

ARTICLE V.

THE PASTORAL RELATION AND THE SUPPORT OF
THE MINISTRY.*

It has been made my duty by the Synod of South Carolina to discuss, on this occasion, the subject of "The Pastoral Relation and the Support of the Ministry." It would appear from this mode of stating the question which the Synod saw proper to employ, that, in the apprehension of this high Court, there is some kind of connexion between these two things, viz., the pastoral relation, and the support of the ministry. It will be my endeavor in this discourse to ascertain and hold up to view the precise nature of that connexion. Is that connexion definite or indefinite? Is it close or remote? Can every minister, *as such*, that is, can every *preacher*, claim to be supported by the Church, or does the claim of support depend in all ordinary cases on his sustaining the pastoral relation, and how far is it so dependent?

Closely connected with this question there is another, to the history of which I must allude in passing. A very eminent Princeton theologian preached before the General Assembly at

*According to previous appointment this discourse was preached before the Synod of South Carolina, in the Presbyterian church at Newberry, during its fall sessions in October, 1874. The following resolutions were adopted by the Synod:

Resolved 1. That the Synod of South Carolina has heard, with pleasure and profit, the discourse on the Pastoral Relation and the Support of the Ministry, by the Rev. J. B. Adger, D. D.

2. That Synod, without holding itself responsible for every utterance, in the sermon, requests a copy for publication in the *Southern Presbyterian Review*.

3. That one thousand copies be printed in pamphlet form for distribution.

4. That when printed, these copies be distributed amongst the four Presbyteries, in the proportion of their Synodical assessments.

5. That Rev. E. H. Buist, T. H. Law, and Wm. Banks, be a committee to attend to the publication.

Also, that a copy of these resolutions be published with the sermon.

Richmond in 1846, a sermon designed to prove that the obligation of a minister's support rests, not on the individual congregation which the minister serves, but on the Church as one and as a whole. The idea was that the Board of Missions, as representing the Church, should be authorized and enabled to give an adequate support to every minister. The doctrine was received with favor by a large portion of that Assembly. The melancholy failure of the churches to fulfil their obligations to their pastors seems to have prepared the ministry thirty years ago to favor any principle, any plan not absolutely false or foolish, which gave hope to them of more just and competent support. Dr. Thornwell, however, in reviewing that Assembly, made it plain, (as may be read in the 4th Volume of his works,) that according to our standards the obligation of the minister's support rests on the party which calls him to his work, whether it be a church which calls him as a pastor, a Presbytery which calls him as an evangelist, or the General Assembly which calls him to be a missionary in frontier or foreign parts. At the same time, our system of government obviously entitles weak churches to obtain the aid of strong ones in discharging their own pastoral obligations. Upon this principle, said Dr. Thornwell, the collective action of the Church in the matter of ministerial support and the sustentation of weak congregations may be rightfully demanded, but not upon the doctrine that the whole Church is bound to support each individual pastor. You may have a central treasury, filled by contributions drawn from all the churches, and then distributed by some central agency amongst all those congregations and Presbyteries which stand in need of help. But you may not delegate to any central committee the place and the power of patrons supporting all your ministers. It is no more the right or duty of the Church, as a whole, to support her pastors than it is hers to appoint them. The right of appointment and the obligation to support go together. If the one be delegated to a central committee, how long is it likely the people can retain the other?

The cardinal principle of Dr. Hodge's sermon, it thus appears, would have given to the old Board of Missions far greater powers

than it ever presumed to claim—even the power of virtually controlling every pastoral election. On the contrary, Dr. Thornwell on this occasion clearly set forth and defended the cardinal principle on which our Church's Sustentation Committee is appointed and its work carried on—the principle of the strong helping the weak, without assuming any control of them. The two theories are the poles apart. The one would centralize all Church power—the other preserves the Church's unity, but interferes not with the free and healthy action of its parts.

The doctrines to be now set forth I find in various scriptures, as follows :

1 Tim. v. 17. "The elders that rule well are worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine."

1 Cor. ix. 14: "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

Gal. vi. 6: "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things."

1 Thess. v. 12: "And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake."

Heb. xiii. 7: "Remember them which have the rule over you who have spoken unto you the word of the Lord."

Now these passages plainly set forth the following truths:

1. Besides elders who *only* rule there are also elders who teach as well as rule, and the chiefest honors belong to this class, because their office is first and highest. These are ruling elders the same as the other class, but having also another office—the grand, the supreme office amongst men, of officially preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ.

These are that peculiar class of Church officers who both bear rule over some charge, and at the same time labor officially in the word and doctrine. They are what we now popularly signify by the term *pastors*.

2. That peculiar class of office-bearers who labor among you and are over you (that is, *rule* over you), and at the same time admonish you—that class you must esteem very highly; and you

are to do this for their work's sake, which is so grand and so useful. In other words, you must esteem very highly in love, your *pastors*, as we now technically call them. Yes! you must remember those officers whose proper description is that they have the rule over you and also speak officially to you in public the word of the Lord.

3. Respecting those elders who preach the gospel the Lord has ordained that they are to get their support thereby. They are not to live by some secular calling whilst they preach freely a free gospel. No, but they are to get their living for their preaching and by their preaching—even so the Lord hath ordained. They are not to starve; they are not to want; but they are to *live*; to be in comfort and free from worldly cares and anxieties. For he that is taught in the word is to communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things—food and raiment and a dwelling-house and fuel and lights, and books for his own adequate improvement, and the means of educating properly his children; also such a support as will enable him to exercise hospitality, and still further to make some provision for his family after his decease. There is not one good thing which you enjoy, who have a pastor that teaches you, but you are commanded by the Lord who gave you that good thing, to communicate a portion of it to your pastor.

4. Especially let it be observed that the ordinance of the Lord respecting support for office-bearers by the Church relates only to official *preachers*, and does not relate to ruling elders nor to deacons, seeing that both these, as described by Paul to Timothy and Titus, are persons finding their daily occupation and support in the market-place.

Now does it, on the other hand, relate to all preachers, or is it applicable only to those who rule as well as preach?—in other words, does the ordinance of the Lord about support relate only to *pastors*, as we now popularly style them, or does it include all preachers? This is a nice question, and it may not be easy to give it a perfectly satisfactory answer.

Let us consider the bearing of a few simple principles. The New Testament gives a full and articulate description of only

two office-bearers—the deacon and the elder or presbyter, otherwise called the bishop. The order of the bishop is, however, divided into two classes, of which one only rules, and the other both teaches and rules. Such is the organisation of the full, complete, and settled Church state. There is another state of the Church not complete and settled—her missionary state, where things are in a formative condition and unsettled, such as it was in Crete when Titus was sent to “set in order things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city.” In this unsettled condition of the Church, her courts are not yet organised; there is no classical, even no parochial presbytery; no pastorates, no ruling eldership, no complete and full and direct representative government. Converts to the truth there are, and they have occasional preaching and the sacraments, through the ministry of some man of God who comes to visit them at intervals, but Church organisation they have none yet, and the sacred and holy discipline of Christ’s house is not exercised amongst them in its full development. There is Church rule there because the Word is there, and it is the Word which rules and governs always in the kingdom of our Lord. So then the solitary missionary or evangelist proper, *because he is a preacher of the omnipotent Word*, carries all Church power in his single hand wherever he goes outside of the settled Church state, and in a just sense is *always a representative ruler*, though acting alone. Indeed, wherever and whenever a preacher stands up to proclaim the truth, he necessarily rules and governs by that very act, so that, in a certain sense, ruling is necessarily involved in teaching. But that state of the Church where there is no Church organisation, and where the preacher or missionary rules alone, whether directly or but indirectly, as just now described, is manifestly a state of pupilage, and not of the full development of the Church’s privileges. For then the Church, so far as she exists there, is under a one-man power of rule. And now, as in apostolic times, the missionary in foreign or frontier lands must always, like Paul and Barnabas, seek to substitute for the one-man rule of the evangelist the government—the representative government, of a body of elders. In other words, he must organise the

converts as soon as it is possible. While as yet not blest with the permanent ministry of the Word amongst them, he must persuade them to elect their best qualified men to be their ruling elders and deacons, and he must ordain and settle these officers over them before he passes on, for that is his calling, to establish other little churches. Only by organisation can he secure what he has already gained. It is order by which he must fortify and establish and so perpetuate the doctrine he has preached. Thus it was that Paul and Barnabas lighted up little candles in Derbe and Lystra and Iconium, and setting them in candlesticks, they made all Asia Minor to blaze for a long time with the glory of the gospel which they preached.

Keeping carefully in mind now the distinction which must be made betwixt the missionary and the settled and organised state of the Church, let us recur again to the fact that *for the latter state* our Lord has provided two offices which are to minister to the Church’s edification and growth, namely, deacons and elders or bishops. The former takes care of the Church’s poor and sick; the latter administers the sacred and holy discipline of the Church. The former is of two classes, one male and the other female—the one to take care of tables, the table of the Lord, the table of the minister, and the table of the poor; the other, called in Scripture the *deaconess* or the *widow*, to take care of the sick, lodge strangers, relieve the afflicted, bring up orphans, wash the saints’ feet, and solace the Church’s sufferers of all kinds. O sweet and blessed ministry of the diaconate! What a divine gift thou art, full of rich resources unconsidered, unemployed, by our Church! How many congregations of our people have never had any deacons at all; how few have ever thought of employing deaconesses! We have need to learn from Roman Catholics and Episcopalians, and begin to subsidise the untold wealth of female influence and usefulness lying buried amongst us. But all this by the way. Now, just as the deacon is of two classes, so also is the elder or bishop—there is the elder who only rules and the elder who rules and also teaches. But be it observed, ruling is the fundamental idea in the Presbyterate. This runs through the whole articulate description of the presbyter or

bishop, as Paul writes it down for Timothy and for Titus. That which makes a presbyter or bishop is ruling. That officer who lawfully bears rule in the Church is a presbyter and none other but such an one. He is a true and proper presbyter or bishop in the Church who is called and ordained to rule, though he be not called and ordained to preach. Preaching, therefore, is not essential to the presbyterate, much less constitutes it. Yet the Lord has ordained that a class of his presbyters shall be also preachers, and this office of the preaching elder is preëminently the first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness. And this teaching elder is always necessarily a ruler; for being always a presbyter or bishop, he must inherently possess ruling powers. The higher office must involve and include the lower. Not every presbyter then is a teacher, but every teaching presbyter is inherently a ruler in the Church. And as the ruling function always necessarily accompanies the teaching, so it must always, in a sense, precede it; for no man may lawfully be ordained a teaching presbyter, (I speak of the settled Church state,) except when some congregation and because some congregation has chosen and called him to be its pastor, that is, *ruler*.

From a consideration of these few simple Presbyterian principles it appears, then, that in the settled Church state, a man is to be inducted into the ministry of the Word only upon the call of some congregation for him to undertake amongst them the pastoral office and work, which signifies both ruling and teaching them. Moreover, it appears that deacons and deaconesses, together with presbyters who rule and presbyters who teach as well as rule, are all the office-bearers which the King and Head gives to edify and build up His Church wherever planted and settled. Now, evidently, we have no power to make a new kind of officer in the Church. But a new office has been creeping in amongst us, viz., that of the *stated supply*, a teaching presbyter who has no power of rule over the church to which he ministers. And it is an important question whether this is a legitimate office, entitling the holder of it to ministerial support.

Let it be observed that I raise no question as to the legitimacy of the occasional or temporary supply which the churches are

frequently under the necessity of securing, with the help of Presbytery, in order that they may enjoy the Word and Sacraments. What I speak of is the *stated supply*. I speak of a *system of supplies* that is distinct from the *system of pastorates*. I speak of a new way unknown to the Scriptures, to our book, and to our fathers, by which our teaching presbyters are systematically deprived of their power of direct and formal rule over the churches to which they minister in the word and doctrine. Every teaching presbyter, I insist, possesses inherently and *ex officio* the right of ruling the church, so that he may sit in any of the higher courts of the church, although he may not sit, unless he be their pastor, in the lowest, that is, the session. But that teaching presbyter who labors constantly in a particular church, ought always to have the power of sitting and ruling in the session of that church by being made its pastor. I am warring, then, against the *disfranchisement of my brethren*, whose rights of ruling where they constantly preach, of applying as well as declaring his Word, the Lord himself has conferred upon them, and of which this new system robs and despoils them. I am contending for the parity of all ministers in the settled church state, and against the further spread or continuance of a system which prevents the exercise by some of them of that power of rule which belongs of right to their office.

You are ready to ask, What about the Professor in the theological school, or the Secretary of one of the Assembly's committees? The proper answer to your question brings in again the distinction of the formative from the settled state of the Church. Two forms of ministry of the Word, and but two, are exhibited in the Acts and Epistles—one the evangelistic, the other the pastoral; one outside the regular Church state, and called extraordinary; the other permanent and ordinary, and belonging to the organised Church. Of the extraordinary form were apostles, prophets, evangelists, and I may add those who taught schools of the prophets, as did our blessed Lord himself. None of these belonged to the Church considered as set up, but all to the Church considered as to be planted. On the other hand, the ordinary workers are those who receive under their pastoral charge the

particular churches when organised, and take the oversight of their permanent life and growth. Two kinds of service, therefore, by ministers of the Word, are contemplated in the Scriptures: one which looks towards the founding of churches, and another which builds them up when founded. Of the former sort is the work of our Foreign and Home missionaries, our teachers of theology, and our secretaries devoted to the Church's various evangelistic operations. All these are working outside of any settled Church. Their labors regard not the edification of any particular congregation, but the progress and advantage of the whole body.

Now, betwixt such general officers working for the whole body and the *stated supply*, is there not a very patent difference? Can you call him, in any sense of the word, *evangelistic*? Is it a fact that he labors for the Church in her general interests? No, he preaches stately to one or two particular churches. Is it a fact that he labors in frontier parts? No, but in the very centre, perhaps, of the settled Church. Is it a fact that he labors in converting with a view to organising? No, but to edify a church established long ago, possibly a century old. Is it a fact that he is laboring for a little while as a missionary, with the design of shortly passing on to do the same kind of evangelistic labors in other destitute parts and in the regions beyond? No, but he supplies the very same church or churches for years together—his title is a *stated supply*. He is a permanent fixture, oftentimes more permanent and abiding than our pastors generally are. There are churches in this Synod to which the same minister has acted as their stated supply for forty years. Surely this is no evangelist. But on the other hand, can you call him a pastor? Well, is he in charge of the congregation as their pastor? Can he take any part in any act of the government of that congregation? Can he cast a vote on any question in the session? Did that congregation ever call him to be their pastor? Was he ever installed such by the Presbytery? Or did the people by their own act alone put him in the place he occupies? And if the people should wish to get rid of him, will they have to consult the Presbytery, or can they not send him adrift at their own

pleasure? Surely this is no pastor! But if he is neither of the evangelist nor of the pastoral class of ministers, then how does he come into and form a part of the New Testament system for settled churches, and that of our Form of Government, which knows only pastors and evangelists?

Now to what extent does this system actually prevail amongst us? I answer, that leaving out the Synod of Missouri, respecting which I have not the needful statistics, we have not far from six hundred ministers engaged in regularly serving particular churches, and that of these about three hundred and fifty are settled pastors, and about two hundred and fifty are stated supplies. Many, very many, of the latter class are amongst our best ministers, and it may not be their fault that they occupy this unpresbyterian position. I am not standing here to-day as the censor of individuals; but you have appointed me to discuss a system, and I would set before the Synod the facts of our case. Of six hundred of our effective preachers, little more than one-half are in the position where Scripture and our Form would put them. The Church ought to know and consider and remedy this evil. We have a Church order which we claim to find in God's word; but we have fallen into another way of arranging our ecclesiastical affairs. This new way has to a considerable extent driven out of use amongst us the good old way. And to such an extent does this new system obtain amongst us, that when the Presbytery of South Alabama overtured the Assembly at Richmond to take measures for checking its progress, that Assembly declined to do anything. It was persuaded to apologise for this new and this unpresbyterian and this unscriptural way, and to declare that in many, perhaps "it is in most cases, the only thing that can save many of our churches from extinction." Thus our Assembly was put into the attitude of declaring in substance that Christ's way of regulating his Church's government is a failure, and that an invention of human wisdom, or rather of human folly—a new officer unknown to the apostolic Church and not named amongst Christ's ascension gifts to his Bride—a preacher who is neither of the evangelistic nor of the pastoral class, must be employed to keep life in many of the Lord's own churches, or they

will be plucked out of his hand, sink down into extinction, and perish!

As against this unpresbyterian deliverance of the Richmond Assembly, I would have the Synod of South Carolina to declare:

I. That the system of stated supplies is *contrary to Scripture*, which gives us two forms of the Diaconate, two forms of the Presbyterate, and again two forms and but two forms of the ministry of the Word, namely, evangelists and other like planters of churches, and pastors to edify them when planted.

II. I would have Synod declare that this growing evil in our Church is *contrary to our Form of Government*, which would be of course a repetition, in different shape, of the former declaration, seeing that we profess to get our Church polity from the Bible. As in the Scriptures, so in our Form, but two kinds of ministry of the word are presupposed and provided for, viz., evangelists or missionaries and pastors. Not one of our formularies refers to any such minister as the stated supply. The call is to the pastoral work. Our Book says the acceptance of a call always involves, when accepted, the instalment by Presbytery.

III. I would have Synod declare that this new way is *destructive of our representative system of Church rule*. Our book says that "ruling elders are *properly* the representatives of the people;" which means that strictly, specifically, simply, solely, they are representatives, whilst ministers are not simply representatives, but teachers as well. The book adds that "ruling elders are chosen by the people, for the purpose of exercising government and discipline *in conjunction with* pastors or ministers." Both classes of elders, then, are representatives, the one being nothing more, but the other having also the higher function of teaching. I would therefore have this Synod declare that the system of stated supplies disfranchises the minister of one of these two functions, which are essential to his office as a minister. The stated supply is a mere teacher, deprived of his ruling function in his own congregation. Whoever is commissioned to preach statedly to any people, ought to have the right to apply his doctrine in the way of discipline amongst them—for doctrine being the life, discipline is the nerves of any Church. This new

system does not object to the minister sitting in Presbytery, in Synod, and in the Assembly to rule over the churches generally, (as American Presbyterianism, more scriptural here than that of Scotland allows,) but then, inconsistently, it shuts him out from all rule over that very church whose condition he best knows, and where he could rule to the greatest advantage—the church to which he ministers statedly. Thus it robs the minister of his inherent rights, and it robs the church of the full advantage of his ruling. And so it tends to overthrow Presbyterian Church government, which is government by representatives.

IV. Once more: I would have this Synod declare, in opposition to the unpresbyterian deliverance of the Richmond Assembly, that this new system, so far from being "in many, perhaps in most cases, the only thing that can save many of our churches from extinction," is, *in fact, naked and simple Congregationalism, which never can be made to agree with Presbyterian order*. The whole Church is one body confederated together, and the parts are all under mutual control. No one church is to act apart from the others, and hence our Presbyterial and Synodical Assemblies. Especially in the matter of settling a minister, there must be mutual council and control. Hence it is for the Presbytery to license, ordain, and install. The call is to come before them, and they will present it to the man called, if they see proper. Obviously the stated supply system is the opposite of this Presbyterian way, for it allows each church to make arrangements about preaching for itself. Every church has certainly a clear right to call whom it will, and none else, to be its pastor; but every church just as certainly also has a clear right to be consulted, through its representatives, regarding every minister that is to sit in the higher courts and rule there over it. And so this congregational way of each church controlling its own pulpit, ought to be broken up amongst us, and the Presbyterian way of settled pastors put into full operation. We ought to emancipate all our brethren from their state of disfranchisement. We ought to confer on every one of our churches the full benefits of the ruling function inherently belonging to every ordained minister of the Word.

It would appear, therefore, that the connection is a very close and intimate one betwixt the two parts of the topic which the Synod appointed me to discuss: the Pastoral Relation and the Support of the Ministry. There are but two kinds of legitimate ministry known to us: that which is *evangelistic*, that which is concerned with the general work of the Church, that which looks to her spread, that which contemplates her progress in the earth as a body; and that which is *pastoral*, involving along with the teaching one or more particular flocks the administration of discipline amongst them. Both these, but none other, can claim the benefit of our Lord's ordinance, that they which preach the gospel shall live of the gospel. If, therefore, our Church would secure the blessing of the Lord, she must conform her use of the ministers whom he gives to his own appointments. She must either employ them in some sort of evangelistic work for her outside progress, or else make pastors of them in her settled estate. She has not discretion given her to invent new offices, but accepting thankfully what her Head has given, she must, in the use of what he ordains, expect his blessing. For his organised and settled churches he appoints that there be what we call the *pastorate*. This involves the idea of a teaching elder devoted to a fixed charge, and at the same time free from worldly cares and avocations, and out of this idea flows the people's duty to give that man his support.

Thus closely connected are the pastoral relation and the support of the ministry. As to the sacredness of the connection, that comes from the ordinance of Christ himself. The pastoral relation! What more holy or tender subsists amongst men? Is the parental relation sacred and sweet? Christ represents his love and care for the Church under the similitudes of both fatherly and motherly affection. Is the conjugal relation still more tender and loving? Christ calls the Church his spouse, and boasts that he cherishes for her a husband's devotion. Now Christ is indeed the chief Shepherd, but every true pastor is a shepherd under Christ, and in his measure loves the Church just as Christ does.

The pastoral work! Paul describes it by three expressions:

the first is that your pastors *labor amongst you*; the second is, they are *over you in the Lord*; the third is, they *admonish* you.

First, they *labor amongst you*—they *labor* in the word and doctrine. No light labor, no easy task is the pastor's, but what might fill an angel's heart, and filled a Saviour's hands. It is hard labor to dig in the mines of scriptural knowledge and bring forth things new as well as old. The true pastor will toil in his study, and he will do hard mental labor as he rides or walks in his rounds amongst his people. He will furrow his brow and pale his cheek with severe and protracted and deep thinking of the things of Christ, that he may provide his flock with the food of their soul, and may instruct them in the doctrines of the gospel, and may defend them from going astray into the paths of error which lead to destruction. And what he thus toilsomely gathers by research and by thought, he brings forth to his people in all the earnestness of his soul's deepest and strongest affections, and wears himself down every week in proclaiming these things in the ears of his congregation. Possibly you may not be aware how weary your minister is at the close of a week's hard study; for it has never occurred to you that it can be hard labor to read or to think. Possibly you have never conceived of the exhausting labors of Sunday to your minister, whom Saturday night found weary and worn. You may not know that very commonly your faithful pastor gets no refreshing rest on Sunday nights, and feels all day Monday his nerves unstrung. And yet this is perhaps the necessary experience of every faithful minister. We have evidence in Scripture that our Lord grew prematurely grey, for the Jews supposed from his looks that he approached fifty when not much more than half so old. And so Christ's ministers must wear themselves out laboring amongst you.

But, secondly, your pastors are *over you in the Lord*. This is the same word which is applied in 1 Timothy, v. 17, to the elders, and is there translated *ruling*. Your pastors are "over you," that is, they *rule over you*. But mark the qualifying term—"in the Lord." Their rule over you extends only to spiritual things, and is only ministerial and declarative. Their rule over you is only that of the Lord's servants speaking to you

what He bids them for your good. Their rule over you is the shepherd's careful, loving rule over his flock which he cherishes through heat and cold, in wet and dry, by day, by night, and in defence of which he would cheerfully lay down his life. Their rule over you is nothing else but an anxious watch that you go not astray. Yes, not only does your pastor labor for you in his study and in his pulpit, but in his closet and on his couch he remembers you by night as by day. This is labor indeed to bear you on his heart, and this is his constant labor and toil. He carries upon his soul continually the burden of your souls. It is the care of souls, which, in the fear of God who called him, and in the love of Christ who sent him, the pastor consented, joyfully yet tremblingly, to have bound upon his shoulders. Oh! the tremendous, awful load—the care, the anxious, sleepless care of your souls! Oh! the fearful responsibility of having to account at last for so many *souls*, immortal souls, candidates for heaven or for hell! This makes the pastor's old age begin while he is still young in years. This bows his shoulders and makes his knees totter before the time. The invisible, the eternal world, is terrible always to mortal eye and mortal heart; all men naturally shrink back from the brink which overhangs that abyss. But it is the vocation of this class of men—the calling of the pastor it is, to look all the time at judgment and eternity as his people stand related to them. It is not his own eternal future which is so dreadful—for by faith he looks exultingly forward to his joyful rest beyond this present life. But it is the eternal future of the souls committed to him, the souls for which, as a pastor, he is called to watch—it is the doubtful future of these objects of his tender, unceasing solicitude, it is this which weighs down the heart of those who rule over you in the Lord.

The third item in Paul's account of the work of your pastors is that they *admonish you*. This completes the beautiful and impressive picture. Here is one who labors to teach you the truth which saves, and one who anxiously watches for your soul's prosperity, weighed down continually with the burden your eternal interests constitute for him; but this person has yet farther the difficult task to perform of constantly *admonishing you*.

Teaching is general, admonition is particular. Caring for the soul of one person or for the souls of a congregation is also general; but admonishing one, or even many, is particular. It is bringing down doctrine to a point. It is saying to an individual, "Thou art the man," or to a class, "It is you, and not others, I am warning." What a hard duty it is to point out faults! How apt the faithful discharge of it is to give offence! How often the honest friend who admonishes is counted a foe! This was Paul's experience when he faithfully told the truth about themselves to the Galatians. A large portion of his work in writing his Epistles was the painful work of admonishing. Read, for example, the first chapters of first Corinthians, and you will see there the inspired model of the faithful pastor's duty, as the admonisher of his people. "As my beloved sons, I warn you," says Paul, "for though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers." Here is the distinction plainly drawn between the *instructing* work of the pastor as he labors in the word and doctrine, and his *warning work*, as he applies his doctrine to individual cases, and points out to particular persons their particular sins. O friendship, thou art a generous, self-sacrificing sentiment, but thy highest, noblest, most exalted embodiment is the unselfish devotion of a true Christian pastor to the spiritual and eternal good of his people!

But the people's duty to their pastor—how does Paul set that forth? He does that in two particulars: the *first* is to *know* them, that is, to recognise them in the character of men officially laboring to teach you the word, and carrying the burden of your souls' salvation, and faithfully warning you of your faults and errors. If such is their office, to which they are divinely called, and if it is an arduous work which consumes their strength and their life itself, then they are surely entitled to be recognised by you in this character. You ought to know your pastor, as he is your pastor. He should be acknowledged by you as the competent teacher, the watchful guide, the faithful reprover, which he is; your invaluable friend, the precious ascension gift of your Lord, taking, in some feeble sense, his place in his absence, and acting in the stead of the great Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.

The other particular is that you esteem them very highly in love. Your esteem is to be in proportion to their value, which you have recognised, and so it is to be *very high*. And it is to be no cold affection, but one warm and lively and practical. You ought to esteem them very highly in love. It is love that must give the measure of your practical demonstration to your pastor of the estimation you set upon his office and his work for you. Love for your Lord and this his servant and his representative—this love it is which must tell you what you ought to do for his comfort and health and happiness. He is a man like yourselves, having all your wants and necessities. Sowing unto you in spiritual things, is it a great matter for him to reap your carnal things? Love answers, "No, it is no great matter, and I will not measure out the good things of this life, which I dispense to him who without stint cares for my soul's good!" He has a family as dear to him as your family is to you. Love will prompt you to see that he is provided freely and fully with every thing needful to their comfort, health, education, and usefulness; and the freeness and fulness in which you contribute to make his family comfortable and happy will be fully proportioned, because love prompts you to what you spend on your own family. Whatever you can afford to furnish to your individual households, you will, out of your esteem and love for your pastor, unitedly furnish to his family. He cannot do his own proper work well if he is harassed with anxious cares about their support. He cannot be a full pastor, and do the work of such, if not set free altogether from worldly cares and avocations. Love to him, love to the Church, love to the Lord, will operate to make the people free their pastor from all annoyance touching worldly maintenance. The pastoral relation involves the support of the ministry, and both esteem and love forbid that support to be stinted or meagre. It is for their work's sake you are to render them a full and competent support. It is their office you are to honor, where possibly the person of the individual may not command, in every particular, your highest respect. It is *in the Lord* they rule over you—it is *in the Lord* you accept their ministrations of spiritual things, and make return therefor in carnal things. Christ

says to them, "Whoso receiveth you receiveth me." As you value and honor your Lord, you will value and honor his ministers. For their work's sake you will not suffer them to lack, but communicate to them in every good thing. And no cup of cold water which you furnish them out of love to them for their work's sake will your Lord forget to reward out of his sovereign grace according to his blessed promise at the last.

The apostle impresses the duty which the Church owes to her pastors by the consideration that the Lord has ordained their support by the Church. Will the Church not observe the ordinance of her Head? The apostle is urgent. He says, "We beseech you to know and esteem and love your pastors." Well may this duty be urged upon Zion. Her vital interests are concerned. She cannot prosper if her pastors are secularised. They cannot but be secularised if not set free by her from worldly cares and avocations. If there be one reform which more than any other in the practical arrangements of the Church calls aloud to be accomplished, it is this one of setting every minister of our Church to his covenanted work. We are suffering great loss as a Church by the necessary devotion of so many good and true men to measures for supplementing the meagre support afforded by their churches. We are suffering great loss by the subtraction of so many of their thoughts and so much of their power from their proper work in the study, in the pastorate, and in the pulpit—a subtraction which their conjugal and parental sympathies force on them, but which the Church cannot afford to endure. We are suffering great loss, because if we do not honor the ordinance of the Lord, he will not honor us in our undertakings for his glory. Oh! that our Church might awake to this great reform! Oh! for a lively sense in every one of our congregations of the value of the pastorate and a strong desire to secure all its benefits, and a cheerful readiness to do, out of reverence to the Master, and esteem and love for his servants and their work, whatever he has ordained and whatever their comfort and usefulness require!