church. This is a very difficult and delicate task, and not only requires sound judgment on the part of the Executive Committee, but great kindness and confidence on the part of those who contribute most largely to the general fund. Whilst the functions of the Central Committee are strictly financial and advisory, all ecclesiastical control is lodged strictly in the hands of presbyteries, or in such committees of missions as they may appoint to carry out their behests. It is for the presbyteries, or their committees of missions, to decide what churches in their bounds are entitled to receive aid from the Central Committee; to appoint missionaries or evangelists, direct their labors and receive their reports; so also it is incumbent on the presbyteries to see that every church within their bounds is not only doing its duty in supporting its pastor, but in contributing, according to its ability, to the general fund, as well as to all the other schemes of benevolence authorised by the General Assembly. Nor is it less the duty of the Presbytery to see that every pastor, who is properly supported by his people, is devoting his energies mainly to their spiritual improvement. From the above, it will be perceived that these two coöperative bodies—the presbyteries and the central committee—move in distinct but entirely harmonious spheres, and that there is no necessity whatever for conflict or collision.

Heretofore they have acted in entire harmony; and so far as is known, the most entire satisfaction has been given on all hands, with the exception, perhaps, that presbyteries have not always received as much from the central fund as their circumstances seemed to demand; which, however, has been a matter of as much regret to the Central Committee as to themselves. As a general thing, all the weaker and poorer presbyteries have uniformly drawn more from the common fund than their churches have contributed; so that the Church is carrying out, as one whole, those great principles of brotherly love and mutual kindness which lie at the very foundation of our holy religion.

The great idea contemplated at the time of the organisation of the sustentation scheme, and which has been realised to a gratifying extent its practical working, was to unite all our widely scattered churches into one close compact brotherhood, so that the stronger and wealthier presbyteries and churches might uphold and sustain their weaker sisters. This was not only necessary as the means of self-preservation, but it was equally necessary to establish among us those great principles of Christian unity and charity which are so essential to true religion, and which were so beautifully illustrated in the earlier periods of the Christian Church. Our own Church at the time was in danger of its being forced out of its true and proper position. Congregational independency, from our long connexion with the Northern Presbyterian Church, had infused some of its very worst elements into its bosom. Presbyterianism, as a system of government and control, was gradually losing its hold upon the hearts of our people, and there were not wanting other indications of disintegration and ultimate ruin. But in the good providence of God, and mainly through the united action on the part of the whole Church, these mischievous tendencies have been measurably arrested; true Presbyterianism is reasserting itself in all our bounds, and our beloved Church, we have every reason to believe, is setting out on a new and grand career of usefulness. Much of this undoubtedly is to be ascribed to that spirit of unity and brotherly love that have grown out of our common calamities. We cannot, therefore, be too careful in

cherishing that great principle which has not only done so much for us in the past, but promises to do even more in the future. Any one who would make light of it, or would wantonly sever those strong bonds that have heretofore held our Church in such happy unison, would, if successful, inflict more real harm on the cause of truth and righteousness than can well be conceived. Whilst, therefore, we should carefully avoid all doubtful and dangerous alliances with other branches of the Church, especially with those in whose candor and orthodoxy we have not full confidence, we cannot draw the cords of unity and brotherly love too strongly around our own.

The functions of the sustentation scheme at the time of its organisation were restricted to three departments of benevolence, viz.: To aid feeble churches in the support of the gospel, to assist in carrying on the missionary work, and to afford aid in the matter of church erection. The claims of all three of these departments had to be met by one common fund, it being understood that the first should have the precedence. At the meeting of the Assembly in Baltimore two years afterwards, the fund for invalid ministers and the widows and orphans of deceased ministers was authorised, and the churches were called upon to take up an annual collection for this particular object on the first Sabbath in July, or as soon after as might be found convenient and practicable. This fund has always been kept distinct, and is administered as such. In disbursing this charity, no specific annual appropriations are made for any particular individual or family, but every case is treated according to its own merits, and upon renewed application sent up from year to year. This fund has never amounted to much more than \$6,000; and whilst this has afforded partial relief to eighty or more families or individuals, it has never been sufficient to meet the demands of the case. At the meeting of the Assembly in Louisville, Kentucky, two years subsequently, the Relief Fund was sanctioned and directed to be placed under the care of the Sustentation Committee also. This fund is to be raised in definite sums by individual churches, and is intended for the benefit of the pastor's family at his decease. The sums specified are \$30, \$60, or \$100, as any par-

ticular church or union of churches may elect, and secures for their pastor's family at his decease \$1,200, \$2,400, or \$3,600, to be paid in six annual instalments, according to the amount annually paid. These sums are to be raised in the same way with the regular salaries; and the amount is in fact considered as an addition to the regular salary, except that instead of being paid to the pastor, it is paid to the Sustentation Committee to be kept for the benefit of his family at his decease. The number of churches that have signified their intention to enter into the scheme is not yet sufficient to put it into full operation, but it is hoped that this will soon be done.

From the above it will be perceived that no less than five separate departments of benevolence are now included in the sustentation scheme, three of which have to be provided for out of one common fund, whilst the other two have each a separate fund. The General Assembly, at its late meeting in Huntsville, Alabama, directed that an annual collection be taken up in all the churches on the first Sabbath in April for the missionary or evangelistic work. This injunction was left somewhat indefinite; but if the Assembly intended the fund to be sent to the Central Committee to be used for the exclusive purposes of evangelisation, as was the intention of the mover of the resolution, it will not only render our general scheme of systematic benevolence complete, but will effect other important results in connexion with the general welfare of the Church. For some time past the Committee has had some difficulty in deciding between the claims of feeble churches and the cause of missions or evangelisation. In the first instance, the claims of feeble churches very properly had the precedence; but since they have had time to recuperate the claims of the two are brought to a more equal footing, which renders the difficulty of deciding between them still greater. If, however, a separate collection is taken up for each, (and their very great importance certainly justifies the measure,) the difficulty of deciding between their conflicting claims will be entirely removed.\*

---

\*We do not approve of the arrangement of the Assembly of fixing upon the first Sabbath in April for taking up the collection for Evangelistic

One of the great objects contemplated by the sustentation scheme from the very beginning, and especially in connexion with efforts made to sustain feeble churches, has been to raise ministerial support to the proper and necessary standard. This is still the great question of the moment, and it is scarcely possible to exaggerate its importance in connexion with the future welfare of our beloved Church. This is one particular in which the great body of our churches are sadly behindhand, and in relation to the serious and threatening consequences of which it is almost impossible to get their attention thoroughly aroused. Much of this deficiency is undoubtedly to be ascribed to their impoverished condition, but more to the want of proper training and right views of the sacrifices that should be made for the support of the gospel. Not one-half of our ministers are receiving sufficient salaries to enable them to devote the whole of their time to the great work of preaching the gospel. Many of them are compelled to betake themselves to teaching, or to some other secular employment, for the means of support; and not a few have been compelled to give up the ministry altogether in order to procure the means of supporting their families and educating their children. Such has been the reduction in the number of laboring ministers from these causes that it has now become very difficult for vacant churches to get their pulpits supplied at all; and no one can foresee the end of all this, unless our churches can be thoroughly aroused to the emergency that is upon us. The evil will not be remedied by the multiplication of ministers, unless corresponding provision is made for their

---

purposes, thus crowding it between the two collections for Publication and Foreign Missions. As there will be six annual collections for the various schemes of benevolence, it would be the best plan for them to be taken up on the first Sabbath of the alternate months—say, for Sustentation, (which is to include church erection,) the 1st Sabbath in January; Publication, 1st Sabbath in March; Foreign Missions, 1st Sabbath in May, (giving to this cause the monthly concert collections taken up on the alternate months when no other collections are taken up); Invalid Fund, 1st Sabbath in July; Evangelisation, 1st Sabbath in September; Education, 1st Sabbath in November. Discretion has been given to Synods to modify the arrangement for the greater convenience of their churches.



support. It is bad policy, to say the least, to educate men at great cost for the work of the ministry, and then have them spend the chief part of their lives at the plough-handle or in the school-room. Besides this, young men will feel very little inclined to enter upon this work, when they clearly foresee that it will necessarily consign them and their families to unavoidable poverty.

The General Assembly at its meeting in Baltimore in 1868, in order to rectify this evil, directed the presbyteries and the central committee to make the effort to raise the salary of every laboring minister to \$600 as the *minimum amount*. At a subsequent meeting they were directed to raise it to \$750, and by the last Assembly to \$800 as the *minimum*. Steady and persevering efforts have been made to carry these injunctions into effect; and although the specific object aimed at has not been fully realised, very encouraging progress has nevertheless been made in the right direction. Several presbyteries reported last spring that none of their ministers were receiving less than \$750, whilst a larger number reported a decided approximation to the same standard. It was further stated in the last annual report of the Sustentation Committee, that the average salary of ministers had increased in three years from \$500 to \$650, which is also a very encouraging state of things. The only difficulty lying in the way of the complete attainment of the proposed object, as it seems to the writer, is *the want of more prompt and thorough action on the part of presbyteries and their committees of missions*. The chief responsibility rests with the presbyterial committees, and only to a very limited extent on the Central Committee. As an illustration of this, it may be stated that the Central Committee is prohibited by the rules given it for its government from supplementing any salary up to \$750, unless the church or union of churches themselves will raise \$500, or two-thirds of this amount. It is the place of the Presbyterial Committee to see that this amount is raised; and until this is done, the Central Committee is powerless to raise the salary up to the proposed standard. Again, the Central Committee is prohibited, and very properly too, from doing anything at all to supplement

a given salary, unless the chairman of the Presbyterial Committee can certify upon conscience that the people themselves are not able to give their pastor a sufficient salary. But numerous cases are reported where congregations are able, but not disposed, to support their pastor. This again is a case for action on the part of the Presbytery, and where the Committee is powerless until the proper action is taken by the Presbytery or its committee of missions. Further, the Central Committee can do nothing in the way of supplementing salaries that really need it, except so far as the means are furnished by the churches; and it is for the presbyteries alone to see that all the churches within their bounds contribute according to their ability to the general fund. We have no hesitation, therefore, in expressing the confident belief, that if all our presbyterial committees would at once arouse themselves to the solemn responsibilities that have been laid upon them, would visit all the churches within their bounds, with the view of stirring them up to a proper sense of their obligations, both in supporting their own pastors and in contributing to the general fund, it would at once not only relieve us from all the distress that is now felt, but would inaugurate a new period of prosperity in the history of our Church.

We express perhaps the common sentiment of the great body of our Christian people when we affirm that the sustentation scheme, together with its kindred schemes of benevolence, has been the great and chief instrument used by providence in preserving and perpetuating our Church through all the trials through which it has been called to pass. The plan had its origin in the circumstances of distress in which the whole Church was involved at the close of the war, and it has always therefore been regarded as the child of providence. At the first meeting of the General Assembly, after the end of the war, the great question which occupied every mind was, How shall the preaching of the gospel be maintained in all our feeble, widely scattered, and impoverished churches? The answer which seemed to flow spontaneously from every heart was that we must stand shoulder to shoulder, as one united compact brotherhood, and make the aggregate

resources of the whole body, in a certain sense and to a certain degree, common property. The sustentation scheme had its origin in this great principle of brotherly love; and by its practical operation, our Church has been kept in a state of life and activity.

But whilst it is admitted on all hands that the scheme was admirably suited to the circumstances of the Church at the time it was inaugurated, doubts are now being entertained whether it is equally adapted to the present altered circumstances of the Church. A number of modifications or changes have been suggested, only two of which we propose to examine in this article.

One of these plans or suggestions is, that the two main branches of the sustentation scheme—the support of feeble churches and the work of missions—should be separated and placed under different committees. The proposition is virtually to have two committees to do the work that is now done by one.

Our first remark in relation to this proposition is, that it is in our judgment simply multiplying the machinery of the Church without securing any increase of efficiency. What is particularly needed at the present time is an increase of executive force, and not the establishment of a new office with a separate set of officers. One executive committee can, without any very great labor, discharge all the various duties involved in the present scheme of sustentation, provided the executive force is sufficient to perform the business in a systematic manner, as well as to attend to what may be regarded as its outside duties. Again, if a committee is needed for each of these departments of labor, then there will be equal reason to have one for church erection and another to attend to the invalid fund. The Northern Presbyterian Church has no less than eight separate committees to carry on its various departments of benevolence, each of which has its own staff of officers, place of holding its meetings, and transacting its business. The whole fund raised by our Church for the various causes of benevolence would not be sufficient to meet the mere expenses of such extended machinery.

It may be remarked further, that the five departments of

benevolence now included in the sustentation scheme are so closely related to each other that they can be more easily administered by one committee than by two or more. In the present state of the Church it is scarcely possible to separate the evangelistic work from that of sustentation. Almost every evangelist now employed is partly engaged in supplying feeble churches, as well as in carrying on the aggressive or missionary work; and if there are two committees for these different departments, then the evangelist must stand related to both, and draw his support from two different sources.

In the third place, to put the missionary or evangelistic work under a separate committee, is virtually to reestablish the old Committee of Domestic Missions, with all the vagueness and indefiniteness of powers that appertain to it, and with the constant liability of coming in conflict with the jurisdiction of the presbyteries. The lines of distinction in the present system between these two spheres are as clear as sunbeams. To bring back the old system with all the objections and difficulties that belong to it, is to substitute confusion in the place of order, and obscurity where light now reigns.

In the last place, we do not see that the organisation of a new committee to carry on the work of evangelisation will be likely to stimulate the churches to a higher degree of liberality. The call for a separate collection for this purpose undoubtedly meets the full demands of the case, and this can be as wisely disbursed by the present committee as by a new one, whilst all the expense of a separate organisation would be saved. The secretary of a separate organisation, provided he could spend a considerable portion of his time among the wealthiest and more influential churches, might augment their contributions very materially. But why could he not do as much, and even more, as an associate secretary in the present committee? Nothing but considerations of economy have heretofore prevented the appointment of a second secretary; but the time has come when this ought to be done, especially if the work of foreign missions is to be continued under same committee.

As to the fears sometimes expressed of this committee becom-

ing a central and overshadowing power in the Church, we do not see how any constitution could possibly be framed to guard more effectually against such a result. The Committee, as now constituted, can accomplish nothing at all, except so far as it commands the confidence and coöperation of the presbyteries. It has no direct or official connexion with the churches as such, but transacts all its business through the medium of the presbyteries. If at any time its affairs are not conducted in accordance with its constitution, or so as to give satisfaction to the Church at large, a single vote on the part of the Assembly may place it in entirely different hands, and compel it to administer its affairs in accordance with the wishes of the whole Church. To suppose that the present incumbents, or the incumbents at any future period, could retain their power after they had lost the confidence of the Church, would argue a degree of degeneracy on the part of our people generally, such that God grant we may never witness.

The other suggestion to which reference has been made, and to which it is important to revert, is, that it is best in the present state of the Church to have the whole work of sustentation and evangelisation remanded to the synods, and let them be made responsible for its proper administration. It is argued that the churches will coöperate more heartily when their contributions are expended in the improvements of the country immediately around them; and the success of the Synod of Kentucky, in raising the salary of all their ministers to \$1,000 as the *minimum*, is adduced in illustration of the soundness of this general principle. We do not believe that either the principle or the illustration can stand the test of scrutiny.

As to the general idea, that the churches will act more vigorously in reference to the narrower field immediately around them, than for a larger and broader one, we think the great Head of the Church himself has given any thing but an equivocal deliverance. The field he marked out for his disciples was not confined to the narrow boundaries of Palestine, but comprehended the whole world. The evangelisation of the whole world was not only assigned to them as a matter of duty; but the Saviour

distinctly foresaw that nothing short of this would develop their energies or their faith, as he intended they should be. And this is in strict accordance with the experience of the Church itself. What has stirred up her energies so powerfully, or given such life and vigor to her faith, as what she has done to impart the gospel even to the remotest heathen nations on the face of the earth? What she does for the home field is in a great measure the work of *sight*; but what is done for the heathen nations is, in a greater measure, a matter of *faith*. Nor are we wanting in illustrations taken from nearer home. When the sustentation scheme was first inaugurated, a number of our presbyteries determined to carry on the work of missions and sustentation in a separate and independent way; supposing that their churches would contribute more freely when the money was to be laid out in the cultivation of the field immediately around them, than when it was merged in a general fund for the benefit of the whole Church. Nor was it surprising that our brethren should have felt inclined to adopt this course. In previous years they had been compelled to adopt it as a matter of self-protection; but the continuance of it after the necessity had ceased to exist, they soon found to be unwise and inexpedient, and almost without exception these presbyteries have fallen into general ranks both as a matter of duty and expediency. They have seen that it is best for their churches, as well as for the Church at large, to act in union and concert.

In relation to the case of the Synod of Kentucky, our first remark is, that those who appeal to its support of their peculiar views are making such use of this example as our brethren there never intended they should. Their plan, which in all important respects is but a copy and counterpart of our own, was intended to be temporary in its character, and was adopted, as leading brethren in that Synod have repeatedly avowed, as a matter of sheer self-preservation. Their frontier was constantly menaced; and it was absolutely necessary as a matter of self-preservation that the whole of their resources should be used in self-defence. And it is their intention, unless we have been misinformed, to abandon the independent features of their plan as

soon as they can do so consistently with self-preservation. We do not feel disposed to find fault with them for adopting their course under the circumstances of the case.

In the next place, the case of the Synod of Kentucky is not parallel to that of the Church at large. The people there have never known the ravages of war as the great body of the Southern people have. The loss of property consequent upon war, the repeated failure of the crops since that time, the heavy taxation that has been laid upon our people, as well as other adverse influences, have reduced the mass of our Southern people to the very greatest straits; and it is a marvel that they have got along at all, much more that they should have made decided progress in enlarging the borders of the Church. At the same time, it is probable that there is more real wealth in the single Synod of Kentucky than in any three of our other synods, with the exception perhaps of that of Virginia. More than this, we must bear in mind that the churches in Kentucky were brought up to the present standard of liberality in the support of their ministers by very great and extraordinary exertions made on the part of a number of their leading men, and especially by Dr. Stuart Robinson—such efforts as we are unable to make in the existing state of our churches. At the same time it should be remembered, that almost the whole of the resources of that Synod have been devoted to this one object. Some of our other synods, if they had adopted the same exclusive policy, might perhaps have effected equally as much for the support of their own ministers. But if all that were able to have adopted this course had done so, what then would have become of our poorer presbyteries and churches? and, especially, what would have become of the missionary work in Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and other portions of the country?

But the worst feature about this plan is, that it would be the beginning of a process of disintegration that would never probably stop until it had landed us in outright congregational independency, and ultimately into open infidelity. If the General Assembly cannot be trusted with the administration of the Church's benevolence, what reason is there to suppose than any

particular synod would prove itself more worthy of confidence? If the synods bring their claims to manage these things in competition with those of the Assembly, why will the presbyteries not follow the example and bring theirs in conflict with those of the synods? And if the work of separation and disintegration is countenanced by the synods and the presbyteries, is it not almost certain that the churches will fall into the same current of disorganisation? And where shall we be then, but on the broad sea of Independency and Congregationalism? And how shall we work then, if we feel inclined to work at all, but on the voluntary plan, and thus dishonor the great Head of the Church, whose plan we shall ignore and set aside altogether?

---

ARTICLE VI.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1871.

The Assembly at Huntsville, Ala., lasted from Thursday, 18th May, at 11 o'clock a. m., until Thursday, the 25th May, at 2 o'clock p. m. It was, as is generally agreed, a good Assembly, and a pleasant Assembly. Huntsville is a beautiful town, with its grand mountain scenery, and its magnificent spring, and its refined, generous, and hospitable people. The attendance was very full and the material of the body excellent, both as to ministers and elders. This is certainly a matter of great consequence, and every Presbytery should bear it in mind when electing its commissioners. Let us put away from us completely all ideas of rotation in these elections, and let Presbyteries always send as their representatives their best men. This does not mean their oldest men or their greatest men, but the men who will in their judgment best discharge the duty.

THE MODERATOR.

The retiring Moderator, Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., delivered a discourse upon "The Form of Sound Words," from 2 Tim. i.