

in him both the willing and the doing according to his own good pleasure. But an enabling act of God is required at the basis of all the human activities. From that moment of the first divine contact the work of the Spirit never ceases, and while man is changing his mind and his life, it is God that is renewing him in true righteousness and holiness. Considered from God's side, the renewal results in the production of a new creature, God's workmanship, with new activities, newly directed. Considered from man's side, the new heart and mind exhibit themselves in new activities. We obtain thus a regular series. At the root lies an act seen by God alone, and mediated by nothing, a direct, creative act of the Spirit, the new birth. This new birth pushes itself into man's own consciousness through the call of the word, and his conscious possession of it is thus mediated by the word. It becomes visible to his fellow-men in a turning to God in external activities. A man must be born from above to become God's son. He must be born anew by the word to recognize himself as such. His renewal must pass into works meet for the new heart he has received to be recognized by his fellow-men as such.

*Princeton.*

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

#### ON LICENSURE.

It is a significant fact, that, in the face of the clear statements of our Book of Church Order, and the uniform practice of the church, one of our Synods still thought it worth while to send up to the Chattanooga Assembly this overture: "Is the formal licensure of a candidate for the ministry a prerequisite for ordination?" Evidently, the real utility of licensure has been seriously called in question, and, if we mistake not, there is an increasing tendency to look upon it as a form which, in many cases at least, may be safely dispensed with.

If we inquire as to the end contemplated in the licensure of a candidate, our Form of Government gives a clear and explicit answer: "Presbyteries shall license probationers to preach the gospel, in order that, after sufficiently trying their gifts and receiving from the church a good report, they may, in due time, ordain them to the sacred office." (*Book of Church Order*, Par. 129.)

It is required of a minister that he should be a man of piety; and the candidate's fitness in this respect may be ascertained, with at least

a reasonable degree of certainty, by an examination touching his experimental acquaintance with religion. He should possess also a “competency of human learning;” and his attainments may be readily ascertained by an examination upon the various branches as prescribed in our standards. He must be able to interpret the Word of God, and formulate its truths in a living message; and as evidence of such ability the candidate is required to present to Presbytery certain exercises, including a sermon. But a minister must also be “apt to teach;” able to stand before the people and speak to them “all the words of this life;” but above all he must be *called of God*. While a strong presumption may be afforded that the candidate is “apt to teach,” yet no examination, however rigid, can show that he has been called of God; this must be demonstrated by actual experiment.

Hence the Presbytery, having examined him, as far as it is possible to do so, licenses him to preach the gospel, in order that, after sufficiently trying his gifts and receiving from the church a good report, it may, in due time, ordain him to the sacred office.

It is assumed here that the candidate has not yet “*tried his gifts*,” having had no authority to do so; that the Presbytery must receive from the church a favorable report as to the result of this trial; and then, *on the strength of this good report*, supplementing the previous examination, he is to be ordained to the sacred office.

The Presbytery, as a court of the church, is called upon to decide as to the genuineness of that call to the gospel ministry, which the candidate claims to have received from the Lord Jesus, and, as a basis for its decision in the matter, it must have the concurrent testimony of the church, rendered by those among whom he has “tried his gifts.”

Thus we see that the prime purpose of licensure is to secure, in an orderly manner, the testimony of the church as to the candidate’s call to the ministry, and consequently, if this be not accomplished the *raison d’etre* of licensure is lacking, and it becomes a meaningless form.

What now is the practice of the church in this particular? Are candidates uniformly, or even usually, licensed with this end in view? The writer recalls at least two cases, coming under his own observation, in which no such end was reached, or even contemplated in the remotest degree. In the first instance, an unlicensed candidate, under the care of a distant Presbytery, was called to the pastorate of a church which he had been serving for several months. At an adjourned meet-

ing of Presbytery, held in this church, he was received under its care, examined, licensed, the call put into his hands and accepted by him, all in the same day. There being a doubt in the minds of some as to the lawfulness of licensing and ordaining a candidate at the same meeting, Presbytery adjourned to meet *two days later*, when it proceeded to ordain and install this licentiate of two days.

In the other case, a candidate was under appointment for the foreign field. A few weeks before he was to sail he was licensed by his Presbytery, and would have been ordained at once, but as his licensure took place at the very close of the meeting, and no arrangements had been made for an ordination service, it was decided to postpone his ordination for ten days, when he was accordingly set apart to his work. In the published proceedings of another Presbytery, but a short time since, the statement occurs that A. B. was “*licensed and ordained*,” as if it were a common occurrence.

But it is entirely needless to multiply instances, as any one may readily call to mind cases in which the licensure was not, and could not have been, for the purpose of allowing the candidate to try his gifts; nor was his ordination based upon the good reports from such authorized trials. In all such cases licensure is but a meaningless form, and probably it was because it was impressed with the absurdity of such a procedure that the Synod of North Carolina was moved to inquire of the General Assembly whether the formal licensure of a candidate is a prerequisite for ordination.

But it must not be supposed that in these and similar instances Presbyteries rashly ordained these candidates before they had tried their gifts, and without having received a good report from the church. Far from it; for these candidates had for a considerable period made trial of their gifts, without having been formally licensed to do so. They had done without a license precisely what a licentiate is authorized to do. Nor was a good report from the church wanting, as was evidenced by the formal calls for pastoral and evangelistic services that came to Presbytery.

In a word, licensure was granted in all these cases, when the very end for which licensure is appointed was already accomplished.

It is as if one should, with pomp and ceremony, introduce a man to his betrothed just before the marriage ceremony, on the ground that they had never been formally introduced, and that in the nature of things an introduction precedes marriage!

Did the Assembly err, then, in declaring that licensure is a pre-

requisite for ordination? By no means; for its decision is in full accord with our Form of Government, and sound reason as well. It is clear (*a*), that no one should be ordained without the testimony of the church; (*b*), that the candidate should try his gifts, and so afford an opportunity for such testimony; and (*c*), that he should not try his gifts unless duly authorized by the proper authority.

The prevalent and growing practice of deferring licensure to a late period, in many cases barely antedating ordination, may be traced mainly to two causes.

In the first place, the practice of the church is such that the candidate has every opportunity to “try his gifts” without formal licensure.

With rare exceptions our theological students spend their vacations in supplying vacant fields, and many of them render most excellent service. Theoretically there is a wide difference between a licentiate and a candidate, but practically there is none. The candidate does everything that the licentiate is authorized to do. He goes into the pulpit and conducts the service in all respects as a licentiate, or even minister, would, and in the eyes of the people he is a full-fledged “preacher.”

Generally the benediction is omitted, as an indication of the character of the service, but if the benediction is the invocation of a blessing merely, there is no reason why this should be singled out for omission; and if, on the other hand, it is an authoritative and official blessing of the people, then neither he nor the licentiate has any right to pronounce it; so that they do not differ in this respect.

On a recent occasion a certain Presbytery met in a church which had been supplied for some months by a theological student, a candidate under the care of another Presbytery. During the opening-exercises he occupied the pulpit with the moderator, and then, when the Presbytery was called to order, at the request of the moderator, he opened the session with prayer; after which he was received under care of Presbytery and licensed to preach! At the same meeting a church asked for leave to employ (as a supply until the next meeting) another unlicensed candidate under the care of a distant Presbytery, and leave was granted, *nemine contradicente*.

Is it any wonder, under such circumstances, that the candidate having the fear of an examination before his eyes, is constrained to ask, *cui bono* ?

“Why seek a license to do that which he can do equally well without

a license"? Why undergo the ordeal of *two* examinations when one will answer the same purpose? For full well does he know that, if ordination follows close upon the heels of licensure, the examination for ordination will be the merest form, and sometimes not even a form. Is it any wonder, then, that the candidate defers application for licensure even as has happened, in the very face of the expressed wishes of his Presbytery?

Growing out of this first reason for the anomalous position occupied by licensure in our practice, there is yet a second. As the candidate has been allowed practically to usurp the position of the licentiate, so the licentiate in turn has come to occupy, in part at least, the place of the minister. In the practice of the church licensure is tantamount to entering the ministry. True, the licentiate must (?) still be examined for ordination, but the result of that is a foregone conclusion. He is now in the position of a candidate who has successfully passed through a primary election in a State where his party has a safe majority. It does happen occasionally that a licentiate fails of ordination, but for every such case it would be easy to call to mind two cases in which men have been deposed after ordination. The candidate emerging from his Presbyterial trials, and bearing a certificate of licensure, naturally feels that he now occupies a different position from that occupied by him previously. It is not that he is at liberty now to "try his gifts," for that he did before without let or hindrance, and as he feels that there must be a difference somewhere, he naturally concludes that he is now "sort of a minister," albeit he cannot yet administer the sacraments.

The writer well remembers the look of mingled surprise and indignation cast upon him by a certain licentiate, to whom he chanced to intimate that he was not a "minister of the gospel." He instantly referred to the fact that he had been licensed "to preach the gospel of Christ," losing sight of the qualifying clause "as a *probationer* for the holy ministry." He does indeed "preach," in the wide sense of the term, but it is not an authoritative proclamation of the gospel, nor is he invested with any office whatever.

But the practical question which now confronts us, is: How shall licensure be restored to its normal position?

We answer unhesitatingly: Let the church return to its former uniform practice of refusing to allow a candidate to "try his gifts" until formally licensed to do so by his Presbytery, after due examination. Such a course would at once make licensure a desideratum in

the eyes of every candidate, seeing that the lack of it shuts him out from all our churches, and from the summer work, so eagerly sought after by theological students.

No call would ever come up to Presbytery for the pastoral services of an unlicensed candidate, as is now often the case; nor would Presbytery ever have occasion to follow a licensure with ordination; nor, indeed, would a Presbytery be found willing to ordain one who had never “tried his gifts.” Then would the licentiate be, in deed as well as in name, a *probationer* for the ministry.

But just here a practical difficulty emerges. Experience, we think, has clearly demonstrated the practical utility of the candidate’s beginning to exercise his gifts at a very early stage of his preparation, and objectors to this statement, if there be such, will be found chiefly, if not wholly, among those not conversant with the workings of this plan. But our Book of Church Order requires that the candidate shall have spent “at least two years” in the study of theology before licensure, except in extraordinary cases; and indeed, if the requirements touching the topics for examination be complied with, it is difficult to see how licensure can take place at an earlier stage than this.

With the plain provisions of the law staring us in the face, we cannot, except in extraordinary cases, license a candidate until he has completed two years of theological study, and we are forced either to refuse to allow him to try his gifts previous to licensure, or else to allow him to do so without formal licensure, as at present. The former alternative is open to objection, as stated above; the latter is still more so. In addition to the fact, already set forth, that it virtually supersedes licensure and renders it a meaningless form, it is also extra-constitutional—a thing unknown to our standards. It is often urged that these services are conducted with the approbation of the Presbyteries, and are under the direction and oversight of some neighboring pastor, or Presbyterial committee; but without stopping to enquire how much this direction and oversight really amounts to, there still remains the indisputable fact that the candidate is discharging the functions of a licentiate, call it by what name you will, without having undergone any examination whatever save that upon which he was received under the care of Presbytery.

Our church, through its General Assembly, has formally condemned the system known as “Lay Evangelism,” as being “irregular and contrary to the order of the church, with reference to the Christian ministry, and calculated to produce confusion and many other evils.”

It is well known that many of these so-called evangelists expressly disclaim the idea that they are in any sense ministers, while virtually discharging the functions of a licentiate, if not those of a minister. If the approbation of a Presbytery, or the endorsement of a pastor, gives a candidate a quasi-license, and legalizes, in a measure, his services, then most assuredly we cannot object to the services of those men who have the cooperation of many of our churches and pastors. Can we consistently condemn them for doing the very thing which we habitually encourage our students to do ?

The difficulty here pointed out can be fully met only by a change in our law touching the requirements for licensure. It is in order now for some brother to rise and offer the customary protest against "lowering the standards." It will no doubt ease his mind somewhat, but does not relieve the situation in the least. We are confronted with the fact that, either we are suffering candidates to try their gifts *without licensure*, and so rendering licensure a nullity; or, if they have a quasi-license, as some contend, it is a license *without examination*. Is it not the very height of folly to keep the gate locked hard and fast, and then, with our own hands, let down the fence by its side to the very ground! Far better to have a reasonable examination for licensure than to give a virtual license without any examination at all.

As the law now stands, the examinations for licensure and ordination are substantially the same; while in practice the examination for licensure is made the crucial test, and that for ordination slurred over. Why, we may ask, is licensure thus exalted over ordination, or even put upon an equal footing with it? It confers no office, as does ordination, nor does it change one's ecclesiastical status, but simply confers the privilege of exercising his gifts, and even this may be taken away without a trial. Reason teaches that there ought to be a wide difference in the requirements for these two. Let the requirements for ordination remain as at present, and let such a change be made in the requirements for licensure as will meet the case of those who are just entering upon a course of theological study; and let us do *according to law* what we are now doing *without law*.

In view of past discussions it is not likely, however desirable, that any such constitutional change will be made, at least for the present. In the meanwhile we deem it the part of wisdom for the church to discourage, and if need be forbid, all unauthorized trials of gifts, and at the same time urge candidates to apply for licensure at the earliest period permissible under the law; and while the church by

such a course will be denied their ministrations, and they will be deprived of the training, yet we will thereby avoid the evils that grow out of an extra-constitutional measure, make apparent the pressing need of a change in our organic law, and at the same time restore licensure to its normal place in our ecclesiastical system.

T. R. ENGLISH.

#### THE RELATION OF ENGLISH TO ANGLO-SAXON.

PROFESSOR WHITNEY defines philology as “ the science of speech, and all that speech reveals of the origin, history, and character of man.” Few branches of study have received more attention within the last twenty years than this. The results of this study have been very gratifying to the student of language, because the facts established have thrown a flood of light in all directions, and have made scientific grouping and generalization possible. Naturally the languages of Western Europe have been most carefully examined. It has been proved that they have certain well-defined points of resemblance, a fact which indicates that there was once a common language from which all have sprung. Furthermore, the development of each has been in accordance with laws differing with its peculiar environment. The resemblances are so marked, and the differences are of so peculiar a nature, that philologists now think themselves justified in stating that all the principal tongues of Europe belong to the Aryan, or Indo-European, branch of languages. When the primitive speech originated, where and by whom it was spoken, is not known, but it is supposed that it had its home somewhere in Central or South-western Asia. In some fertile valley, or on some pleasant table-land, the mother language was born, sheltered, and developed.

As those who spoke it increased in numbers, they were forced to send out colonies. These emigrants moved westward, carrying with them, of course, their native language and their national customs. But time and chance happened to them all.

Long years of separation made the colonies forget the mother-state, and different surroundings developed in each peculiar habits, peculiar characteristics, and peculiar forms of speech. So it happened that the fact of a common ancestry was soon entirely forgotten, and the languages diverged so rapidly and so far, that scholars have only recently suspected that similarity really exists. By careful investiga-