

The Presbyterian Witness,

AND EVANGELICAL ADVOCATE.

THE BIBLE IS OUR GREAT CHURCH DIRECTORY, AND STATUTE BOOK...Dr. Chalmers.

VOL. VIII.

HALIFAX, N. S., SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1855.

NO 22.

United Presbyterian Synod.

The Synod of the United Presbyterian Church commenced its annual sittings on Monday morning at the Queen Street Hall, Edinburgh. Dr. N. McMichael, minister of Glasgow, was unanimously elected Moderator for the year, the name of Rev. Mr. Leith, which had also been proposed, having been withdrawn. The Clerk reported that six ministers belonging to the body had died during the year; twelve had demitted their charges; one had been deposed; and one suspended. The order of business was then arranged, and the Synod adjourned.

APPLICATIONS FOR ADMISSION TO THE CHURCH

The Rev. Walter Inglis, late missionary in South Africa, and the Rev. James Caldwell of the Free Church, were received into the United Presbyterian body; and an application by the Rev. J. Cowper of the Reformed Church, United States, was delayed for the production of certain documents bearing on it.

An application by the Rev. Alexander Rutherford, formerly of Falkirk United Secession Church, but who was suspended by the Synod in 1843, was next read. Mr. Rutherford admitted the justice of the suspension, and the fallacy and sinfulness of the views which he had since entertained and preached with reference to the atonement, and begged the Synod to reverse the suspension in order that he might labour in any Church into which he might be admitted.

Some discussion took place as to the course to be pursued, some members stating that it was proper that Mr. Rutherford should let the Synod know whether he intended to join some other denomination after the sentence of suspension had been removed; while others held that the question of removing the suspension should be decided on its own merits, and not on Mr. Rutherford's intentions as to his future course. Other members proposed that Mr. Rutherford, who was in court, should be asked to make a statement on the point, while this was objected to by others. It was ultimately agreed that he should be heard as to the nature of his application, as it appeared there was some ambiguity on this point.

Mr. RUTHERFORD said that his application was that the suspension be removed, and that he should be restored to the office of minister of this Church. He exceedingly regretted that the ambiguity in the prayer of the petition should have subjected the Synod to so much trouble. The reason of that was, that his own mind was in doubt at the time when he saw it to be his duty to make his application to the Presbytery of Stirling. He saw at that time his way clear only so far that he wished to have a little time to elapse between the month of August last and May, to consider whether or not it would be better to apply to be admitted to this Church, or perhaps some other Church. He had now considered that point, and, with the permission of the Synod, he would wish the prayer of the memorial to be that the suspension be removed, and that he be restored to the office of a minister of this Church. (Applause.)

It was unanimously agreed, on the motion of Mr. Bell of New-castle and Dr. Wilson of Greenock, that the suspension be removed, and that Mr. Rutherford be restored to the status of a minister of this Church. Dr. Brown observing that they received Mr. Rutherford with much cordiality.

The MODERATOR then intimated the deliverance of the Synod to Mr. Rutherford. An application from Mr. Wm. Anderson, lately a theological student of the Evangelical Union Church, to be received into the United Presbyterian Church, was referred to a committee to examine the documents in the case, come to a judgement upon these, and to report to the Synod.

NATIONAL FASTS.

The Synod then took up an overture from the Presbytery of Paisley and Greenock on the subject of national fasts. The overture complains of the appointment of recent national fasts by Royal authority, as peremptory in their terms, and as an interference by the civil magistrate with religious services, as often capricious and ill-timed, and couched in offensive terms, and as subjecting those who do not comply with these edicts and homologue repugnant assumptions, to the odium of disloyalty. The overture suggests that all the object sought to be accomplished by the Royal edict could be more efficiently secured by mutual arrangement amongst the different ecclesiastical bodies; and prays the Synod to issue a recommendation to the ministers, elders, and members of the Church in their respective localities to take action, by the usual constitutional methods, to bring the subject of these fasts under notice in the proper quarter, with a view to bring about an alteration of the phraseology employed on these occasions, so as to divest the Royal edicts of those offensive phrases which characterised the recent Royal proclamations, and adapt them to the circumstances of a free community.

Mr. HUTTON of Paisley, in supporting the overture, dwelt upon the necessity of pronouncing a certain sound on this subject, and said it was of importance they should make their principles on this subject known both to their rulers and to those who were without the pale of their denomination, and also seeing that a generation had risen up even within their own pale who did not know these principles.

A lengthened discussion took place upon the subject, some members simply objecting to the phraseology employed, while others stated that their objections went further, as they were opposed to the interference of the civil magistrate in the matter. Dr. Taylor of Glasgow and others, on the other hand, thought it would be better not to legislate on the subject at all, on account of the difficulties

with which it was surrounded. Three motions were made bringing out these views; but on a vote, that by Mr. Thomas, approving of the object of the overture, reserving any opinion as to the other matters referred to in the body of the overture, and appointing a committee to frame a minute on the subject, strongly disapproving of the phraseology which had been used in recent proclamations on the subject of national fasts, was carried by a small majority.

SUPPORT OF THE MINISTRY.

The Synod resumed in the evening, when a report was given from the committee on the better support of the gospel ministry. The report stated that the collection throughout the Church last year amounted to £1442; and that, counting that sum and the other sums which it had called forth from the congregations themselves, it had increased the stipends of ministers of weak charges this year by £2992, as contrasted with the amount raised two years ago, and that the efforts of the committee had been specially directed to aid congregations who could not of themselves give their ministers £120 of stipend.

In the course of the discussion that arose on this subject, members adverted to the importance of getting the small stipends given to many of their ministers increased by bringing the matter under the consideration of their people, and commending the scheme to their liberality. Mr. Bell urged that the committee should act through the medium of Presbyteries, and should make their proceedings public. Dr. Young of Perth said it was not necessary that the members of their congregations should be made aware of their scheme, but that it was discreditable to them as a Church that many of their ministers had not an adequate support. Dr. Baird, as a member of committee, stated it was delightful to find that as they progressed, the congregations were cordially co-operating with the committee. The Synod approved of the committee's diligence, and reappointed it.

The Synod spent the remainder of the session in devotional exercises, having special reference to the circumstances of the country.

Wednesday, May 9.

The Synod resumed this morning at ten o'clock—Dr. McMichael, Moderator.

It was agreed to admit into the body the Rev. J. Cowper, late of the Reformed Church, United States.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPLES.

A discussion took place on the summary of the principles of the Church, which ultimately ended in the adoption of the following motion:—"Without entering on a minute examination of the summary prepared by the committee, approve of it as fitted to promote the end in view in its preparation, namely, that of affording, especially to persons seeking admission into the fellowship of the Church, a distinct account of its rise and past history, and of the views of Divine truth which it holds; and authorise the publication of the summary in a cheap form for general circulation. At the same time, the Synod declare that the summary is not to be regarded in any respect as an addition to, or as superseding or explaining the recognised subordinate standards of the Church, which remain as stated in the basis of union."

The Synod then adjourned.

SYNODICAL MISSIONARY MEETING.

The annual Synodical meeting in connection with the home and foreign missions of the Church was held at night in the Music Hall—Dr. McMichael, Moderator, in the chair.

The Rev. A. SOMERVILLE submitted an abstract of the annual report of the Missionary Board, showing the progress of the home and foreign missions.

Mr. PRIDMORE, W. S., next read an abstract of the financial statement from May 1854 to May 1855. The receipts for home missions had been £5702, and for foreign missions £11,798, making a total of £17,500, or £3787 more than last year; while the expenditure on the former had been £4471, and on the latter £12,208—in all, £16,579, being £920 less than the previous year.

Both reports were unanimously adopted; and addresses were delivered in the course of the evening by Drs. Lindsay and Peddie, the Rev. Frederick Monod (deputy from the Evangelical Union of France), the Rev. William Reid, and other gentlemen.

China.

The suspicions, with which the friends of Protestant Christianity in China have lately had reason to watch the progress of Sir John Bowring, will be confirmed by the speech of Captain Fishbourne at the Wesleyan Chinese Mission meeting, of which we give an extract. Sir John is a Socinian, but avows his admiration for the labours of the Roman missionaries in China, who, according to him, are the only European religionists who have ever done any good in that country. The reformers in China think differently from Sir John as they have placed the two idolatries of Buddha and the Pope in the same category, and the images of both have shared the same fate at the hands of the Chinese iconoclasts. It can scarcely be expected that the reformers will receive any favour at the hands of Sir John Bowring, whose influence will more probably be united with that of the French in China, and placed at the service of the Jesuits.

The following extract while it contains much that is gratifying to the heart of the Christian, contains also a melancholy evidence of the little regard which men in high places have for the spread of the religion of Christ pure and undefiled.

"This movement is especially interesting to us from the fact that it is drawing special attention to the teachings of foreigners; because they invariably say, 'This movement has originated with foreigners;' and they go and learn what the Christian missionaries are doing and saying. Therefore there will be immense room and immense opportunities for the work of the Christian missionaries in China. Further, the character of the movement depends, so to speak, on the work that is done by the Christian missionary. If you thoroughly indoctrinate the Chinese who will join you, they will go up and join the movement; the leaders of the movement will receive them; and they may thus possibly learn that which they were still a feeling hostile to the Europeans. Perhaps I use a wrong expression when I say it is 'hostile.' It is a fanciful superiority in the Chinese over other nations. This is very difficult to remove. Therefore, I say they will receive impressions from their own people which I do not think they would receive from Europeans. At Shanghai, when it was taken by our people, 300 persons were received into an hospital, and were very much benefited by the ministry of an eminent Scotch missionary, Mr. Burns. His preaching produced a decided impression. They were, of course, grateful for having had their lives saved, and they were prepared to receive impressions; they did receive them; they were afterwards scattered abroad through the country; and I have since seen Mr. Burns, who told me, that, having gone into the country, he had met some of these people, and that he had formed a church. A remarkable feature is this, that he went into the country and remained six months in the interior (which, I believe, is wholly unparalleled), in his European costume. Many missionaries have gone there dressed as Chinese. He never did so. He always dressed as a clergyman; and I believe it has not hitherto been known that any other clergyman dressed as an European, could go into the country and remain unharmed for the space of six months. While he was here, he received some most interesting letters from some of the converts; he read some of them to me, and they expressed their feelings in a most delightful Christian spirit, showing that they had not a mere head knowledge. I am perfectly satisfied, as far as any man can be satisfied who does not speak the language, that I have met Chinese whose religion was more than an outward conformity; that it was reality; and I could perceive that they were under influence more than ordinary. I have not the slightest doubt that this movement will overthrow the present dynasty. Even that is a thing to be thankful for; for I believe that missionary labour is utterly impossible as long as the present dynasty continues; so thoroughly hostile is it to any progress of the mind, or any knowledge whatever. And even should they propagate error, which I do not think is possible, it will not continue, for we know that 'God's word shall not return unto him void; but accomplish that whereunto he hath sent it.' Even the political result would be one of immense importance, because it brings with it such an enlargement of mind. There is another point; and that is, that our treaties have expired, and we shall be making new ones. (Hear, hear.) The old treaties took no heed of the missionaries, and did not refer to him, in fact they quite ignored his existence. They did not suppose that these people required anything like Christian teaching. Now it behoves us to make an effort to see that there is introduced into any new treaties protection for the missionary. (Cheers.) It does appear to me monstrous to suppose that the most estimable of men—the men who above all others might bring down blessings on a nation—should be the men who are excluded; as if, because they became missionaries, they had ceased to require the protection which is afforded to every other Englishman. (Hear, hear.) We may derive a lesson from our neighbours the French in that respect; for, wherever their flag flies they do special honour to their missionaries. In China this is remarkably the case. They keep an ambassador there, and keep ships there, for no other purpose than to protect and forward their missionaries. (Cheers.) I do not malign Sir John Bowring because he avows that he is a Unitarian; and I have often had conversation with him upon the subject of his views. He has often told me that he has no sympathy with Protestant missionaries; that he has no belief that they have done anything in China; and that he has a most thorough belief that what they had done, he has replied, that there was a great deal that was not to be seen—that he had been admitted to a degree of intimacy to which Englishmen were not admitted—that he had been to their houses, and they had taken him to a back room, and had shown him their altars. I said, I thought that very much like 'a hole-and-corner' kind of religion; that it was not the characteristic of Christianity, which was 'not ashamed of the gospel of Christ.' (Hear, hear.) Upon one occasion I was talking to Sir John Bowring on the subject of what the Roman Catholics had done in China, and eventually he referred to the argument of numbers, which you would hardly suppose a man in the nineteenth century would do, as if numbers constituted intellect, intelligence, or information. (Cheers.) We are taught by the Scriptures that the Church is always to be the 'few,' and not the 'many.' I said to him, 'Dr. Bowring, there are some subjects upon which one may say with Augustine *Athanastus contra manum*. The Doctor was angry; and this is the kind of man who has to make these treaties! (Cheers.) I believe, while meaning to do all he can for this country, his feelings are altogether against missionaries, and that he is in the hands of others, who have not the interest and honour of our country, or the interest of Christianity at heart."

From the Philadelphia Presbyterian.

Presbyterianism.

An Address delivered before the Presbyterian Historical Society at their Anniversary Meeting in the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, on Tuesday evening, May 1st, 1855.

BY THE REV. CHARLES HODGE, D. D.

BRETHREN:—We are assembled this evening as a Presbyterian Historical Society. It has occurred to me that it would not be inappropriate to discuss the question. What is Presbyterianism? You will not expect from me an oration. My object is neither conviction nor persuasion; but exposition. I propose to occupy the hours devoted to this address in an attempt to unfold the principles of that system of Church polity which we, as Presbyterians, hold to be laid down in the word of God.

Setting aside Erastianism, which teaches that the Church is only one form of the State, and Quakerism, which does not provide for the external organization of the Church, there are only four radically different theories on the subject of Church Polity.

1. The Popish theory, which assumes that Christ, the apostles and believers, constituted the Church while our Saviour was on earth, and that this organization was designed to be perpetual. After the ascension of our Lord, Peter became his Vicar, and took his place as the visible head of the Church. This primacy of Peter, as the universal Bishop, is contained in his successors, the Bishops of Rome; and the apostleship is perpetuated in the order of Prelates. As in the Primitive Church, no one could be an apostle who was not subject to Christ, so now no one can be a Prelate who is not subject to the Pope. And as then no one could be a Christian who was not subject to Christ and the apostles, so now no one can be a Christian who is not subject to the Pope and the Prelates. This is the Romish theory of the Church. A Vicar of Christ, a perpetual College of apostles, and the people subject to their infallible control.

2. The Prelatical theory assumes the perpetuity of the apostleship as the governing power in the Church, which therefore consists of those who profess the true religion, and are subject to apostle-bishops. This is the Anglican or High-Church form of this theory. In its Low-Church form, the Prelatical theory simply teaches that there was originally a threefold order in the ministry, and that there should be now. But it does not affirm that mode of organization to be essential.

3. The Independent or Congregational theory includes two principles; first, that the governing and executive power in the Church is in the brotherhood; and secondly, that the Church organization is complete in each worshipping assembly, which is independent of every other.

4. The fourth theory is the Presbyterian, which it is our present business to attempt to unfold. The three great negations of Presbyterianism—that is, the three great errors which it denies are—1. That all church power vests in the clergy. 2. That the apostolic office is perpetual. 3. That each individual Christian congregation is independent. The affirmative statement of these principles is—1. That the people have a right to a substantive part in the government of the Church. 2. That presbyters, who minister in word and doctrine, are the highest permanent officers of the Church, and all belong to the same order. 3. That the outward and visible Church is, or should be, one, in the sense that a smaller part is subject to a larger, and a larger to the whole. It is not holding one of these principles that makes a man a Presbyterian, but his holding them all.

1. The first of these principles relates to the power and rights of the people. As to the nature of Church power, it is to be remembered that the Church is a theocracy. Jesus Christ is its head. All power is derived from him. His word is our written constitution. All Church power is, therefore, properly ministerial and administrative. Every thing is to be done in the name of Christ, and in accordance with his directions. The Church, however, is a self-governing society, distinct from the State, having its officers and laws, and, therefore, an administrative government of its own. The power of the Church relates, 1st, To matters of doctrine. She has the right to set forth a public declaration of the truths which she believes, and which are to be acknowledged by all who enter her communion. That is, she has the right to frame creeds or confessions of faith, as her testimony for the truth, and her protest against error. And as she has been commissioned to teach all nations; she has the right of selecting teachers, and judging of their fitness, of ordaining and sending them forth into the field, and of receiving and disposing them when unfaithful. 2d, To matters of discipline. She has power to set down rules for the ordering of public worship. 3. She has power to make rules for her own government; such as every Church has in its Book of Discipline, Constitution, or Canons, &c.—4. She has power to receive into fellowship, and to exclude the unworthy from her own communion.

Now, the question is, Where does this power vest? Does it, as Romanists and Prelatists affirm, belong exclusively to the clergy? Have they the right to determine for the Church what she is to believe, what she is to profess, what she is to do, and whom she is to receive as members, and whom she is to reject? Or does this power vest in the Church itself—that is, in the whole body of the faithful? This, it will be perceived, is a radical question—one which touches the essence of things, and determines the destiny of men. If all Church power vests in the clergy, then the people are practically bound to passive obedience in all matters of faith and practice, for all right of private judgment is then denied. If it vests in the whole Church, then the people have a right to a substantive part in the decision of all questions relating to doctrine, worship, order, and discipline.—The public assertion of this right of the people,

at the time of this Reformation, roused all Europe. It was an apocalyptic trumpet, i. e. a trumpet of revelation *tuba per sepulchra sonans*, calling dead souls to life; awakening them to the consciousness of power and of right; of power conveying right and imposing the obligation to assert and exercise it. This was the end of Church tyranny in all truly Protestant countries. It was the end of the theory that the people were bound to passive submission in matters of faith and practice. It was deliverance to the captive, the opening of the prison to those who were bound; the introduction of the people of God into the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free. This is the reason why civil liberty follows religious liberty. The theory that all Church power vests in a divinely constituted hierarchy, begets the theory that all civil power vests, of divine right, in kings and nobles. And the theory that Church power vests in the Church itself, and all Church officers are servants of the Church, of necessity begets the theory that civil power vests in the people, and that civil magistrates are servants of the people. These theories God has joined together, and no man can put them asunder. It was, therefore, by an infallible instinct, the unfortunate Charles of England said, "No bishop, no king;" by which he meant, that if there is no despotic power in the Church, there can be no despotic power in the State; or, if there be liberty in the Church, there will be liberty in the State.

But this great Protestant and Presbyterian principle is not only a principle of liberty, it is also a principle of order. 1st. Because this power of the people is subject to the infallible authority of the word; and 2d. Because the exercise of it is in the hands of duly constituted officers. Presbyterianism does not dissolve the bands of authority, and resolve the Church into a mob. Though delivered from the autocratic authority of the hierarchy, it remains under the law to Christ. Is it restricted in the exercise of its power by the word of God, which binds the reason, heart, and conscience. We only cease to be the servants of men, that we may be the servants of God. We are raised into a higher sphere, where perfect liberty is merged in absolute subjection. As the Church is the aggregate of believers, there is an intimate analogy between the experience of the individual believer, and of the Church as a whole. The believer ceases to be the servant of sin, that he may be the servant of righteousness; he is redeemed from the law, that he may be the servant of Christ. So the Church is delivered from an illegitimate authority, not that she may be lawless, but subject to an authority legitimate and divine. The Reformers, therefore, as instruments, in the hands of God, in delivering the Church from bondage to prelates, did not make it a tumultuous multitude, in which every man was a law to himself, free to believe, and free to do what he pleased. The Church, in all the exercise of her own power, in reference either to doctrine or discipline, acts under the written law of God as recorded in his word.

But besides this, the power of the Church is not only thus limited and guided by the Scriptures, but the exercise of it is in the hands of legitimate officers. The Church is not a vast democracy, where every thing is decided by the popular voice. "God is the author of confusion, but of peace," (1 Cor. xiv. 33) is in all churches of the saints. The Westminster Confession, therefore, expressing the common sentiment of Presbyterians, says:—"The Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of Church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate." The doctrine that all civil power vests ultimately in the people, is not inconsistent with the doctrine that that power is in the hands of legitimate officers, legislative, judicial, and executive, to be exercised by them according to law. Nor is it inconsistent with the doctrine that the authority of the civil magistrate is *jure divino*. So the doctrine that Church power vests in the Church itself, is not inconsistent with the doctrine that there is a divinely appointed class of officers, through whom that power is to be exercised. It thus appears that the principle of liberty and the principle of order are perfectly harmonious. In denying that all Church power vests exclusively in the clergy, whom the people have nothing to do but to believe and obey; and in affirming that it vests in the Church itself, while we assert the great principle of Christian liberty, we assert the no less important principle of evangelical order.

It is not necessary to occupy your time in quoting either from the Reformed Confessions or from standard Presbyterian writers, that the principle just stated is one of the radical principles of our system. It is enough to advert to the recognition of it, involved in the office of ruling elder.

Ruling elders are declared to be the representatives of the people. They are chosen by them to act in their name in the government of the Church. The functions of these elders, therefore, determine the power of the people; for a representative is one chosen by others to do in their name what they are entitled to do in their own persons; or rather to exercise the powers which radically inhere in those for whom they act. The members of a State Legislature, or of Congress, for example, can exercise only those powers which are inherent in the people.

The powers, therefore, exercised by our ruling elders, are powers which belong to the lay members of the Church. What then are the powers of our ruling elders? 1. As to matters of doctrine and the great office of teaching, they have an equal voice with the clergy in the formation and adoption of all symbols of faith. According to Presbyterianism, it is not competent for the clergy to frame and authoritatively set forth a creed to be embraced by the Church, and to be made a condition of either ministerial or Christian communion, without the consent of the people. Such creeds profess to express the mind of the Church. But the ministry are not the

Church, and, therefore, cannot declare the faith of the Church, without the co-operation of the Church itself. Such Confessions, at the time of the Reformation, proceeded from the whole Church. And all the Confessions now in authority in the different branches of the great Presbyterian family, were adopted by the people through their representatives, as the expression of their faith. So, too, in the selection of preachers of the word, in judging of their fitness for the sacred office, in deciding whether they shall be ordained, in judging them when arraigned for heresy, the people have, in fact, an equal vote with the clergy.

2. The same thing is true as to the *jus liturgicum*, as it is called, of the Church. The ministry cannot frame a ritual, or liturgy, or directory for public worship, and enjoin its use on the people to whom they preach. All such regulations are of force only so far as the people themselves, in conjunction with their ministers, see fit to sanction and adopt them.

3. So to, in forming a constitution, or in enacting rules of procedure, or making canons, the people do not merely passively assent, but actively co-operate. They have, in all these matters, the same authority as the clergy.

4. And finally, in the exercise of the power of the keys, in opening and shutting the door of communion with the Church, the people have a decisive voice. In all cases of discipline, they are called upon to judge and to decide.

There can, therefore, be no doubt that Presbyterians do carry out the principle, that Church power vests in the Church itself, and that the people have a right to a substantive part in its discipline and government. In other words, we do not hold that all power vests in the clergy, and that the people have only to listen and obey.

But is this a scriptural principle? Is it a matter of concession and courtesy, or is it a matter of divine right? Is our office of ruling elder one only of expediency, or is it an essential element of our system, arising out of the very nature of the Church as constituted by God, and, therefore, of divine authority?

This, in the last resort, is after all, only a question. Whether the clergy are the Church, or whether the people are the Church. If, as Louis the XIV. said of France, "I am the State," the clergy can say, "We are the Church," then all Church power vests in them, as all civil power vests in the French monarch. But if the people are the State, civil power vests in them; and if the people are the Church, power vests in the people. If the clergy are priests and mediators, the channel of all divine communications, and the only medium of access to God, then all power is in their hands; but if all believers are priests and kings, then they have something more to do than merely passively to submit. So abhorrent is this idea of the clergy being the Church to the consciousness of Christians, that no definition of the Church for the first fifteen centuries after Christ, was ever framed that even mentioned the clergy. This is a fact to have been first done by Canisius and Bellarmine. Romanists define the Church to be "those who profess the true religion, and are subject to the Pope." Anglicans define it as "those who profess the true religion, and are subject to Prelates." The Westminster Confession defines the visible Church, "Those who profess the true religion, together with their children." In every Protestant symbol, Lutheran or Reformed, the Church is said to be the company of faithful men. Now, as a definition is the statement of the essential attributes or characteristics of a subject; and as, by the common consent of Protestants, the definition of the Church is complete without even mentioning the clergy, it is evidently the renunciation of the radical principle of Protestantism, and, of course, of Presbyterianism, to maintain that the Church power vests

* This point is argued at length by Turretin in this chapter, *De jure Vocacionis*. He proves that the right to call and appoint ministers belongs to the whole Church: 1. *Quia data est ecclesia potestas clavium*. He quotes Tostatus, who, he says, proves by various arguments, "Claves datas esse toti ecclesie, atque adeo jure illarum exerceantur ad eam primario et radicaliter pertinere, ad alios vero tantum secundario et participativo." 2. *Idem probatur ex jure ministerii*, quod ecclesie competit. 3. *Ex jure superioritatis*. Quia superioritas est actionis ad subordinationem non ad inferioritatem pertinet. At ecclesia est superior pastoribus, non pastoribus ecclesie. 4. *Ex prohibitione doctorum*. Quia illud potestatem vocandi, enjus est discernere doctores a seductores, probare sanam doctrinam, vocem Christi a voce pseudopastorum distinguere, alienum non sequi, anathematizare eos qui aliud evangelium predicant. 5. *Ex praxi apostolorum*. 6. *Ex ecclesia primitiva*.

Gerhard, the great Lutheran theologian of the seventeenth century, teaches the same doctrine. *Tomus xii. p. 85*. Cuiusque clavium regni coelorum ab ipso Christo sunt tradita; penes enim est jus vocandi ecclesie ministerios. Atqui tota ecclesia tradita sunt a Christo clavium regni coelorum. Ergo penes totam ecclesiam est jus vocandi ministerios. Propositio confirmata ex definitione clavium regni coelorum. Per clavium enim potestatem ecclesiastica intelligitur, enjus pars est jus vocandi et constituendi ecclesie ministerios. Ille quoniam Augustinus lib. I. de doctrina Christ. cap. 13: "Hic claves dedit ecclesie suae, ut quia solverit in terra, soluta essent in coelo, et quia ligaverit in terra, ligata essent in coelo."

In the *Smalcald Articles* it is said:—Ad hoc necesse est ateri, quod claves non ad personam unius certi hominis sed ad ecclesiam pertinent, ut multa clausura et firmissima argumenta testantur. Nam Christianis de clavis dicitur, Matt. xvi. addit, ubique duo vel tres consenserint super terram etc. Tribuit igitur principibus vel clavibus ecclesie, et immediate; sicut et ob eam causam ecclesia principaliter habet jus vocacionis.—Hase, *Liturg. Symbol.* p. 347.

Ubique dicitur, ubi est jus administrandi evangelium. Quia necesse est, ecclesiam recte regere jus vocandi et ordinandi ministerios. Et hoc jus est donum proprium datum ecclesie, quod nulla humana auctoritas ecclesie eripere potest.—*Ibid.* p. 353.

† Sherlock on the Nature of the Church, p. 55.