

THE  
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY  
AND  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

NEW SERIES, No. 17.—JANUARY, 1876.

---

**Art. I.—THE AUBURN DECLARATION.**

By Rev. E. D. MORRIS, D.D., Professor of Theology in Lane Theological Seminary.

AMONG the treasures preserved in the Library of Lane Seminary, is the original draft of what is widely known as the AUBURN DECLARATION. More than thirty years after its preparation, just when the separated Presbyterian Churches were happily uniting, this interesting historical document was presented to the Institution by its author, the venerable BAXTER DICKINSON, D.D. It was also accompanied by valuable memoranda with respect to its authorship, and to the circumstances which occasioned its preparation. Its contents have at various times been made public through the press, and have recently been incorporated under another name in the Presbyterian Digest. Its doctrinal quality and its important historical relations to the Presbyterian Church, both as separate and as united, are such as justify its further introduction to public notice in the columns of our denominational REVIEW. What will be attempted in the present article, is a narrative of the origin of this declaration, an analysis of its contents, and a brief discussion of its doctrinal significance and value, as one among the interesting memorials of our beloved Zion.

It is hardly needful to say that this task is undertaken in no conscious mood of partisanship, and with no anticipation of awakening old animosities or arousing new oppositions, but

## Art. VII. — CHURCH QUESTIONS IN FOREIGN MISSIONS.\*

By Rev. JOHN C. LOWRIE, D.D., New York.

WE often find in the Reports of our Foreign Missionary Boards, references to what we may call Church Questions. These questions relate to practical measures in the spread of the gospel, more or less ecclesiastical in their nature. They may be distinguished from the gospel itself, though almost necessarily included in all well-devised efforts for its extension in the world. We have an example in this Report, in the case of certain churches, "formed on the so-called union basis;" and it is added, "if it should be deemed expedient for them to remain as they now stand, they will virtually add a new denomination to the number of Christian churches," . . . "a result to be deprecated, but it is one which may be overruled for good, especially if grace be given unto all to follow the golden rule in their intercourse with each other." These church questions may be expected to occupy attention abroad, as well as at home. We cannot yet dispense with a "Committee on the Polity of the Church," and a "Committee on Bills and Overtures," in our General Assembly—two committees, by the way, which seem to be entrusted with similar duties; much less should ecclesiastical matters be left to shape themselves in newly-formed missionary communities. At the least, the principles on which they ought to be settled should be well understood, both by the supporters of missions and by the missionaries in the field. We do not design, however, to enter on any extended discussion of these matters; our aim is rather to give a statement of some practical questions, with brief suggestions as to their answers.

At the outset, we meet with a question which goes to the foundation of all church ideas. Why should we trouble converts from the heathen religions with ecclesiastical matters?

---

\* *The Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church.* New York, 1875.

Why should we say anything at all to them about the church? It is the gospel we wish to give them, not the church. Now, we do not differ from those, who thus put the case, in their views of the supreme importance of the gospel of the Grace of God in the salvation of sinners by faith in Jesus Christ; we define the point thus fully as of the greatest moment. But we must think that the way of doing this is not unimportant. We would not "trouble" the converts, but we would save them from trouble, by beginning our work for them on right views. The simple story of the cross includes correct instruction, presupposes the proper calling and training of the teachers, is followed by public confession of faith, receiving the sacraments, fellowship with the saints, a godly life, Christian discipline, active labors for good objects, and all the means of self-support and the perpetuation of the gospel ministry and ordinances. With all of these ideas, the Christian Church, the organization of Christians in church fellowship, is closely connected. The missionary might as well attempt to live in an ideal house, and not in one of wood or stone, as to preach the gospel in the abstract. If his preaching is with power from on high, an external organization of some kind must follow. Granted that the form of church government is of minor moment, as compared with the great truths of the gospel, but a scaffolding is needful for the rising palace. In this case both are sacred; "the church of God" is "the pillar and ground of the truth." All enlightened men in Christian lands have considered this church question; regard the church as a divine institution, and are not likely to change their convictions; and until these convictions are changed, it cannot be expedient for missionaries to proceed on the theory of indifference to this matter. As to leaving the native converts to choose for themselves the form of church government, eventually they will do so, without doubt; but at first we might as well leave it to our children to choose whether they will be Presbyterians or Episcopalians, republicans or monarchists; and in any case, the converts can not avoid meeting whatever disadvantage may arise from the existence of different denominations, as we shall see presently. For ourselves, and our missionary brethren, it is our happiness to regard our church system, in its doctrines and its leading features of order, as taught by sacred Scripture, adopted by

the primitive Christians, upheld by considerations of expediency, and having distinctive advantages in the great work of missions, as will be apparent further on.

Holding these views of the church—and, commonly, all but Plymouth brethren do hold distinctive views, while theirs are simply demoralizing, in a military sense—we next meet certain ideas of comprehension, and so we pass to the question of a union church. This is, in its last analysis, nearly the equivalent of Broad Churchism. It involves our making a distinction as to the relative importance of doctrines, which we should be slow to make; an affectionate child receives loyally the slightest intimation of a beloved father's wishes, and does not distinguish between great and small. Earnest men, moreover, will not long be contented with the idea of indifference which underlies this specious church theory. But while we abhor the notion of Broad Churchism in our missions, we may well cherish all Christian charity toward those who honestly differ from us, and allow to others the liberty we claim for ourselves—following the golden rule. The idea of a non-denominational church is attractive to some minds, but whatever may be its first steps, the union church usually ends its journey in one of the denominations, commonly in one of the extreme sects. In one of our foreign missionary countries the union church, bearing the great name of "The Church of Jesus," after a short course, ended under the banner of a narrow prelacy; in another, the union church, called simply "The Church of Christ," seems to be already an ultra independent body. In both these countries the leading denominations have their representatives, so that, practically, the non-denominational movement has secured no uniformity. We might easily predict this result. From the nature of the case, some order must be followed. Forthwith practical questions arise as to what it shall be. Shall the confession of faith of our native converts be made by their being placed out of sight in water, or will pouring or sprinkling agree with the Scriptural warrant, and sufficiently represent the virtue of baptism? And what shall be said of the infant children of believing parents? Shall the native minister be ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, or by the hands of a single minister, or, per adventure, by a committee of the communicants, empowered

by a majority vote for the purpose? These and similar questions come for reply inevitably. At present they will receive different answers from different bodies of Christians; and we must tolerate the diversity until, under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, we reach the same views of what is true. In the meantime, let us not magnify, unduly, the points of difference.

On the other hand, we can see certain great advantages resulting from denominational action in missions. A wider range of field is occupied, a greater amount of work is done, a larger variety of method is brought into use, and tested for the common benefit, a clearer and fuller testimony for Christ and his truth is maintained, all for the greater spread of the gospel than could be secured under any plan of visible and organic unity. That such unity is not Christian union, is shown in the missions of the Roman Catholics; witness the disgraceful jealousies and contests of their different orders, resulting in their banishment from China, and the expulsion of Christianity for so long a time from Japan. That our Protestant diversity may also result in certain evils we need not deny; witness in our country the settlement of four or five ministers, each supported in part by home missionary funds, in a community of a thousand souls, with little or no prospect of numerical increase.

This evil can and will be corrected. Here and abroad the law of love, of simply doing as we would have others do to us, will govern all the faithful servants of Christ, and keep them from objectionable action. We must honor all who are in Christ by faith; we would lay no straw of hindrance in their way; we would help them to the utmost; yet both they and we must stand in our lot, as witnesses, unto Christ and his truth. This position is set before us in inspired words: "first pure, then peaceable;" "holding the truth in love." It is idle to tell us that we cannot love and honor our Christian brethren of denominations differing from our own, and, therefore, we must break down all lines of separation, and become fused in a visible unity. As well insist that there shall be no infantry, no artillery, no cavalry, in a well-organized army. It is all in vain to urge the differences among Christians as hindering the work of missions abroad. Fifty years of modern missions attest the general catholicity and the wonderful progress of their work. The difficulties of denominational action

are found mainly here at home. We may leave them to the teaching of the Divine Spirit, and the restraints and guidance of Divine Providence. When the churches of this country come to unite in one denomination, then may our missionaries abroad go and do likewise; but earlier movements of this kind on their part will be a vain attempt to march an army into an enemy's country, and to sustain it there permanently, after cutting loose from every source of supply and reinforcement.

We take it for granted that denominational action will continue, and we must consider the relation of the native church to the church at home. Here several questions of practical interest emerge. Shall the foreign missionary be ecclesiastically connected with the local or native church, or shall he remain outside of it? Shall the native church be independent of the mother church, or be affiliated with it for a time? How far shall the rules of the church at home be considered applicable to the missionary churches, referring specially to the subject of appeals to the higher church courts, and to the far greater subject of qualifications to be required for the work of the ministry? When missionaries of different churches, holding almost identical views of doctrine and order, find themselves in the same field, how shall they and their native churches sustain the best relations to each other, and yet retain their connection with the churches at home by which they are supported? This question is now a practical one in several countries. As showing the differing practice in some of these matters, it may be stated, that in the missions of our foreign board three methods are in use. In one country there is no general church organization, though there are local churches; the "mission" governs all. By its direction certain persons, not always natives merely, are ordained; the churches are not connected in presbyterial relationship; the missionaries, those of them who were ordained before they went abroad, remain in connection with the presbyteries at home: In another country, the missionaries are organized as a presbytery, in connection with our General Assembly, but it has neither churches nor ruling elders, nor does it expect to have any; while the native ministers and churches, a goodly number, are organized substantially as presbyteries, without connection with the

church here. In other countries still, the rule usual in our country is followed: presbyteries are organized in connection with the General Assembly, which embrace all the ministers, foreign and native, and all the churches within certain geographical boundaries, with a ruling elder from each church in the meetings of the presbytery. The first of these methods grew out of its history; and the second has also certain reasons in its favor, which formerly had, perhaps, more weight than they have now. It is not the purpose of this article to criticise either of these methods; while yet its views will favor the third as the more excellent way.

Instead of giving a categorical answer to most of these questions, we invite attention to some of the conditions of the case; rightly viewed, these, we think, will suggest the proper reply. And first, as to the foreign missionary—the minister sent out from this country. It is important to form a just conception of his position, and yet, from the circumstances in which he is placed, mistakes may readily occur. He is usually superior in character and education to the native ministers; often he is the honored instrument of their conversion; they owe their training for the ministry largely to his labors; and their support from the home church, so long as it is necessary, depends very much on his recommendation. On the other hand, they may sometimes be his superiors in intellect and breadth of understanding; they possess a knowledge of the character, ways, modes of thought, language, etc., of their own people, which a foreigner seldom completely acquires. From the nature of the case, therefore, the foreign minister must be the counselor of his native brethren; his temptation often is, that of being also their director. We think his true position is that of their co-presbyter. Both then stand in regulated liberty toward each other, and each may share the benefits of the distinctive gifts of the other, while bound by common sympathies. It is abroad as it is here at home in our presbyteries; the most distinguished and gifted of our ministers meet cordially their less-known brethren as of equal grade in office. They may differ in talent, station, influence, as these things may be allotted to them by Providence; they agree in their high calling by grace into the church and its ministry, which is their common and greatest glory in the Christian household. As

in the Presbytery of New Brunswick, so in the Presbytery of Ningpo—the gifts and grace of all the members are happily available in common bonds for the spread of the gospel. We magnify the divine institution of presbytery in this matter. Its apostolic history is quite sustained in its modern missionary examples. All that is valuable in counsel and direction, and, if need be, in authority, is well secured by its simple, easily-understood, properly-guarded administration. Nothing in the position of a missionary as a *quasi* bishop, standing outside of the native church, giving his counsel in a way that is almost necessarily irresponsible, for he is a member of a church association in a distant country, not able to supervise his actions closely; nothing in such a position can be favorably compared to the status of a co-presbyter in a mission field. We may go still further, and claim that nothing in the theory, not of a *quasi*, but of an official bishop, in the prelatiic sense, can subserve so many interests as the episcopal functions of a presbytery rightly constituted and faithfully fulfilling its sacred duties. It can see that the gospel is preached, discipline maintained, godly living encouraged, self-support promoted, the calling and right training of ministers well considered; in a word, that all the gifts and grace of all the servants of Christ shall be subjects of careful study and wise nurture. And we believe that the greatest efficiency of our evangelistic work, at home and abroad, and also the wise economy of its administration, are to be sought in the line, not of centralization, but of presbyterial action, each presbytery taking charge, so far as practicable, of all such work in its own bounds. Not that we can at all dispense with the Central Board of the General Assembly, but that we should place all practicable details of work in the hands of the presbyteries.

We must not overlook the theory of some esteemed brethren, that the foreign missionary is an evangelist—a theory which may mean much or little, as it is defined. In the sense of Acts viii: 4, all Christians are evangelists, and this idea is properly coming to the front in recent times. But when our presbyteries ordain missionaries as evangelists, we apprehend the common idea is, that they are ministers without pastoral charge; to this is superadded, in most cases, the purpose of their going out to fulfil their ministry in new settlements, or

among the unevangelized, but still as preachers rather than as pastors. We see not on what ground a presbytery could ordain an evangelist who was to go straight to a pastoral charge in another presbytery; but in regard to foreign missionaries, in many cases at any rate, it would be found impracticable to ordain them abroad. Their work is essentially missionary, and not pastoral, yet it is not merely itinerant in our day. Sometimes the missionaries are pastors for a time; sometimes teachers, translators of the Scripture, etc. They are usually settled in their homes, and full of work at their stations, it being, perhaps, their temptation to neglect itinerant service; but in view of all their duties, it may well be questioned whether the title of evangelist, in the sense of our usual practice, is appropriate; it would seem to be preferable to ordain them simply as ministers of the gospel, a title convertible with any other, and suitable for every phase of missionary work. Thus far all seems plain; but when we are told that our foreign missionaries are evangelists after the order of Timothy and Titus, the case becomes difficult. Conceding this, our theory of presbytery, as connected with our missionary service, must be greatly changed; for Timothy received "the gift of God" from the hands of the Apostle (2 Tim. i. 6, 14); and he, as well as Titus, exercised powers which no modern presbytery would entrust to one of its members—among others, that of ordination. Perhaps, we may be content to regard these evangelists as occupying, not a permanent office in the church, not as representing a permanent order in the ministry, but as employed by the Apostles for a special service—a view which was held, apparently, by the framers of our form of government. (See ch. iii; see, also, *Dr. Alexander McLeod's Catechism*, under this title.) Eusebius speaks of them as having a special work: "Having laid the foundations of the faith in foreign nations, they appointed other pastors, to whom they intrusted the cultivation of the parts they had recently occupied, while they proceeded to other countries and nations." This is a description that is seldom applicable to modern missionaries.

While we cannot admit the Episcopal claim of diocesan duties for these evangelists, we can hardly regard them as ordinary members of presbytery; and, therefore, we do not derive from their history much light in solving some of the questions in

hand, and we fall back on our general principles as to church affairs. These lead us to give to all the members of our presbyteries in foreign missions, whether foreigners or natives, very much the same duties as are sustained by presbyters in Christian countries. We see no good reason for making the foreign ministers either semi-bishops or independents pure and simple; let them remain only Presbyterian ministers, members of presbytery with their native brethren. They may, after a while, be out-voted, as the native members increase in number, and the sooner the better. Dangers from class distinctions are suggested, founded on diverse nationality. We make little of either objection. The foreign members will probably always possess as much influence in moulding the action of presbytery as they ought to desire; indeed, the practical danger is that of their having too much, so that the gifts of the native members may lie too long in abeyance. So far as the local expenditure of the funds received from the Board at home is concerned, we need apprehend no injurious action by the native ministers and elders, even were this matter placed in the charge of the presbytery with all its other business, as we should prefer, rather than in the hands of a "mission." In either case, all financial matters would be committed to the hands of men appointed by the Board to take charge of them.

Turning now to the native church, we can readily see how its conditions point to the same conclusion. It may be taken for granted that this church, in doctrine and order, will be very much the same with the church by which the missionary was sent out. It ought to be, but it is fair to admit that there are points of diversity. The native church members are usually but little advanced in Christian knowledge, not reaching the attainments of many of our children of ten years of age. They have not been trained to habits of self-government, forecast, and orderly deportment. They are easily discouraged and too easily overcome by temptation. They are unduly influenced by their own previous ideas and by the examples of their unconverted neighbors. We do not disparage the grace of God that is in them, and which shall lift them to a higher level of character and conduct; but taking them as they commonly stand, we at once see why they should not be deprived of

any legitimate guiding, restraining, elevating influences. No theory can afford to leave the native churches to themselves; direction, counsel, advice, in some form or way, must be given in the first instance, and continued for a time. This may be given by those who stand outside of the local church, and then it may be liable to imputations of insufficient acquaintance, of partiality, of inadequate power, of irresponsible action, but whatever is good in such direction, need not be lost in the union of the foreign and native members in the same body; while their close acquaintance and official connection under the venerable forms of church organization, tend to guard against various evils, and to increase the force of all that is good. It tends especially to lessen the distance between the foreigner and the native, a matter of great moment. So stands the case as between independency and presbytery. As to the prelatial way of exerting the required influence, we may concede certain advantages of the "one-man power," in promptness of action particularly, but great are its defects in not developing the best energies of the native church, as well as its positive risks of ill-informed or of ill-judging administration.

In further support of the foregoing views, we may argue: 1. That the want of common church organization leaves the native Christians in a state unfavorable to their growth and strength; they are like grains of sand, instead of being knit together in one body and compacted by that which every joint supplieth. 2. That the want of organization on Presbyterian principles lessens their power of resisting those who seek their own things and desire to have the pre-eminence, and exposes them to the danger of divided counsels, while it weakens their sympathy for their brethren living in distant places; the great idea of the union of all in the faith, is in danger of being overlooked. 3. Especially in the training and ordaining of ministers is this organization, embracing both the foreign and the native factors of the case, inestimable in its practical use. 4. The duty of self-support can be well fostered on this plan of presbyterial relationship, in which the strong must help the weak, and the slow learn to keep step with their more active brethren. 5. Self-government is also promoted by well-known rules, cordially adopted, and tending to personal freedom combined with the welfare of the many; if these are "governed churches," it is be-

cause they so elect, and the result is self-government in the best sense. 6. These views accord with the definition given in our book of the members of a presbytery (see *Form of Government*, ch. x)—a definition founded on right reasons and sustained by our history. 7. Actual trial has shown that such presbyteries work well; witness the presbyteries in China, India, Brazil, and other countries. 8. We think the examples of the early Christians, as recorded in some instances, and inferable in others, support the theory here advocated, but from the limited space at command we cannot well enter on an examination of the subject. 9. One thing seems clear, that these Scripture precedents do not forbid nor discourage this conclusion, while the great text on the subject of church affairs, "Let all things be done decently and in order," may be accepted as supporting our views. We are not required to deny that some of the preceding points may be adduced in support both of prelatric and independent theories of the church; indeed, we concede a certain merit in some of the features of these theories, but we think our own system accords with the Scripture pattern, and happily embodies things essential to the welfare of missions. We are quite willing to see it stand or fall, as its merits are tested in the work of evangelization.

While we rest in this conclusion, we do not advocate too early organization. Much depends on the qualifications of men who are to be chosen as office bearers; and much depends also on general and local circumstances.

All thoughtful students of the earlier labors of missionaries to the Nestorian, Armenian, and other nominally Christian churches, must have sympathized with their desire to reform the evils of these churches from within, rather than by encouraging their converts to form separate organization. It was well to proceed in this way at first, nor is it surprising that the results were not encouraging. Not merely in the days of Presbyterian and Congregational missionaries did this method of proceeding soon reach its end, even the Episcopal missionaries among the India-Syrians were constrained to abandon the hope of reformation by the Syrian Church itself. Similar disappointment, in less degree, seems to have attended the Moravian "Diaspora" movement, and the purpose of Wesley to work within the English Episcopal Church. Reverting to the organ-

izing of churches in our foreign missions, we suppose that organization might usually take place when suitable persons are found for the office of elder ; and if the right men are found as pastors, then the case is doubly plain. When they are able to stand alone, let these churches be encouraged, and, if need be, urged, to go onward by themselves ; in the mean time, let them be so affiliated with the parent church, as to be under its ecclesiastical care and direction.

This provisional relationship does not imply, however, that our missionary churches in India, China, and elsewhere, should be related to our General Assembly in all respects, as are our home congregations, presbyteries, and synods. Certain modifications of our rules are needful in their case, as, for instance, in regard to studies for the ministry. The peculiar circumstances should be well considered. Probably, the time is not distant when judicious and careful action on the subject should be taken by our chief court. This may be taken, we apprehend, without following the method of sending down "overtures" to the presbyteries. We may regard the missionary churches as ecclesiastically connected with the church in this country, not by constitutional bonds, nor by those of legal charter, but by the procedure and formal action of its highest court, and by the sacred ties of common Christian faith and sympathy. No undue haste is admissible ; no action not in full harmony with our church views is to be thought of ; yet a competent commission might suggest important measures on the subject for the consideration of the General Assembly. It has been proposed that appeals and complaints should be limited to one remove, and thereby little encouragement be given to the litigious spirit which is said to characterize some of these foreign people. It might be considered whether the right of voting in the General Assembly, and on overtures sent down by it, should be given to the native members of the missionary presbyteries ; leaving their right of membership in other respects untouched, but reserving authoritative action on much of the business of the Assembly to its American members. As to another point, we see no strong reasons for requiring annual meetings of synods. This matter was brought before the last General Assembly, and a report was adopted in regard to one of the missionary synods, which did full justice to one side of the

case. But it would require several times the sum of money recommended for the traveling expenses of this synod, if all the members were in attendance; it would take the members from work which they could not well leave; it would, in this particular case, require the use of four, if not five, different languages or dialects, doubling the confusion of former Canadian legislative experience. And if it be merely or chiefly the American missionaries who are to be convened, then the reply is obvious, they cannot be a synod in the sense of our church standards. In our own early history, it was many years before a synod was held, and it may be supposed that in our missionary churches for a good many years to come presbyteries can perform all needful supervision.

The only other question to which we shall now refer in a few words, grows out of the relations and interaction of presbyteries on the ground, which are connected with churches at home holding the same views of doctrine and order. In some countries northern and southern Presbyterian missionaries occupy the same or neighboring stations; in others the Reformed (Dutch), the Scotch, and the American Presbyterian missions are neighbors. It is evidently desirable to unite the native churches, whenever it is practicable, in common ecclesiastical bonds; and yet, it is also desirable that they should, for a time, maintain their relations with the parent churches; while the foreign members of presbyteries ought not to be separated from the church at home. How shall these differing features of the case be happily ordered? To solve this question requires careful study. We may suggest that much depends on the spirit with which it is considered at home and abroad; in some cases, nothing can probably be done at present. As to practical measures, wisdom from above will be given when the time shall come for taking action. In the meantime, not much will suffer by delay. Perhaps, it will appear eventually that a two-fold organization can be advantageously effected, all of the foreign and the native members being included in both. Certain matters should be reserved to each, so that they could go on harmoniously in separate grooves. First, a general affiliation with the mother church during the days of native feebleness, as already advocated; second, a local organization on some basis not inconsistent with the former; some general

method of this kind would, perhaps, answer the purpose. If not, some better way will in due time appear.

Here we end this paper. It has treated of questions of method and external order, but our interest in these questions is owing to their close connection with the spiritual welfare of the church in unevangelized countries.

---

### Art. VIII.—THE UTRECHT PSALTER AND THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

By Rev. FREDERIC VINTON, Librarian of Princeton College.

EVERY reader of the Book of Common Prayer perceives the noble eloquence of much of its phrase. Comparatively few, however, are aware of the high antiquity of some petitions and formulas therein contained. From the frequent prefixing of Latin rubrics, they may infer that the originals belong to that older church, still revered in great part of Europe. But many do not suspect that the hymns and creeds they so often rehearse have come down unchanged from the early ages of Christianity, and are the product of pens famous in their day, but long since lost sight of, across the gloomy sea of the middle age. The veneration, or the presumption, of prelatists has claimed for some of these precious fragments antiquity and dignity to which they are not entitled. It is not surprising, indeed, that formulas held sacred from infancy should be defended with spirit against innovators in the English church. So remote is the period to which they must be referred, and so various the judgments of men claiming the recondite learning involved, that intelligent persons may well remain in doubt. Yet, some of those formularies are so evidently the fruit of polemic zeal; they exhibit such a passionate eagerness to bind the conscience to a specific conception of the trinity and of the person of Christ; and they denounce God's vengeance so promptly against such as fall short of their own extreme orthodoxy, that they have not lately carried universal assent. What is called