

CHAPTER II

RULE ABSORBING FUNCTION

WE have seen from a Church letter at the close of the first century that in one church (Corinth) power was understood to be vested in a plurality of persons, called sometimes Presbyters and sometimes Bishops; and we have seen that in a contemporary document (the *Didaché*) the most important men in the estimation of some other church or churches were not Presbyters or Bishops, but Prophets, *i.e.* gifted preachers of the Gospel. The scattered churches or congregations of the Church warmly welcomed such preachers, who moved from place to place. They were usually called Prophets, sometimes Teachers, and probably in some cases still Apostles.¹ The congregation had chosen by election some of its own number to be Bishops and Deacons; chosen them for their moral and spiritual qualities.

¹ *Teachers.* There is great difficulty in outlining the work and noticing the disappearance of Teachers. The Prophet's work and way we can more readily explain. The teacher was of necessity more settled; his work implied that; but as all Presbyters were to be apt to teach, his functions were not indispensable. Origen pathetically struggled for place and position as a teacher, but in vain. See Harnack, *Ausbreitung*, book iii. c. i. §§ 3, 6.

Those local men were evidently looked down upon in comparison with the mission preachers,¹ and the *Didaché* claims respect for them. But still it says, Give your first-fruits to the prophets, "for they are your chief priests; and if you have not a prophet, give to the poor" (*Didaché*, ch. xiii.).

If we went on to deal with the letters of Ignatius (A.D. 115?), which are said to have been written at various stages of his journey to Rome as he was being taken to martyrdom on a great "Roman holiday," we should see in detail that he had dreams of churches clustering round divinely accredited Bishops, every member with pains and prayer seeking to bring forth fruit to the glory of God. Unless his Epistles be treated as Oriental dreams, rather than as ecclesiastical photographs of fact, we see a picture of Church relationship quite different from what we get elsewhere. Into the endless controversies those letters awaken we cannot attempt to enter. Our present purpose is served when we have shown that—as we might expect—in three different places the Christian Church was not at the same stage of development, but everywhere was seeking to cultivate the seeds of truth sown all over the Roman world in Apostolic times. Not on the same lines nor tending to the same end. Thus much regarding the public teaching of the Word and the ruling of the congregation. We have glimpses of the inner life of the Church about the same

¹ "The Prophet was a kind of D.D., "Two Lectures on the mission preacher ordained by no Teaching of the Apostles"). human authority" (C. Taylor,

period in writings of heathen observers. Pliny, Roman gentleman, governor, and man of science, gives a picture (A.D. 111) of a Christian gathering in early morning with its hymns, its sacrament, its mutual pledges of each member to the rest to be never guilty of adultery or breach of faith in business; and of all gathering again at night to have a simple meal together. And all this in a region where heathen temples were deserted alike in town and country, and where markets for victims of heathen sacrifices found scarcely even a stray purchaser. Those were public facts: the elegant Roman put two deaconesses to torture and could learn no more.¹

Some sixty years later the heathen satirist Lucian, describing the experiences of his hero Peregrinus Proteus, makes him take up the rôle of a wandering prophet or evangelist, in consequence of which he received from the confiding Christians all the best of entertainment his heart could desire. The picture is touching, though sketched with a scoffer's pencil. Not in Justin or Clement or Tertullian do we see the Christian community, its simplicity, unselfishness, and devotion, in so attractive an aspect as in Lucian's description of people, young and old, crowding round the prison gates every morning to bring their tribute to their poor brother (as they thought him) imprisoned for the Word's sake, while other believers in all the cities of Asia sent their contributions for his needs. The "Love Feast" and the

¹ See copies of Pliny's letter and Trajan's reply in *Canonicity*, pp. 362-4.

holy teachings of the sanctuary were, with the connivance of the jailors, enjoyed by the Christians in the prison where the wanderer was immured.¹

We gather from these brief notices in connection with the New Testament some idea of the varied functions and free life of the Christian Church ; we have now to indicate their disappearance.

We therefore pass on to the end of the *second century*. We find a great change. It is now the stationary men, not the wanderers, who are paramount. The great Apostles were long dead, and their very name looked so great in the distance that no man now dared to use it. It was everywhere understood that they had no successors like themselves. There was still immense reverence for powerful preachers, but those preachers were stationed, and were revered by the community which they habitually addressed. Wanderers, under the name of prophets, had ceased to be respected. Evangelists, men who proclaimed the glad tidings, were still known, but their functions had been merged in those of the ordinary preacher ; sometimes in those of the Reader.

The proceedings at an ordinary meeting of a congregation are significant.² Christians had begun to imitate the heathen and to treat their sacraments as "mysteries," open only to the initiated. All the officiat-

¹ See Lucian's narrative, *Canonicity*, p. 368 ff.

² It is difficult to describe the worship of the second century, so scanty are the notices. Justin Martyr's outline (of which we

speak in another chapter) is held ; and, with some misgivings, I take the partial account in the Canons of Hippolytus, A.D. 230 (?), which are retrospective, as the main authority in the text.

ing office-bearers were robed in white, including the Readers. Those Readers read aloud while the people were gathering; then the Deacon brought bread and wine; the Bishop offered prayer; the people received the Communion. The people presented their gifts and offerings. The Bishop prayed and blessed the givers. This was seen in the evening service. When the congregation met in the early morning the Word of God was read, Psalms were sung, and the Gospel was usually declared in a sermon, and prayers were offered for those who were seeking admission to the Church. To this service catechumens and even heathen were admitted. This marked the difference from the evening. Thus early in history there were grades in the Church and in its meetings. The evening meeting was for the instructed and pure members alone.¹ We have said the Gospel was proclaimed at the beginning of the meeting. Perhaps it was by a stranger. Evangelist, perhaps by one of the congregation. But reverence for the New Testament Scriptures had greatly grown since the century began; and, instead of an Evangelist who preached, there was often a Reader who read the written word of inspiration to the whole people. This Reader was not a New Testament functionary, but was substitute for the Evangelist of an earlier date. There seems to have been one in every congregation at the middle of the century. At the end of the century he was probably regarded as a layman; and in order to invest his functions

¹ See Achelis, *The Canons of Hippolytus, Texte u. Untersuchungen* vi. 4, 1891.

with authority and sacredness he was absorbed in the Deacon.¹ Thus the number of Christian functions was lessened, and the dependence on officials grew greater. Apostles and Prophets were now merged in the Bishop, Evangelists in the Deacon, and all the "helps" of the Apostolic sketch in one or other of those leading governors. Readers had come into vogue from the necessity of the case; not always as mere mechanical readers, but as preachers also in some cases. Still the rulers and managers had come to be regarded as the only necessary functionaries of the Christian Church.² The Common Love Feast, as in New Testament times and in Pliny, was still observed in the evening before the Lord's Supper; but it had not its original significance. The extension of the Church led to this.

By the end of the *third century* the process of change was well-nigh complete. The Bishop is now the chief figure, perfectly distinct from the Elder. When Paul wrote to Timothy, Bishop and Elder were one. Gradually the occasional President of the Church came to be regarded as permanent Bishop or overseer. Congregations at first were in towns or cities; it appears

¹ Harnack, in *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, ii. 5, pp. 42 ff., has a full discussion of the Reader. In Justin's time there seems to have been one in every congregation; though he was regarded as a layman by Tertullian, he was treated by Cyprian as a kind of apprentice to the Presbyterate (see Harnack, p. 62).

² For full examination of all the subject here touched upon see Dr. Lindsay's *Church and Ministry in the Early Centuries*. I regret that I cannot quite adopt his apparent acceptance of the *Didache* and the Canons of Hippolytus as guides to the usual worship of the Church at a particular date.

that when several congregations were formed they were regarded as one church. The villagers were heathens and called Pagans.¹ When congregations were afterwards formed in the villages they were considered inferior; they were grouped round the town in understood inferiority. The President of the Central Church was the superior of all the rest. Even when country Bishops were appointed, as the number of country congregations increased in importance, they were regarded as an inferior class—only allowed to preach and ordain under certain restrictions. The Bishop of the chief city in a province took the lead of all the rest;² and thus in the beginning of the fourth century the Bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria were counted the heads of the Church.

The Elders were now the advising council of each Bishop. They were seated beside him on a raised platform at the end of the place of meeting, and were possessed of many privileges, but with no recognised power of independent action. The Bishop was the unit to give the appended figures all their value.

The Deacon had also fallen back. The "Seven" were originally the servants of Christ, or of Christ's people, ministering the charitable allowance to the poor; but the necessity of providing sustenance seems to have

¹ Zahn, followed by Harnack, makes Pagan mean "civilian."

² A diocese was the central city or town with the villages around it. The greatness of the city naturally decided the rank of the

Bishop. The Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381 (Can. 3), declared that the Bishop of Constantinople (New Rome) should have the chief rank next after the Bishop of Rome.

soon passed away, and in the Acts of the Apostles we see that it is Elders and not Deacons nor "the Seven" who took charge of the money.¹ It has not been found easy at any time in any branch of the Church to maintain the Diaconate on its original footing of ministry of money to the poor. When the Church is filled with the Spirit of Christ the Deacon rises up into the Elder; if the Church is worldly or formal he falls out of sacred functions. Is not this in St. Paul's mind when he says that "they who have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus?" (1 Timothy iii. 13). This seems to point at the Diaconate as a transition to something higher and better. It is the best defence of the Episcopal practice of making the Diaconate a kind of apprenticeship for those who covet the higher grade of Presbyter; but the Episcopal Deacon has nothing to do with money, nor has his training fitted him for business.

The Deacon in the early days was the servant of the people and the delegate of the Apostles. In later days he became the servant of the Bishop. At the middle of the second century, in Justin Martyr's time, there is a trace of his first functions in this, that he distributed the bread and wine of the Sacrament to the congregation, and then carried those emblems and

¹ Then the disciples (in Antioch), every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judæa.

Which also they did, and sent to the Elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul (Acts xi. 29-30). This is referred to before, p. 18.

elements to the poor and sick who could not attend in church to receive them. But the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) says that Deacons must remain within the limits of their functions, and remember that they are the assistants of the Bishops, and are inferior to Presbyters. They must no longer sit among Presbyters, for this is contrary to all rule and order (Canon 18). They were still regarded as a clerical order, but in an initiatory stage—apprentices. We may anticipate history and note the varied treatment of the Diaconate. In Rome there was an attempt to maintain likeness to the original office by keeping the number seven; and when more service was needed than those seven could render, a new order or class of Sub-deacons was appointed. Elsewhere—in Constantinople, for example—the number of Deacons was unlimited. We read of a hundred in one church. It was usually, however, a small number.

There is another office in those original New Testament lists—the *Teacher*. In the second century teachers abounded. In the third century, as we have seen, the famous Origen, as Lay Doctor or teacher, struggled for an independent place in the Church, but the power of the organisation at the command of the Bishop was too strong for the head of the Catechetical School, and Origen had to become a Priest that he might better vindicate his position in the face of the Church.

Thus went on the concentration of function in the hands of the few ruling officials. A Presbyter originally was a Bishop; then the single Bishop, as chief ruler,

claimed the vital or effective power in ordination ;¹ then the urban Bishop assumed the ordaining power to the putting back of the country Bishops ; then, finally, the other chief Bishops were counted lower, and the Pope, as Supreme Power, became the arbiter of all functions and the fountain of all order in the West, overriding and overruling the Bishops and other local authorities of the Church as he overruled the local authorities of the State. Thus, in the Middle Ages, Wilfrid and Anselm in England, as the representatives of the Pope, each fought and won a battle, establishing the Pope's position as the sole channel of spiritual blessings in England. Collisions often came, but the stronger power of the Papacy always carried the day. For a time the Abbot of Iona was the supreme ruler of the monasteries in Scotland and the north of England. One of the monks was consecrated as Bishop, but it was only for spiritual functions, not for rule, and the Abbot of Iona was still the ruler. But when the Pope's power came into collision with the power of Columba's successors in Iona, the Roman authority naturally carried the day ; and the monasteries of the north of England became subject to the Pope.

The whole Monastic system furnishes us with an illustration of the tendency of rule to absorb function. The monks were originally laymen. They attended the

¹ Not the sole power. Ordination is in Rome, and even in England, effected by a plurality ; by a Bishop and Presbyters nominally ; a Bishop is ordained by

several Bishops, in ordinary practice. In Presbyterian churches this is the "laying on of the hands of the Presbytery."

nearest church. They had no recognised place in the Church.¹ They had a work to do which began and ended with themselves; and they had to submit even in that to the power of the officials of the Church. When they attempted to teach or edify others, they were forced by the ruling priesthood to become priests, that they might have the right to exercise those functions.² Thus the priesthood eventually swallowed up the individuality of the lay monastic. Not that things remained in this shape for ever. The monastery or college of monk-priests, as it came to rule in a district, swallowed up the individuality of the parish priest. There was no resident parish priest near the monastery; one of the monks came out from the monastery to supply ordinances to the parish.³ The monks, to secure their local independence, *i.e.* to resist the local Bishop's ruling power, clung to the Pope rather than to the Bishop; and they had their reward in privileges and immunities innumerable. The result was that the monks became the mere subordinates of the Pope, as the chief ecclesiastical ruler, and all their active functions frequently fell into abeyance.⁴

Something of the same was seen in the history of

¹ It was only at the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century that monks in general were considered a part of the clergy, properly so called. We then find that priests and bishops became monks, believing that by so doing they made a fresh progress in religious life.

² Guizot, *History of Civilisation*, i. 120.

³ The parish was by no means the original unit. The Parish Priest had originally no official rights; he was the delegate of the Bishop.

⁴ See Hallam's *Middle Ages*, ii. 215.

the orders of Friars. When they began they had the most valuable of all Christian functions. They resolved to preach the Gospel to the poor: a much-needed and much-neglected duty of the ministry. St. Francis sent out preachers. He wished to carry the enlightened conscience of the people with him. He enrolled a Tertiary Order, pledged simply to holy Christian work without further monastic vow, and without abandonment of home or occupation; but all his Orders became a standing army of the Bishop of Rome, and made the Pope's despotism more complete than before. He had forbidden his preachers to have churches; but magnificent churches were built, and privileges were attached to them. His "brothers" became officials. He sadly saw his Rule of Love become political government.

This was the ultimate goal of Ruling in the Church. All functions absorbed in Bishop - Presbyters and Deacons; then the Presbyters made only the council of the Ruling Bishop, and the Deacons his attendants; then all Bishops only deputies or delegates of the Bishop of Rome.

But the Reformation came? Yes, and what then? The very same principles were soon at work. The English Reformation made as little change as possible in the relations of Bishops and Presbyters, but the Pope was ruled out and the King's authority came in. In the Lutheran Church we see the independence and spontaneous action of the Corporate Church subjected to royal or civic authority, and we do not find that individual office-bearers are regarded as part of an ecclesiastical body.

Scotland is perhaps the best illustration of another system, because there the Reformation, like the first life of the Christian Church, sprang upwards from the body of the people. At first the Reformers, probably under the wise influence of Knox, adopted and adapted various forms of ministry suited to the temporary needs of the Church. Superintendents as superiors (who were not all ordained ministers when appointed, and were subject to admonition while in office), Readers as an inferior rank (who might read and preach but not administer sacraments) were used in the service.¹ But after a little while the Protestant ministers not only claim authority to overrule the King when they are in the pulpit, and to call him "God's silly vassal" when they are out of it, but they take away from the Church of Christ the whole of its varied functions and refer all functions to such as hold office. In A.D. 1647 the *Directory for Family Worship* says: "As the charge and office of interpreting the Holy Scriptures is a part of the ministerial calling, which none (howsoever

¹ The first Reformers were jealous of Superintendents becoming lordly. Spottiswood, when ordained Superintendent, said: "I acknowledge myself a man subject to infirmitie, and one that hath need of correctioun and admonitioun, and, therefore, I most willingly subject myself to the holisome discipline of the Church, yea, to the discipline of the same Church by which I am now called to this office and charge, and heire in Goddis presence and

yours do promise obedience to all admonitions secretly or publicly gevin, unto the which if I be found inobedient, I confess myself most willing to be ojected not only from this honor but also from the society of the faithfull in case of my stubbornes; for the vocatioun of God to bear charge within his Church maketh not men tyrants nor lordes, but appointeth them servandis, watchmen, and pastors to the flock."

otherwise qualified) should take upon themselves in any place but he that is duly called thereunto by God and His Church," etc. No man, that is to say, howsoever personally qualified, was allowed to explain the nature or apply the invitations of Scripture to others unless he were a regularly ordained minister. This is simple jealousy of any one except ministers expounding Scripture. One wonders where they thought they had Scripture for that! It is quite true that in enjoining family worship those "men of the Second Reformation" allowed the household to have a conference on the passage read, but none but those who were lodging under the roof or taking meals in it were allowed to be present.¹ To explain the Bible to a gathered few was the monopoly of Presbyterian ministers; and yet the household is invited to have "conference," *i.e.* conversation, and to "make some good use of what hath been read and heard." One can easily see that the strange hampering directions, and at the same time the encouragement to improving "conference," arose from a desire to honour the ministry, while allowing "the master of the family to have the chief hand" in the household conversation on the passages read. So also one can see in the end of the eighteenth century that the desire to uphold their own ministers and licentiates moved the General Assembly²

¹ "At family worship a special care is to be had that each family keep by themselves, neither requiring, inviting, nor admitting persons from divers families, unless it be those who are lodged

with them or at meals or otherwise with them upon some lawful occasion" (*Directory for Family Worship*, § vi.).

² See Pastoral Letter of General Assembly, A.D. 1799.

to shut the pulpits of the Church of Scotland against all other preachers; and to denounce Sunday Schools as enabling unauthorised teachers to teach children, thereby weakening the authority of ministers and lessening the sense of the responsibility of parents for maintaining religion in the family.

Until quite lately the same principles operated all over our land. In England Bishops, Priests, and Deacons were alone permitted to preach; and the activity of laymen in parish work was frowned upon. In Scotland ministers and elders ruled, but the ministers as chief rulers were sole preachers and speakers. Every part of the varied activities of Christ's Body was in some confused way supposed to be concentrated in, and expected to be discharged by, those two classes in Scotland, those three in England. The English Church has now instituted Lay Readers, whereby, with certain restrictions, the Layman can share clerical duties and burdens; its "Church Army" is an attempt on a large scale to organise the work of the membership of the Church for reclaiming those that are outside of ordinary congregations, and it involves the employment of Laymen to preach the Gospel to the poor. The Presbyterian Church, in all its branches, employs Laymen as city missionaries, catechists, Sunday School teachers, to overtake the arrears of work left by the ordained ministers.

There is much need in both parts of the kingdom for more effective means of training and testing those to whom is thus entrusted the primary, the most

difficult, and the most blessed of all the functions of the Church. We may even say that if its importance were realised, no branch of the Church of Christ could entrust this function to the inexperienced, the imperfectly educated, and the untrained.

Another reflection is forced upon us when we look at missions to the heathen in foreign lands. The creeds of the Reformation are almost silent upon the duty of spreading the Gospel among the heathen; the hearts and hands of the Reformers were full of the work to be done at home. In the nineteenth century the Church awoke to the knowledge of her undischarged commission; but even yet the work is not properly distributed. The Gospel is to be sent to the heathen; then send ordained ministers. If they cannot be had in sufficient numbers, then wait till they come. This means that no man, however well qualified by gifts and graces and experience of life, shall be ordained as a minister of the Gospel among the heathen unless he has had a full curriculum at a university (in Scotland it is six or seven years long), spent for the most part in studies of no shadow of direct use for the work of a missionary.¹

It may be said with truth that the Church of every name has gone far in allowing, we may even say recognising, other agents. There are teachers and artisans

¹ I am glad to say that this is now modified in practice. I know two cases in which the Church of Scotland has recognised long and faithful service in the Mission-

field as qualifying for ordination; and the United Free Church "ordains" its medical missionaries without special theological training (note added in A.D. 1905).

now sent to foreign mission stations working side by side with ordained ministers. There are Sunday School teachers, district visitors, lay missionaries, busy at home. It may well be doubted, however, whether enough has been done to incorporate those workers in the strength of the Church. Are all foreign missionaries enrolled in a council which directs the work of the agents and sends them forth as members of the Church in Antioch sent forth Barnabas and Saul? (Acts xiii.). There are said to be now no miraculous endowments of those thus employed in the work of Christ, which is technically true; but every converted man and woman has the miraculous endowment in the heart, and receives God's witness in the success of the work done. All such gifts ought surely to be recognised, exercised, and organised. Let the question of Orders be left in the subordinate position which it has in the New Testament; let the functions and activities be brought up to that prominence in which the Apostles place them; and then we shall have, as of old, every gift of every member used to bring us into nearer approximation to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. There is no need to change the time-honoured names and functions of our Rulers. Let the Protestant Church have its bishops, or its Presbyterian Courts, or its Lutheran consistories: what matters it which? But if there be men among us who have the gifts of an evangelist, or of a doctor or teacher, or of a help (*i.e.* one who can minister to the needs of others in the spirit of many-handed helpfulness with which the

early Church was filled), then there is a Divine call upon the Church to enrol those workers, to recognise them as well as their work, so that we may plead for the entire fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel, "I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions; and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out of my spirit."

It was begun to be fulfilled more than 1800 years ago, but it is not yet exhausted of its manifold meaning. It means, as in the early days, that the Church is to be of an essentially popular character. Its Rulers are to be no conclave, meeting in secret, whether in Rome or in some Protestant city. It is not enough that they be a privileged class or caste discussing things "in presence of the public," *i.e.* of the reporters for the press. They have to carry the sympathies and suffrages of the whole Church with them always. "The Apostles and Elders with the whole Church"—that was the ancient formula on the most solemn occasion of a Church meeting since the first Pentecost (Acts xv. 22).

One is glad to notice how this idea of the Church is reviving in our time. Congregational Reports show its working in detail; Church Courts and Church Rulers know and show that they are bound to have the backing of popular approval. Episcopal charges are not edicts; they are in substance, whatever they be in form, appeals to the public opinion of the Church. The "Church Congress" is an annual endeavour in the

Church of England to stir the hearts and inform the minds of the people; and its great success shows how wise was the conception. There is also growing up in the Church of England a strong conviction that the people are the Church, and must have a recognised voice in her councils—her local as well as her supreme councils. One of the most powerful of Bishops says in a remarkable volume of *Essays on Church Reform*: “To co-ordinate the laity with the clergy (and let it be said Presbyters with Bishops) in regulating the affairs of the Church is only deliberately to return to the primitive ideal of the New Testament and the purest Christian centuries.”¹ Presbyterianism also is showing a new spirit. But Presbyteries must learn somehow to discharge more quickly, or to delegate if they cannot discharge, their merely formal functions as Courts of Registration, and to consider how best to help on the manifold work of all the members of the Church.² It is the era of the people’s power; and the Presbyterian Church is the people’s Church, or ought to be; and it would be, if Elders were chosen in sufficient numbers and were sufficiently in earnest about work to represent

¹ Gore, *Essays on Church Reform*, p. 8.

² Forgetful that our Church Courts are freely representative, and therefore express public opinion; forgetful also that members of the inferior Courts are to be elected, chosen, not to be sent in rotation, the Church of Scotland, instead of her selected best in each sub-

ordinate Court, sends men by sheer rotation to the General Assembly. That Church consequently is losing faith in her Courts and holding Congresses, which in the Church of England are needed just because there are no popular Courts, but are not needed in Scotland if we would give our own system a chance.

a working membership. Elders ought to be chosen by the people; not nominated by their predecessors and the minister. The present practice of nomination of new Elders by existing Elders in the Church of Scotland is a grotesque survival from a troublous time. It does not represent the system of the First Book of Discipline at all, though it sometimes professes to imitate it. In some other Presbyterian Churches, *e.g.* in Wales, and in the Scottish Dissenting Churches, a popular vote seems to be the rule when new Elders are made.

We are not painting a baseless picture of the Millennium. Yet the present tendency seems likely to bring about that happy time. If the Church go on drawing out the experience of each of its members, much sweetening of the breath of society must come. It will soon be clear what work "sons and daughters," "old men and young men and maidens" can do, and those willing workers will be brought together, and, under whatever form of Church government, all the servants of Christ will be at one. No union can ever be effected by wrangling arguments about Church government, but it is no Utopia to believe that men under the influence of the one Spirit of God, seeing the fruits of that Spirit in other men, will no longer allow themselves to be severed by questions of Episcopacy or Presbytery, of National Church and Dissent, but will say there are diversities of operation, but one Spirit, and therefore one work.