

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIII.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXXII.

ARTICLE I.

THE CHRIST OF JOHN.

1. The germ of the doctrine of the Christ was cast into the soil of Eden. Straightway it sprang up into a vigorous plant, which has outlived and far surpassed all the glories of Paradise. Its growth through the centuries has not been constant or uniform. Long periods have elapsed without any perceptible progress; but these have been followed by epochs of great and sometimes even startling development. In the fulness of the times God was manifest in the flesh, and dwelt among us for a third of a century. For about another third of a century the Canon of Scripture was not extended beyond the limits of the Old Testament. Malachi had uttered the precious promise, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple." This was the latest promise in the Hebrew tongue. Through the long succeeding night, in which there was no vision and no revelation, it lingered in the air like a sweet presence, cheering the hearts and sustaining the hopes of all who in that troublous time waited for the consolation of Israel. But now the messenger had prepared the way. Christ, born in Bethlehem of Juda, had finished the work given him to do; had been crucified under Pontius Pilate; had been dead and buried; had risen again on the third day, had ascended on high, led cap-

Thornwell assisted in forming the present Constitutions of our Committees,¹ and “approved of the structure of our present schemes,” and Dr. Wilson insists that the only “solid foundation on which all Christian coöperation ought to rest” is a “provision for the whole Church to rise and stand together, as one compact, united body.” This being *no doubt* what Dr. Thornwell, if now alive, would hold, it would, with *just as little doubt*, be his doctrine that Presbyteries ought to coöperate through the Sustentation Committee in their Home Missions, and churches, through the same Committee, in their pastorates; for is not this the “broad and solid foundation on which all Christian coöperation ought to rest,” and does not the permanency and the very life of our Church “depend on the steady maintenance of this great principle”?

JOHN B. ADGER.

ARTICLE VI.²

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1882.

The Assembly and the whole Church are to be congratulated that the complications growing out of the development of small-pox in Atlanta were not allowed to interfere with the attendance of the Commissioners nor with the business of the body. The facts were about as follows: Some weeks before the time appointed for the meeting of the General Assembly this loathsome disease appeared in the city. It was confined chiefly to the colored population, large numbers of whom steadfastly declined vaccination. But this population furnishes domestic servants to such families as were most likely to entertain our brethren,

¹Our Sustentation Committee was not in being during Dr. T.'s lifetime.

²This interesting and able review of the late General Assembly, prepared at our request, may fail on several points to meet the views of many of our readers. No man could expect on some of these topics to satisfy all. Ours to a large extent is, and has ever been, and must always be, a free journal, open to writers of different opinions.—EDITORS OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

and experience had proved that colored domestics could not be hindered from exposing themselves to infection whenever an acquaintance had the disease. And just at the close of the week preceding the meeting developments occurred which justified the the fear that a number of those who had been exposed to infection would, in all probability, show the disease while the meeting was in progress; and as many of the expected guests came from localities where no disease was reported, it was feared that they might be unprotected. Duty to them, therefore, seemed to require that notification be published by telegraph of the real condition in Atlanta, so that every man might govern himself accordingly. Only one instance is known in which a member of the Assembly was disturbed by the development of small-pox in the family to which he had been assigned; and, in order to escape the long confinement of quarantine, he promptly, and wisely, withdrew from Atlanta. The negroes had at last been persuaded to put aside their folly and submit to vaccination, and so the disease was checked.

As it was, the prompt hospitality of the church at Columbus, Ga., placed everybody under obligations to them. The tantalizing uncertainty as to the rendezvous caused some confusion and extra expense. But, so far as known, only one brother (and he from "the far West") actually erred so far as to take up his quarters in the wrong city. After enjoying his bath, his dinner, and his "nap," however, he discovered his mistake, and boarded the first train, reaching Atlanta in ample time to be placed by hearty and unanimous choice in the Moderator's chair!

A large congregation assembled at 11 o'clock a. m. to hear the opening sermon by Dr. Farris. The theme was: "*The Resurrection of Jesus a conclusive demonstration of the truth of Christianity.*" First of all, the boast of infidelity was met by an imposing array of statistics, which showed the steady, uninterrupted march of the gospel toward its predestined triumph. And then the reasons were adduced with point and fulness for the claim that the resurrection of Jesus is the best attested fact in all history. The discourse extended through an hour and a quarter, but it was not too long for the subject and the occasion.

And this opportunity is improved to emphasise the hope, which was generally expressed by his hearers, that Dr. Farris will give us his able and timely discussion in a permanent form.

The Assembly being constituted, the name of Dr. R. K. Smoot was proposed for Moderator, and there being no other nomination, he was unanimously chosen by acclamation; the Rev. Frank Mitchell, of Missouri, being made Reading Clerk in the same way.

The docket soon showed that a great volume of business, some of it of especial difficulty and importance, was to be acted upon; such, for example, as Overtures, more than thirty in number and covering all sorts of questions; three judicial cases; new adjustments in the working of our Executive Committees, and the ever-recurring problem of "Fraternal Relations." It is matter for devout gratitude that such weighty questions were discussed, some of them at great length and with intense earnestness, and yet there was scarcely a word spoken the recollection of which should give pain to the speaker or the hearer. The decisions reached will not, of course, give equal satisfaction to all parties. Some points, it is plain, are to be debated elsewhere. But in the end, the mind of the Church will rest, for the most part, in the decisions of the Assembly.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The twenty-first Report was presented by the venerable Dr. Wilson, of whom it was testified by a brother, who knew whereof he affirmed, that among missionaries in China it is very generally conceded that he is "the best Secretary in Christendom." The Report acknowledges with devout gratitude a growing interest in the work among the pastors and the people, so much so that its claims are generally recognised by all. The gospel is now preached by our representatives in many tongues; 500 children are under tuition; 1,500 hopeful converts have been gathered into the churches; an increase over the past year is reported of \$10,000; the treasury proper is freed from debt, though the claim of Mr. Morton for about \$10,000 continues to be pressed against the mission property at Campinas; our corps

of native laborers now musters fifty strong; a native Presbytery has been organised in Greece. And yet our overtaxed brethren are in some instances compelled to live in unhealthful houses, because the money cannot be had for better. For this purpose at least \$15,000 is needed immediately.

Along with the Report, Dr. Wilson submitted, on his own responsibility, a memorial touching the power of evangelists laboring as foreign missionaries, which was received and referred to a special Committee, their report to be matured *ad interim* and presented to the next Assembly.

HOME MISSIONS.

Dr. McIlwaine's Report shows that tenacious grasp upon the multifarious details of this vast scheme which he may have inherited from ancestors devoted to mercantile life. Mention is made of the twofold calamity, drought and floods, which have disabled many congregations, rendering our beneficiaries more numerous and our helpers fewer. Notwithstanding, all the Committee's pledges have been redeemed, and the treasury is out of debt.

Sustentation reports an increase of contributions aggregating more than \$3,000; ministers are better supported, ninety-two *per centum* of those wholly engaged in ministerial work receiving what may, in some sense, be termed "adequate maintenance;" *manse*s are being provided; 205 are already in use, of which 30 were obtained during the last twelve months. But along with these encouraging features, the Secretary mentions the fact that 133 ministers, many of them able preachers and consecrated men, are compelled, because of inadequate support; to resort wholly or in part, to other employment; 320 congregations are entirely vacant; 110 require help in order to build houses for public worship. Such, in brief, are the facts upon which the call is based for \$50,000, whereas \$150,000 might be profitably employed.

The Evangelistic department shows signs of healthful growth. The past year's income was \$11,628, giving help to 55 evangelists—19 more than at any former period. All doubts as to

finding suitable men for the work have been solved, and God has blessed the means to the salvation of souls. The most noteworthy developments have taken place in Western Texas and in the Synod of Kentucky, where noble things have been devised by individuals of our communion. It is risking nothing to say that if these examples are generally followed, the time is near at hand when the expansive energies of Presbyterianism shall be better known, and (what is yet more to be desired) the dark corners of our land shall be fully illuminated by the Sun of Righteousness.

The evangelistic work among the colored people does not move forward as it should. But testimony is at hand to show that wherever it has been tried, the results have been good.

But one of the most comforting paragraphs in the Report is that which is devoted to the Invalid Fund. The congregational collections are not pushed by the pastors and Sessions as they might be, this deficiency having been made up by individual liberality. Among these the noble bequest by Dr. Stuart Robinson, of course, is preëminent. He devised the sum of \$25,000 to the Trustees of our Assembly, the income of which is to be applied *in perpetuum* to aiding infirm ministers and the families of such as have died. The condition of this bequest was that an effort to raise \$75,000 additional be set on foot by the General Assembly—a work which Dr. Robinson had reserved as the last work of his life—a labor of love for Christ and his afflicted saints. And, then, a letter from Bennett H. Young, Esq., was read, tendering, on behalf of Dr. Robinson's heirs, the bequest unencumbered by the condition. Surely God will raise up some good wise man who will take up the scheme of an endowment of \$100,000. It can be raised—so raised, too, as not to interfere with any other work.

The matter which gave most anxiety to the Assembly, though it was not debated on the floor, was the separation of the two Committees. Reasons for this separation had been urged on former occasions; and, indeed, the Assembly at St. Louis had ordered it to be done. But to the surprise and grief of many in that Assembly, the action was reconsidered at the very end of

the sessions, and under a pressure that, as we ventured then to say, ought never to have been applied, the action was reversed. These reasons were adduced in the committee rooms at the last Assembly, and being reinforced by others which need not be rehearsed now, the two standing Committees concurred in recommending a separation, which was made, *nem. con.* The action was timely. The business is too great for any man. Here place is found for the Lord's saying, "No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will hold to the one and despise the other." If only the separation be completed, according to the original plan, by sending Home Missions to Nashville, to Louisville, to St. Louis, or to New Orleans, an objection will be forever removed that has long lain in the minds of many among us, namely, that there has been an undue aggregation of Committees in the northeastern corner of our territory.

EDUCATION.

The Report on Education presented by the Rev. E. M. Richardson showed a gratifying condition in these respects: all appropriations to candidates, the maximum fixed by the Assembly being \$125, have been met, and \$1,000 in addition has been distributed to cases which seemed specially urgent; the treasury is out of debt, and a surplus is, for the first time in many years, on hand.

But what has long troubled thoughtful minds among us is the small number of young men who are seeking the ministry. The Secretary says that anxious scrutiny of the proceedings of our Presbyteries enables him to report that about seventy-five candidates have offered themselves. Of these twenty-five are studying at Union Seminary, Va., five in other Seminaries, and the remainder in colleges and academics. These are not sufficient, as all will see, to replace the annual losses occasioned by death, old age, and other causes. So that in this vital matter our Church is certainly declining. So far from reaching out vigorously to supply the destitutions at home and abroad, she is relaxing her hold upon what she now has. The cry spontaneously

rises to one's lips, "Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth; the faithful fail from the children of men!" Now, if ever, must the Church pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers. The Assembly has commended the solemn subject to the consideration of such as pray for the peace of Jerusalem. True enough, this has been done again and again. And yet no other course is left to Assemblies than to reiterate the exhortation until God shall hear.

The subject was earnestly debated in the Assembly, and among other things, these two causes were suggested as explaining, at least in part, the saddening deficiency: 1. Worldliness in the Church, and especially among parents, moving them to prefer lucrative employments for their sons. Hannahs are no longer bringing their little Samuels to God in prayer. And in the face of such worldliness, it is not to be wondered at that our youth are no longer like Moses, who "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt." 2. The Church has been negligent of her trust in failing to provide sufficient help for such of her young men as have offered themselves for the work, either before they have been ordained or after it. These are grave and serious matters, which deserve to be carefully considered by the people of God. If our glorified Lord sees us to be careless concerning his "ascension gifts" (Eph. iv. 11), he may take occasion to remind us of it by withdrawing the gifts until such time as experience shall reveal to us the greatness of our sin.

An additional suggestion occurs which we do not remember to have heard in the discussion—the carelessness of Presbyteries in the oversight of their candidates is unquestionably giving rise to scandal and alienating the confidence of men and their gifts from this branch of our work. The writer speaks according to observation, and *knows* whereof he affirms. As a pastor in three widely separated congregations, one of them closely connected with a Theological Seminary, and another with the Executive Committee of Education, he has found the evil present in the minds of men at these points. It merits prayerful attention at the hands of presbyters. A thoughtful pen has recently discussed

this topic in the *Presbyterian Review* (Northern.) Attention is invited to an important change in the relations of candidates to their Presbyteries which has been silently produced by the Theological Seminaries. Formerly the candidate, at least during his theological course, was placed by Presbytery under the special charge of some one or more of its ministers. His life and his studies were thus brought into the closest relations with the body. But this order has passed away, and nothing is being done to compensate for the loss of some of its benefits. The inexperienced and comparatively unknown youth, either before or after his collegiate studies, goes entirely out of the Presbytery, sometimes 500 or 1,000 miles away. He is, indeed, in a certain sense under the care of the Theological Faculty, but their power and responsibilities to God, and, under him, to the Church, are not sufficiently defined. Of all temptations few are more subtle and dangerous than a *divided* responsibility. It works evil in this matter to our certain knowledge. "But," we are told, "the Presbyteries are so jealous of their power. They will not allow you to interfere with their candidates." So much the worse, we reply, for the Presbyteries, for the cause of Christ, and for the inexperienced youth, if, indeed, he is ever to assume the awful responsibilities of a gospel minister. All, however, that we would propose is that some more clearly defined mode of communication be established between the Presbyteries and our Seminaries. Let the Faculty be freely used as the eyes and ears of Presbytery, and when occasion requires, as its voice also to counsel and rebuke. The evil is patent, and a remedy greatly needed. Instances are known of good and true men being set against Beneficiary. Education by the abuses of the system.

PUBLICATION.

It would be impossible to say whether the Assembly was more pleased at the disclosures of Dr. Hazen's Report, or perplexed at the plans of future work to which it gave rise.

It was a source of unalloyed satisfaction to learn that the great debt growing out of the disasters of 1877—\$60,000 in all, principal and interest—had been paid in full. Our excellent Secre-

tary, as modest and kindly in counsel as he is capable in action, has deserved well of the Church. And the Executive Committee is watching the business with intelligence and fidelity. We are assured fully that such a disaster as that of 1877 cannot again occur, under our present Secretary, nor while the present Committee holds the reins. But Publication is not an easy business. No one of the religious publishing concerns seems to be giving satisfaction. The Methodists have had trouble with theirs, incurring thereby very great losses. Our brethren of the Northern Assembly have just been going through the usual amount, they say, of grumbling and complaint about theirs. It is a comfort to have Dr. Hazen's assurances that he will in no case advise the Church or its agents to become responsible for the cost of issuing a book. The writer or his friends must furnish the money for press-work, stereotyping, &c. The Church will then aid in its distribution, if she judges it beneficial to her people. This is all that she should ever do for a new book. The hazards are too great for her to do more.

A corporation—and of all corporations a Church—is liable to peculiar risks, if she becomes a publisher for her corporators. The rules of business are made to bend to friendship and importunity. Having a fine opportunity to speak on this subject with Mr. P., of Philadelphia, the head of the largest book jobbing house in America, and, as it is said, in the world, the writer heard him say: “It is my confident opinion that Churches cannot safely become responsible for the cost of unpublished books. They should all follow our plan, which is to let the book get into print as best it can; then if it proves worthy, use it for your purposes. We have our skilled labor to observe the world's market, and when we discover what we need, we watch it until the publisher has about made out of it what he can. We then come in with our offer in cash. Our stock costs us about fifty per cent. of what religious concerns pay for theirs.” Paying one's money out for an untried book is always a doubtful experiment. Dr. Hazen is moving on the right course when he contracts for Dr. Robinson's Hymnals. Ours has proven a sad failure. It takes something like genius to succeed at such work; and genius cannot be had on demand.

The Sabbath School Publications, issued on contract with Messrs. Whittet and Shepperson, are growing wonderfully in favor with the people, and consequently in profit to the cause. Already the "royalty" on them is yielding \$1,800 toward the Secretary's salary; and ere long, the whole amount being paid in this way, all the funds given by the churches can be used for disseminating good books and our Sunday School literature among the destitute congregations.

But a perplexing question came up in connexion with the Assembly's contract with the Presbyterian Company. Complaints came in from various parts of the Church, and formal overtures, requesting that the Executive Committee engage directly in the work of distribution. In order to do this we *must* have in cash at least \$16,000 to cancel the contract and enter upon the business hopefully. The Executive Committee, so we heard on the floor, did not choose to suggest a plan. But the Standing Committee, through its Chairman, Dr. Smith, of Dallas, indicated three possible modes of obtaining the money—by a special application to churches and to individuals; by waiting until the annual collections should accumulate, say three or four years; by issuing bonds based upon the Publishing House, which, after paying off the lien of \$31,000 so long hanging over that property, would leave a surplus of \$9,000, which, added to the collection of 1883, would furnish the \$16,000 needed. By floating \$40,000 at four per cent., it was urged, we shall actually be saving \$260 per annum in the interest now paid; we shall not be incurring a new debt, but putting an old one in better shape; and we shall have not only the \$9,000 of surplus for capital, but also the enhanced value of our Publishing House, which will, it is believed, be worth the \$45,000 paid for it. These arguments, backed by the approval of men of business who entered heartily into the discussion, and enforced by the opinion of Dr. Hazen, prevailed over the repugnance of most to having bonds, and of some to retaining that house, which has been a costly and annoying experiment from the beginning. The vote was hearty, and along with his other cares the Secretary will have laid on him the work of placing the bonds. If any man can do it, he can. Should the Executive

Committee, after full consideration, adopt the plan, (the discretion being wisely left to them,) Dr. Hazen will no doubt get the money and go forward. He deserves and has the confidence and esteem of all who know him; and if his life is spared ten years, he will pay off the debt too.

THE JUDICIAL CASES.

It was a happy thought that two of the three cases were referred under the law to a Commission of twenty-seven. They were both brought at the instance of Mr. W. S. Turner, a member of the Central Church, Atlanta, who appeared in a similar manner before the Assembly in Staunton. The first of these cases originated judicially in a complaint taken before Presbytery by Mr. T. because the Session had declined to prosecute its Clerk for allowing one of the witnesses in a former case, (the one above mentioned,) to revise the record of his own testimony and correct a clerical blunder made by the assistant clerk. The *manner* of doing this (though precise rules are not given in the law) might by inference be termed an irregularity. But a corrupt motive was entirely out of the question, and the circumstances required prompt action. Session declined to prosecute, and cited Rules of Dis., Ch. V., parag. 8th, to show discretion vested in them. The Presbytery sustained the Session, as also the Synod. And the Commission unanimously sustained the lower courts, but noted the irregularity of the mode of correcting the mistake.

The second case was an appeal from the sentence of Session excommunicating Mr. Turner for alleged offences of the gravest nature. Appeal was taken to Presbytery, and after hearing the case the Session was unanimously sustained, nineteen votes being cast. But when appeal was brought before Synod, the court, upon motion, threw the case out on the ground that appellant had not furnished a sufficient reason, as required by law, for taking his appeal to Synod.

Dissatisfaction was expressed in the Commission at the state of the record. For, *first*, Synod had neglected to state formally its reasons in an explanatory minute; and, *secondly*, an extract

had not been made of what Synod really did *in re*, so as to be attached in proper form, but the Commission were furnished with the printed minutes, the references to this case being marked on the margins of the pages. The appellant had claimed that he was not *de jure* liable to the discipline of said church because he had asked a letter of dismissal to the M. E. Church, South, to which he claimed to be entitled, but it was denied him by Session on the ground that he was under sentence of admonition. The Assembly at Staunton had indeed decided (unwisely, as we think,) that in all cases admonition is *transient*, and expires when delivered; that Mr. T. was therefore at the time in regular standing, and entitled to a letter to any church within our denomination; but that, having asked it to another denomination, the matter was not regulated by law at all, but was a courtesy only. The obvious reply to this was that even if he had *obtained* his letter, yet until he had presented it and been enrolled elsewhere, he was a member of the Central church and subject to its discipline. This principle decided the famous case of the "seven elders" in the First church, Louisville. They had letters which they declined to present, returning them to said church, and claiming the privileges of members and officers. The Assembly held that they were such. But this question, it is said, gave rise to much debate in the Judicial Committee of the Assembly, by some of whom the case was strangely pronounced to be exceedingly complicated. The question of jurisdiction, however, gave no trouble in the Commission; and after grumbling for a while over the fragmentary state of the Synod's records, they came at last to consider very earnestly whether Synod had acted within the law in declining to entertain the appeal. To ascertain this the appeal before Synod was compared with the requirements of the law, (Rules of Dis., Ch. XIII., Sec. III., Par. III.,) and the Commission decided that the appeal was sufficiently definite to warrant a hearing of the case on its own merits by the Synod. The action of Synod was, therefore, reversed, and the record sent back for a trial on its merits, the vote being: to sustain, 24; not to sustain, 1.

THE PARK CASE.

This *cause célèbre* was to determine the status of a colored minister, ordained by the Presbytery of Memphis, as was alleged and admitted by both parties, under the plan proposed by the Assembly in 1869, looking to the organisation of a separate African Presbyterian Church. This man, San Park, it was alleged, though under the friendly care of said Presbytery was not *de jure* a full member of the same; that he had not in fact ever offered to vote on questions of discipline, nor was he fitted for it; that during an exciting discussion concerning the reception by Presbytery of a white minister who was suspected of unsoundness, Park was called on by members to vote; but the Clerk declining to call his name, as he said, because he had never voted and was not entitled to vote (indeed, he had no desire whatever to do so), the Moderator deciding that Park could vote, appeal was taken to the Presbytery, and decision given that he could not. From this complaint was made to the Synod, which, after earnest discussion, decided (48 to 12) to sustain the complaint. From this decision complaint was made to the Assembly.

The discussion was protracted and able. On the one hand, it was contended that Park, being ordained under the action of the Assembly in 1869 looking to a separate African Church, had no authority conferred on him to rule in the white churches; he was to administer sacraments and discipline in the churches of colored people to whom he was sent as an evangelist; that, unforeseen providences having hindered the formation of the African Presbytery, these Presbyterial powers were, in his case, held in abeyance awaiting the opportunity for their employment; that such was Park's understanding at the time of his ordination and since, and such was the mind of the Presbytery. On the other hand, it was urged that ordination is a matter to be regulated by the Constitution, and under it there is but one kind known; that if the Assembly in 1869 meant to suggest a different sort of ordination, it went beyond its legal power, and its action is *ipso facto* null and void; that Park being in point of fact ordained, and in the usual way, the Constitution must decide what powers were conferred by the ordination, Assemblies, Presbyteries, etc., to the

contrary notwithstanding; that the records of the Presbytery show Park to have performed various and sundry acts pertaining to membership—*e. g.*, his name was called, excuses rendered, was counted to make a quorum and to entitle Presbytery to double representation in the Assembly. On the one hand, it was argued that in deciding that Park was a full member of Presbytery, this court would be making a “collateral attack” upon the action taken by the same court in 1869, which would be inadmissible. On the other hand, it was argued that Park being ordained somehow, it is incompetent to bring a “collateral attack” upon the validity and fulness of that ordination. If this be done at all, the Presbytery must be cited for departure from the law in ordaining a man to the ministry who fell, as to qualifications, neither in the usual line, nor yet under the exceptional cases provided for. The effect might be to show that *de jure* Park is not a minister at all, but not that he is one of a peculiar sort—that is, one of limited powers.

When the vote was counted, it stood thus: to sustain the complaint, 42; not to sustain, 81. And thus Park was declared to be a member of Presbytery, and entitled to all privileges pertaining to the same. Subsequently, the following minute was reported by a Committee, of which Dr. Farris was Chairman:

Whereas, perfect ministerial parity is an essential and fundamental principle of the Presbyterian polity; and

Whereas, it is in evidence that Rev. Sam Park was duly ordained in the Presbytery of Memphis, according to the provisions of our Constitution; and

Whereas, said Presbytery did at several times, by their formal act, recognise him as a duly ordained minister under their care; therefore,

It is the judgment of this court that Rev. Sam Park is in full ministerial connexion with said Presbytery, and consequently entitled to vote, and that this court do not sustain the complaint of said Presbytery.

We take occasion to declare our full persuasion that the Presbytery of Memphis, in denying to Rev. Sam Park the exercise of his right as a presbyter, were not at all influenced by race prejudice, but simply desired to carry out strictly the recommendations of the General Assembly of 1869.

Adopted.

Thus ended the "Park Case." It was throughout considered and decided as a question of *law*. It was well known that the party whose name it bears had never desired the test to be made. He had not proposed to vote on the occasion referred to, nor upon any other. A simple-minded man, of very limited information, he has been content to be a *protégé*, as it were, of Presbytery, and as such to be aided by the counsels and the money of the white people in carrying on, as best he can, his labors among the blacks. The question of his vote was raised—unwisely, as it seems, and at a time of great excitement,—by brethren of the other race, by them discussed, and by them decided, he being quiet all the while. The two chief factors in this decision were: 1. That, on the supposition that Presbytery had acted fully upon the plan proposed by the Assembly in 1869, nevertheless that Assembly had no power to make new terms of ordination, that being a matter regulated by the Constitution, which can only be amended in the prescribed way. Consequently, Park being ordained, as Presbytery said he was, he is a presbyter. The additional words, to the effect that he was to be an evangelist to his own race exclusively, count for nothing, because they are extra-constitutional. If ordained at all, he is fully so, simply so, the Assembly of 1869 to the contrary notwithstanding. And if the contention be that Park did not possess the qualifications, whether regular or exceptional, as provided for in the Constitution, then Presbytery must be called before Synod for transgressing the bounds of that discretion which is expressly given to it by law, and the action must be declared null and void, after due inquiry. 2. But it was also conceded that Presbytery had not acted in accord with the plan commended by the Assembly of 1869, and consequently with the theory of this complaint. The record revealed such facts as have been set forth above—his name called and excuses rendered as with regular members; counted to make a quorum and to give double representation in the Assembly; name placed upon a committee, etc. The privilege of voting he seems never to have claimed, openly at least. The first of these positions is far the more important, and, to the writer's mind, no

answer can be framed. The second, though less important, had its weight with many.

But the anxious inquiry raised by the discussion in the Assembly was, What effect is this decision to have upon our prospects of doing good among the colored people? Had the Assembly decided that Park was not a presbyter in the eyes of the law, that decision was sure to be used as a means of agitation among the churches and candidates who remain under the care of our Presbyteries. The slender films of attachment between the races are liable to be snapped by busybodies of either color who thrive upon these jealousies. On the other hand, what is to be the effect of this decision upon the interest felt by the white people in our work—in the Tuscaloosa Institute, for example? Doubtless some among us will be tempted to withhold their gifts. But it is to be hoped that further consideration will relieve their minds. None of the speakers denied that a separate African Church is a necessity. The instincts of both races require it. The colored race feels it, as was said without contradiction over and over again during the debate, even more than we do. Theorists who live far away from us may utter all the nonsense which empty minds can find. But the facts remain. The only question is, How shall we best promote that end without disregarding the fundamental law? To this two replies have been made. Introduce an amendment, say some, to enable the Assembly to carry out some such plan as that proposed in 1869. But this is very questionable; and a better plan, it seems to the writer, would be to *license* suitable candidates, retaining them in that condition until the Synod can, according to the Constitution, set them apart as a Presbytery so soon as they shall have been ordained. This is all regular and valid. True, the emissaries, black and white, of other and kindred Churches, will be almost sure to inveigle all such even then. Let them do it, if they will. Let us only do the best we can, and like Paul we may say that though some preach Christ of envy and strife, nevertheless Christ is preached, and we will glory therein.

"FRATERNAL RELATIONS."

This vexed and vexing subject was brought up by overtures from four of our Presbyteries. The overtures were referred, as usual, to the Assembly's Standing Committee on Correspondence, Dr. Wm. Brown being Chairman. But on the second day, just after devotional exercises, Dr. Pitzer sprang the question in a new shape by introducing the following :

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to bear our cordial Christian greetings to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church now in session at Springfield, Ill., and to express our willingness to co-operate as far as practicable with that body in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wiggins, of Texas. But on motion of Dr. Farris, the resolution was also referred to the Committee ; and the motion of Mr. Morton, to make this subject the order of the day for 12 o'clock on Saturday, was lost. However, the matter was again brought up on Saturday upon receipt of a telegram bearing the Christian salutations of the Assembly at Springfield ; Mr. Morton moving to postpone a reply until our Committee had reported, but upon learning that no report was likely to be made that day, the motion was withdrawn and the usual response sent by telegram. On Monday, (the fourth session of the Assembly,) Dr. Brown, of Virginia, in behalf of the Committee on Correspondence, submitted the following report, which had been approved by all the Committee save the Rev. D. O. Byers, who dissented :

"The Committee on Foreign Correspondence report to the General Assembly that five overtures have been placed in their hands, viz., from the Presbyteries of Abingdon, Atlanta, Holston, South Alabama, and Maryland. Also a resolution offered by Rev. A. W. Pitzer, D. D. The object of all these overtures, with some slight difference in their forms of expression, is the same. They desire and respectfully request this General Assembly to establish fully and formally what are called 'Fraternal Relations' with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, by sending forthwith a delegate or delegates to that body, now in session at Springfield, Ill. The resolution referred to proposes, also, that such delegation shall convey an expression of 'our willingness to co-operate with that body, as far as practicable, in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation.'

“After the most careful consideration your Committee have been able to give to the weighty matters involved, they recommend to the Assembly the adoption of the following paper :

“While the General Assembly might restrict its answer to these overtures and the resolution, by a general reference to the action of former Assemblies on the same subject, it may be proper to state it somewhat fully, not only out of regard to the sources from which these papers emanate, but as useful to a right understanding of the matter in hand. It is our deliberate judgment that to accede to the requests aforesaid would not be a measure suitable in itself, nor would it minister to the edification of our Church; and this judgment is sustained by the following reasons :

“1. Because it would be inconsistent with the position taken by our Church—a position thoroughly considered and thoroughly established.

“In 1874 a committee was appointed by our Assembly at the request of the Northern Assembly, to confer fully with a committee of that body ‘concerning the removal of those causes which have heretofore prevented fraternal relations between the two Churches.’ When these two committees met in Baltimore in January, 1875, and the committee of the Northern Assembly was requested to state what measure they proposed for healing our division, they answered: ‘We now propose that your committee join with us in recommending to our respective General Assemblies the interchange of delegates, thus recognising each other as corresponding bodies.’

“This our committee refused to do, and it was precisely upon this point and principle involved in it that the whole design of conference failed to agree. In accordance with the language used by our General Assembly as late as last year, ‘It never has been with our Church a question whether we should not, in some form, acknowledge a Christian brotherhood with the Northern Presbyterians. More catholic and Christian sentiments towards all evangelical Churches, more especially those of the Presbyterian order, are nowhere to be found than in our Minutes of 1861 and 1865. But the question simply is as to the form and extent of the acknowledgment. This statement is established by well known facts :

“1. At the close of the war, when brethren of the Northern Church were present in our Synods and Presbyteries, they were invited to sit as corresponding members.

“2. As soon as a Christian salutation was sent by their Assembly, it was unanimously reciprocated. But.

“3. In 1870, and subsequently, we declined a proposal for an interchange of delegates, which would recognise each other as corresponding bodies, on the distinct ground that this has always been regarded as the most manifest and visible consummation, and the most complete evi-

dence, of such relations. Like the sending of ambassadors between nations, this interchange of delegates carries with it the fullest significance of fellowship, and we declined it unless our grievances should first be removed.

“ This proposition has been confirmed by the action of the Assemblies of 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, and 1881. To accede, then, to the requests now presented would be nothing less than a surrender of this position. Having been most carefully taken, and its rightfulness reaffirmed so deliberately and repeatedly, it should not be yielded now except under most controlling considerations.

“ And this introduces a second reason for not granting the requests here referred to, viz. :

“ 2. Because the position aforesaid was right and proper. If it was wrong, no considerations of consistency are worthy of regard for a moment. The only upright way of dealing with acknowledged wrong is to confess it, and as far as possible to repair it. But as to the righteousness of our position, we may safely refer—

“ (1.) To the fact that we have never, in a single instance, assumed an aggressive attitude towards the Northern Presbyterian Church, but, on the contrary, have explicitly declared that ‘ no grievances experienced by us, however real, would justify us in the acts of aggression or a spirit of malice against any branch of Christ's visible kingdom.’

“ (2.) To the fact that no instance is known to us in modern times in which one part of the denomination of Christians has heaped upon another such extreme and odious accusations, ‘ extending, as they do, to heresy and blasphemy.’

“ (3.) To the fact that any retraction, even the least, has not only remained unoffered, but has been repeatedly refused.

“ The lapse of time changes many things, but can make no change whatever in such a record of aspersions. If true, we are not worthy of their confidence and respect. If untrue, Christian honor, manliness, and truth require them to be withdrawn. So long as they remain upon record they are a perpetual offence, and an impassable barrier to the kind and degree of official intercourse referred to in the papers aforesaid.

“ 3. A third reason for not acceding to this request is because it would inflict a grievous wound upon the bosom of our Church. Even supposing it could be agreed to hold in abeyance the considerations already presented—to waive the whole question of consistency and of right—there is, to say the least, a great multitude in our communion, and among our very best people, who would feel deeply aggrieved by the step proposed. They have intensely sympathised with our beloved Church in all her sorrows and trials, and when our General Assembly has through all these trying times vindicated her Christian honor against

the aspersions of her assailants, they have rejoiced to recognise in it the protection of their own. Will the time ever come when that protection shall fail? Can the sending of delegates to the Northern Assembly furnish any compensation for the infliction of such an injury upon our own body?

"In reference to the co-operation, suggested in the work of Foreign and Home Evangelisation, it may be answered:

"1. As to co-operation in the foreign field, our Assembly of last year, in response to our Presbyterian Alliance, has placed that whole subject in the most favorable attitude looking to such co-operation as may be found practicable with all the 'Reformed Churches.'

"2. In reference to the work of home evangelisation, this Assembly does hereby declare its readiness to co-operate, in every way which may be found practicable and judicious, with all of the 'Reformed Churches,' in the undertaking which we are now struggling to advance, but with efforts and means so utterly inadequate to its vastness and importance. We refer to the work of building up a separate Presbyterian Church of the colored people, according to the policy accepted by all evangelical denominations in the Southern States, and in general more earnestly desired by the population of African descent themselves, than by any other.

"Finally, the General Assembly deems the present occasion suitable to counsel all the members of our beloved Church to cherish sentiments of brotherly-kindness and charity towards their brethren of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, (as, indeed, towards their fellow-Christians everywhere,) and to co-operate with them, as far as practicable, in every good work; thus manifesting to the world the great truth that, notwithstanding the imperfections and divisions in the Church of Christ, there is still a unity and a communion of saints which is of priceless value."

A motion to adopt being made, Dr. Pitzer proposed to the Committee that the reasons for declining to do as the overtures requested be omitted. But this was declined, on the ground that it was necessary that the reasons be given. A motion to recommit being lost, Dr. Lefevre took the floor, earnestly protesting the devotion to the Southern Church of those border congregations from whom some of the overtures had come, and urging the Assembly not to omit the last reason if it should see fit to deny the requests. Dr. Pitzer explained that his proposal to the Committee had been made in the interest of peace and to secure unanimity. For himself he had been in favor of fraternal correspondence ever since the Northern Assembly had said that all their past action

touching the Southern Church was "null and void." The report says, "It is only a question of form and extent;" he believes in going further. Dr. Richardson, of Richmond, was ready to abide contented the action of the Church, but believed the interests of religion demand forgiveness and magnanimity. "They," he said, "have hardly used harsher words than our declaration that they had taken the crown from Christ's head and tied it to Cæsar's wheels."

Mr. Tenney, of Texas, opposed Dr. Pitzer's motion to strike out the reasons, because it did not go far enough. He was opposed to the report because he favored fraternal relations. The work in Texas demands this course. We are losing all the while on this account. Brethren speak of losses likely to occur should we establish correspondence. Perhaps a half dozen might go, but we may lose scores, if we don't act now. He therefore proposed the following substitute for the report:

Resolved, That this Assembly, while not receding from its position as heretofore taken in protesting against certain grievances which we claim have been inflicted by the Northern Presbyterian General Assembly upon us, and while we do not think that they have done all that they ought to have done toward removing these grievances, yet does now agree to send a delegate or delegates to bear our fraternal greetings to the Northern Presbyterian Assembly, now in session at Springfield, Ill., and are ready to co-operate with them in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation."

Mr. Brown of Lexington Presbytery, Mr. Lumpkin of Georgia, Dr. Bryson of Huntsville, and Mr. Gordon of Virginia, followed in a similar strain, the latter reading the action of our Assembly in 1870, condemning the political enactments of the Northern Assembly. Dr. Farris, of St. Louis, reviewed at some length the steps taken to secure a withdrawal of the offensive aspersions; named several eminent brethren in the Northern Church who hold that it ought to be done; proclaimed his desire for fraternal relations on terms honorable to all alike; repudiated the declaration that that the Reunited Assembly is not responsible for the debts of its constituents, though it carefully claims all the assets.

On Tuesday the debate was resumed by Mr. Tenney, who observed that the advocates of the report was mostly *old* men.

We respect them, but do not need to hear these battles of the past rehearsed. Recalling our wrongs is not the way to promote that peace and friendship which all profess to desire. Mr. Leyburn, of Missouri, feared that there is too much of the old war spirit in those who oppose fraternal relations. He objected to the declaration that correspondence involves the sacrifice of principle. By telegraphing our salutations we have virtually done the thing already; and so by sending delegates to the Pan-Presbyterian Council. We have no right to ask more than they have already done in declaring their former action "null and void."

Mr. Collier proposed to add to Dr. Brown's report the following as a fourth reason:

"Recognising the obligation to do unto others as we would that others do unto us, we hereby express our willingness to disavow any and all acts on our part, past or present, of which rightful complaint may be made, deemed by our Northern brethren derogatory or offensive to them, and so signify our willingness cheerfully to exert our best efforts in clearing the way of all difficulties to full fraternal correspondence. And until such expressions are mutual, fraternal relations are not desirable."

Dr. Brown, Chairman of the Committee, reviewed at length and with signal ability the negotiations between the Assemblies. We must not allow "the world" to force us into measures which disregard principle. They would have us to open our arms to all sects, regardless of creeds. "Nor must we be so anxious for their money as to forget *how* we obtained it."

Mr. Tenney (interrupting)—"That is just what I *am* particular about—asking for money when we cannot show fraternal feelings."

Dr. Brown—"I suggest four questions: 1. Have we been wronged? 2. Have we vindicated ourselves, and how? 3. Has that wrong been rectified? and, 4. What is our duty in the premises?" In answering these questions he read extracts from their Minutes; traced out all the steps taken to procure retraction, and said: "Are these words sufficient? Let me illustrate by a case. You go to a man and say, 'You have put an insult on the name of my mother.' If he replies, 'We have formed a partnership, in which nothing of the past should have any force

unless reënacted by the united firm;’ or, ‘I did not do it this year, but ten years ago; and let the dead past bury its dead;’ or, ‘I have a very great respect for you and your mother, and though I did make imputations, nothing that I have ever said is to be construed as an imputation.’ ”

In reply to Mr. Gordon, he said that there was a great difference between their aspersions of us and what was said by us at Louisville. They had asked us to state our complaints, and this was one of them. He was free to say that he did not defend the wisdom of that utterance as a preliminary to correspondence, whereas it properly belonged to organic union. But the *circumstances* make a world of difference between what we said and what we complain of. As for Mr. Leyburn’s remark touching the Council, he would say, that there were doubtless men for whom we might have great respect, whom we would salute on the street and shake hands with in the bank, but we did not ask them into our families, for good reasons.

Dr. Girardeau felt that after the able speech of the Chairman there was hardly need for a long speech, but he could not be altogether silent. The mere allegation of fallibility in all councils and synods does not warrant a change of action; caution is the legitimate inference. To infer change, one must be prepared to show error in the action complained of. As to what has been said of forgiveness, he would suggest the difference between forgiveness in one’s heart and the act of saying to the wrong-doer, “I forgive you;” the latter step pre-supposes manifest repentance. The wrongs inflicted are against the Bride of Christ, whose character we are bound to defend. They have expressed confidence in our *present* character, but our present is our past. We have not repented. We are still separate. He objected to fraternal correspondence because the arguments by which it is urged would naturally lead on to organic union.

The discussion for the day closed with a speech from Dr. Lane, of Georgia, in favor of fraternal correspondence. But the next morning Dr. Pitzer rose to a question of privilege, moving to postpone unfinished business in order to consider the following paper:

"Resolved, That the following telegram, signed by the Clerks and Moderator, be immediately telegraphed to the General Assembly at Springfield, Ill.: 'Will it please your Assembly for each body to remove aspersions cast upon the Christian character of the other, and exchange delegates?'"

Dr. Brown rejoiced in such a paper from that side, but could not see how it was a question of privilege. After some discussion on the point of order, Dr. Brown read the following resolution, "which," he said, "I was writing just as Dr. Pitzer rose to speak. I believe good results will follow, if this paper of mine, Dr. Pitzer's, and Mr. Collier's, be all referred to the Committee on Correspondence, with the addition of other brethren holding different views. My paper is this:

"In answer to overtures from Presbyteries and others, asking this Assembly to send delegates to the Northern General Assembly, this Assembly does hereby declare that if there be any utterances of the Southern General Assembly which can be interpreted as containing imputations upon the Christian honor and character of the Northern General Assembly, they are to be regretted, and are hereby withdrawn; and whenever the Northern Assembly shall take similar action, this Assembly will rejoice in an interchange of delegates."

The papers were referred, together with the following from Dr. E. P. Palmer:

"Resolved, That this Assembly send a telegram, signed by the Moderator and Clerk, to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, expressing our desire to co-operate with that body, as far as practicable, in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation, and our readiness to correspond by an exchange of delegates for the promotion of that end."

Also the following from Mr. Kerr, of Savannah:

"We suggest the following minute for the action of your Assembly: While receding from no principles, we hereby disown all expressions which may be regarded as reflecting upon, or offensive to, the Northern General Assembly. Will you adopt this minute *mutatis mutandis*?"

About noon the Committee entered the room, Dr. Brown expressing great pleasure that they had agreed upon a report which would harmonise the Assembly and the Church, he was sure.

"The Committee on Foreign Correspondence report to the General Assembly that five overtures have been placed in their hands, viz.,

from the Presbytery of Abingdon, Atlanta, Holston, South Alabama, and Maryland. Also, a resolution offered by Rev. A. W. Pitzer, D. D. The object of all these overtures, with some slight differences in their forms of expression, is the same. They desire and respectfully request this General Assembly to establish fully and formally what are called 'fraternal relations' with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, by sending forthwith a delegate or delegates to that body, now in session at Springfield, Ill. The resolution referred to proposes also that such delegation shall convey an expression of 'our willingness to co-operate with that body, as far as may be practicable, in the work of Home and Foreign Evangelisation.' After the most careful consideration your Committee have been able to give to the weighty matter involved, they recommend to the Assembly the adoption of the following paper :

"In order to remove all difficulties in the way of that full and formal fraternal correspondence for which, on our part, we are so earnestly desirous, we adopt the following minute :

"That while receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon, or offensive to, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

"Resolved, That a copy of this paper be sent by telegraph to the General Assembly, now in session at Springfield, Ill., for their prayerful consideration, and, *mutatis mutandis*, for their reciprocal concurrence, as affording a basis for the exchange of delegates forthwith."

Dr. Arbuthnot moved its adoption by a rising vote.

Dr. Brown—We say, *first*, if we have said anything harsh, we regret and withdraw it; then we ask them to do the same.

Mr. Hopkins—I want to know what we withdraw. It seems to me a confession which I do not wish to make.

Dr. Brown—We make no specification; we leave that to the individual conscience. Let each party decide in his own mind how much it means.

Mr. Hopkins—I want to know what we have said that was offensive.

Dr. Brown—The report neither affirms nor denies. It leaves us non-committal as to whether we have said anything that is offensive.

Rev. H. C. Alexander, D. D.—I am satisfied that we have never said anything *intended* to be offensive; there may be something which has been understood in that way.

Dr. McIlwaine moved the previous question. The resolution was adopted by an almost unanimous vote, there being but three dissenting votes—Rev. Roger Martin of North Carolina, Rev. Donald McQueen, and Mr. W. G. Vardell, of South Carolina. Thereupon Dr. Henry C. Alexander was called upon to lead the Assembly in prayer.

After an interval of several days a reply came from Springfield, stating that the paper forwarded by our Assembly known as the "Concurrent Resolution," had been adopted with enthusiasm and by a vote almost unanimous. However, before action could be taken, another telegram was received, headed "Personal," which excepted from the action taken in the "Concurrent Resolution" all the deliverances of former Assemblies touching "loyalty" and "the rebellion." These telegrams will be here inserted in their order:

"That while receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon or offensive to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

"Resolved, That a copy of this paper be sent by telegraph to the General Assembly now in session at Springfield, Ill., for their prayerful consideration, and, *mutatis mutandis*, for their reciprocal concurrence, as affording a basis for the exchange of delegates forthwith."

"SPRINGFIELD, ILL., May 26.

"To the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in session at Atlanta, Georgia—from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America:

"The following report from the Committee on Correspondence was adopted this morning. The Moderator is instructed to telegraph to the Moderator of the General Assembly in session at Atlanta, Ga., that his telegram is received with warm enthusiasm by this Assembly, and in order to remove all difficulties in the way of that full and formal fraternal correspondence between the two Assemblies which we are on our part prepared to accept, we adopt the following, to wit: While receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon or offensive to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and we renew the expression of our warm fraternal regard for all who compose its communion, and our readiness to exchange delegates forthwith.

HERRICK JOHNSON, Moderator.

WM. H. ROBERTS, Permanent Clerk."

“SPRINGFIELD, May 26.

“*To R. K. Smoot—“Personal”—Moderator Assembly, Atlanta, Ga. :*

“As a matter of information, and in justice to all parties, I would say that our Assembly’s action on your basis for fraternal relations was taken. *mutatis mutandis*, with great heartiness, only two or three dissenting. Pending our action the following resolution was passed:

“*Resolved*, That in the action now to be taken we disclaim any reference to the acts of previous Assemblies concerning loyalty and rebellion, but only to those concerning schism, heresy, and blasphemy.’ We were led in prayer after final action, and sang the doxology amidst grateful and profound feeling. We shall welcome words from your Assembly concerning delegates.
HERRICK JOHNSON.”

“*To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in session in Springfield, Ill.—from the General Assembly in session at Atlanta, Ga. :*

“If the action of your Assembly telegraphed by your Moderator to our Moderator does not modify the Concurrent Resolution adopted by your Assembly and ours, we are prepared to send delegates forthwith.

“R. K. SMOOT, Moderator.”

“SPRINGFIELD, May 27.

“*To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States at Atlanta, Ga. :*

“The action referred to does not modify, but it explains the Concurrent Resolution, and the explanation is on the face of the action. There is nothing behind it or between the lines. The dissolution of our Assembly is near at hand. We may be ready for final adjournment this evening. The exchange of delegates is impossible before Tuesday. Shall we not each appoint delegates this day to visit the respective Assemblies next year? We await your answer with deep and prayerful interest.

“HERRICK JOHNSON, Moderator.

“WILLIAM H. ROBERTS, Clerk.”

“ATLANTA, May 27.

“*Resolved*, 1st. That this Assembly does hereby declare its entire satisfaction with the full and explicit terms in which the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has expressed its reciprocal concurrence in the paper transmitted to said Assembly on fraternal correspondence.

“2. That we do unfeignedly rejoice, and render thanksgiving to God, in an event suited to take away the reproach of alienation between bodies holding the same standards of faith and tending to bring peace to our borders.

“3. That inasmuch as it is impracticable at this date to have an in-

terchange of delegates, the Assembly does hereby appoint Rev. William Brown, D. D., Rev. T. A. Hoyt, D. D., and Hon. B. M. Estes, principals, and Rev. R. P. Farris, D. D., Rev. H. C. Alexander, D. D., and Hon. Patrick Joyes, alternates, to bear to the next General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America our cordial Christian salutation."

We had confidently expected to receive ere this time a review of "Fraternal Relations" by Dr. Brown, the Chairman of the Committee on Correspondence, but his recent indisposition has so delayed its preparation that we are forced to go to press without it. This, however, is less to be regretted because Dr. Brown's discussion will be given to the Church through the Presbyterian newspapers, so that it will have met the reader's eye before the more slowly moving REVIEW can have reached him.

Now, upon the important topic which has been impartially outlined as it was developed in the Assembly, we shall submit a few comments.

1. And first, it seems clear to the writer that, so far as the action contained in the "Concurrent Resolution" is concerned, the mind of the Church will surely come into full accord with the Assembly.

The charge of *inconsistency* will not lie against the Committee or those members of the Assembly who sustained the first report because they finally voted for the Concurrent Resolution. The above outline will show that the first report was recommended as the Assembly's answer to the proposal that we should ignore the basis of correspondence propounded by our Commissioners in the Baltimore Conference and send our delegates to the Northern Assembly without any withdrawal of their aspersions. To this proposition the Committee recommended that an emphatic reply in the negative be given; and had the vote been taken, it is our candid opinion that the Assembly would have carried out the Committee's recommendation. It would have stood by the Baltimore platform, though there would have been a large minority vote against the report. But by adopting the Concurrent Resolution the Committee and the Assembly determined so far to gratify those who had sent up the overtures as to approach our

brethren in a Christian manner, asking them whether they would now withdraw their offensive imputations. There was no inconsistency whatever in proposing or voting for such action.

Moreover, the action had much to commend it. It unified the Assembly, as it promised to unite the Church. For it is a palpable fact that many of our most devoted adherents have been troubled by the air of mere passivity which our Church seemed to wear through these long years of negotiation. It is always a dangerous posture in war or diplomacy. It is oftentimes harder to hold a line than to assault one, to stand a charge than to make one. But when alienation has been effected, no matter how, there is always a presumption in favor of the disciple who is active in making demonstrations toward peace. He always *seems* to be most desirous of removing the "offence," even when it can be demonstrated that not one of his proposals ought to be accepted. It is natural, too, that such difficulties should press more heavily upon our brethren who live along the border than upon those in the interior. This does not argue less attachment to the principles which we hold in common. In many cases the intimation would be a cruel injustice. If one may speak as a pastor, the writer can say from observation that he knows many devoted children of our Church, who, holding firmly to the conviction of the injustice of our brethren, have yet longed to see her move forward and show that she loved peace by actions as well as by suffering. The action of our Assembly in forwarding the Concurrent Resolution was a measure eminently fitted to give relief to these tender consciences.

But it has been said that the means adopted were questionable. "We had never said hard and offensive things about them. Why, therefore, should we seem to imply that we *had*, by expressing regret for and withdrawal of any such expressions?" The same assumption was made, we observe, in the Northern Assembly, Dr. Humphrey observing during their discussions that it might be said to the credit of the Southern Church that we had never said such things. But a reference to the outline of the debate in our Assembly will show that members on both sides of the question *did* recal words spoken on one occasion by our Assem-

bly which had a severe and harsh sound. The writer, had he been allowed a vote, could have adopted that clause most heartily; for, happening to be a member of the Assembly of 1870, he objected to the words then, in the Committee on Correspondence and on the floor, not only for the reason intimated by Dr. Brown in his reply to Mr. Gordon, but also because of the sharp, biting rhetoric, as it seemed to him, in which the thought had been clothed. Doubtless the majority felt as those who commented on the words did—Dr. Brown and the others—that they could wish they had not been uttered by us; and they were glad that the only severe, or seemingly severe, words which had passed our lips could be honorably withdrawn.

Nor can the writer now see anything impolitic in our Church seeking to establish fraternal relations on this honorable basis, because it may lead to organic union. This is evidently the idea entertained by many at the North. The astute editor of the *New York Observer* hastens to say:

“With such important demonstrations before our eyes, all made within one short week, it requires no spirit of prophecy to predict that a formal reunion of the Churches cannot long be delayed. The wedge that has kept them apart has been the view which each Assembly has taken of the other's acts during and consequent upon the war. That wedge has now been removed by the spontaneous action of the Southern Assembly, and the concordant action of the Northern. What more is there to be said or done?”

Other journals in that region have followed Dr. Prime's lead, the *Philadelphia Presbyterian* bringing up the rear. But do not our brethren know that we have been for years in close and affectionate intercourse with the Reformed (Dutch) Church? In their conservative adhesion to the standards, they are far nearer to our type of thought and feeling than are our former associates of the Reunited Assembly. Let them be assured that we will not give up our peace and freedom for the bitter contests in store for us should we enter their great but somewhat miscellaneous Church. We cannot abide their *penchant* for politics, as shown by resolutions touching the civil rights of the Indians, and the Federal legislation about Chinese immigration, and the Mormons. Their recent behavior should settle that question with us; for to us it

seems as though, when put to the test, our brethren clung to their political deliverances as the Ephesians to that blessed image which fell down from Jupiter. We cannot approve of their allowing women, contrary, as we hold, to the word of God, to preach, as they do, in their pulpits, and even in presence of Presbyteries, on resolution of the body. We fear their departures from the faith, as foreshadowed in the illy-disguised advocacy among teachers in their Theological Seminaries of the theories of Weiss and Wellhausen. Let the able men whom God has given to be, in a fair and honorable sense, the leaders of our Church do their duty in teaching the truth to our people. They shall see that we will not barter our liberty to become a helpless minority in an Assembly that is already overgrown.¹

2. But this brings us to consider that part of the Assembly's action which followed the adoption of the "Concurrent Resolution."

There was no occasion whatever, so far as we can see, for the Committee on Correspondence to have assumed, as they did, to solve the riddle of the sphinx. For their so-called explanation in response to the inquiry of our Assembly touching the meaning of their action relative to loyalty and rebellion is a riddle, the interpretation of which awaits a Daniel who is not yet born. But when our Committee went on to say that this explanation was "perfectly satisfactory," they rashly led the Assembly into saying what is far enough from the fact. How the sagacious Chairman, who has served his Church so ably during the whole controversy,

¹ It is with a feeling of surprise and mortification that, on looking over the speeches made on "Fraternal Relations" in the Northern Assembly, we discover allusions to hints dropped by Southern brethren, members of our Assembly, as it would seem, which encouraged the inference that we of the South are ready for a reunion. What was said or telegraphed, we know not; and who may have said it, we do not wish to know. But that the inference is an error we feel fully assured. The people in this region prefer their own independent organisation. Among other intimations of it, one might cite the vote on Mr. Martin's resolution. Some of the most resolute advocates of separation declined to vote because they did not consider the motion to be called for. But the vote was about ten to one in favor of our separate existence.

came to be "taken in" after this fashion, we can only explain by the old formula, "*quandogue bonus dormitat Homerus.*" We suspect that he was misled by the words, "The explanation is on the face of the action; there is nothing between the lines," applying them to their adoption of the Concurrent Resolution. We know that such an impression was widely prevalent in the Assembly. We have been tempted to surmise that the counsel of the young men also proved as disastrous in this instance as it did to Rehoboth.

When that enigmatical answer came, the Committee should have recommended that we wait for further light from them as to their meaning. It would not have been long delayed, if we may judge the feeling of the body from their official reports. Or, if action must be taken immediately, the Committee might have reported something to this effect: "*Resolved*, That accepting the explicit declaration of the Assembly at Springfield that they did not intend to modify the Concurrent Resolution as proposed by us, withdrawing all imputations cast upon either body by the other, we do now, upon that understanding, appoint delegates, and ask them, if they accept our interpretation, to do the same." This would have brought on the issue and completely wiped out the Johnson resolution with its exceptions. The blunder is, in this case, all the harder to bear because we happen to know that a resolution to this effect was prepared by a member of the Assembly after conference with a number of gentlemen, and it was handed to the Committee. The error would have been exposed on the floor, but, unfortunately for all concerned, "the question" was called, and the Assembly being fagged out by long-continued sessions, the call was sustained. This error and its consequences none will regret more than our honored brother, Dr. Brown. And we know him too well to doubt for a moment that he will be the first to apply whatever remedy the occasion may demand; for he will see that truly fraternal relations cannot be established while the matter stands as it is. It will be easy for him to report the painful doubt in the minds of his brethren to our next Assembly, and the delegation of which he is Chairman may call upon the Assembly at Lexington to instruct them as to

their duty in the circumstances. Or the delegation may go on to the other Assembly and say: Our people are in doubt as to your exact intentions in speaking of loyalty and the so-called rebellion as you did. If you only meant to save yourselves from the appearance even of repudiating your principles, while we consider the resolution unnecessary, because the Concurrent Resolution had already done this for you as for us also, yet we have no purpose to object to your excess of caution. But if, as some among us apprehend, you meant us to know that you neither regretted nor withdrew the severe denunciations of us which were mingled with those opinions of yours, please to speak out plainly. We wish not merely the semblance, but the reality of a Christian reconciliation—one that will be alike honorable to you and to us." This will bring out the truth and open our way clearly. The gentlemen associated with Dr. Brown (Dr. Hoyt and Mr. Estes) are also thoroughly well known. They would not consent to remain as our ambassadors in any foreign court which would be understood as reaffirming the fearful aspersions of us intermingled with their expressions about that government to which the loyalty of citizens in these States is, or was, primarily due. Our brethren of the North, be it remembered, went so far in their excitement as to affirm solemnly that our Church was organized in the interests of rebellion, and to aid in perpetuating negro slavery. Worse they could not say, and yet this is part of their deliverances about loyalty and rebellion. The mistake into which our Assembly fell was painful, but it admits of remedy.

And, moreover, we believe that good men at the North will be glad to accord such an explanation. We have spoken with distinguished brethren of their Assembly, who have frankly regretted the resolution which was passed chiefly by the agency of Dr. Johnson, who doubtless meant no harm. The Northern journals, we observe, touch the matter very gingerly. They all feel shy of it, if we do not mistake them, and will be quite as glad to get rid of it, we imagine, as our Church will be. The fact is apparent, that so great was the excitement in their Assembly, as indicated by uproarious applause (of which we had none) and by the confusion in the house, that many of the members had but a very

obscure conception of what they were doing. Upon referring to the "Assembly Edition" of the *Illinois Journal*, which was sent by a member of that Assembly to a friend in the South as containing ample and trustworthy reports of all they did, we find in the reports of May 26th, but published on the 27th, the following colloquy as taking place immediately upon the offering of Dr. Johnson's resolution touching loyalty and rebellion :

"Rev. Mr. Tully inquired if the resolution was to accompany the reply to the South.

"Dr. Johnson : 'It is no part of our action in reference to the Church, South.'

"The rules were suspended, and the resolution adopted.

"A member : 'This is not to be embodied in the returned answer?'

"Dr. Johnson : 'No, sir.'"

Again, in the same paper, under date of May 29th :

"The Moderator : 'I will now seek to make plain, if I may have the ear of every member of the body, the exact status of the case, in order that we may take appropriate action.

"It was thought by the Moderator and other members of the Assembly, upon consultation, that it would be only justice to the body at the South to apprise them of our action taken prior to the action upon the Concurrent Resolution. . [Applause.]

"You will remember that in anticipation of that action, we passed a resolution, simply explanatory, which the Moderator communicated to the Moderator of the Assembly, South, in connexion with the official telegram, in the following telegram sent to him personally.'"

Then follows the telegram as above given, with the word "Personal" affixed to it. The report continues : "To the official telegram to that body, we have received the following reply."

Then follows the telegram of our Assembly, dated "Atlanta, May 26th," as above given, suggesting that charitable construction of Dr. Johnson's resolution, according to which it had not modified the Concurrent Resolution, and inviting an interpretation of it by the other Assembly. Dr. Johnson then proceeded to say that having telegraphed to Atlanta that their Assembly was not then in session, he had in the meanwhile taken the liberty of preparing an answer to the inquiry touching the force of his resolution, which he would now read, with a view to its being adopted and sent to Atlanta as the Assembly's reply to our

telegram. Then follows the reply in which occurs the enigmatical phrase, "does not modify, but it explains," etc.

A motion to adopt having been made and seconded, then followed some promiscuous talk about the practicability of an exchange of delegates during the present session of the Assemblies. This was cut short by impatient cries of "Question! Question!" Whereupon "Judge Moore, of Chicago, moved to amend by striking out the words 'in explanation.'¹ If these words were stricken out there would be an end of the controversy, which all so much desired. [Applause.]"

Drs. Phraner and Niccolls opposed the amendment—the former on the ground that, if Dr. Johnson's motion touching "loyalty and the rebellion" had not been passed previously, the Assembly's vote on the Concurrent Resolution would have been different; the latter because the Southern brethren had never asked an apology for deliverances about loyalty and the war. The Moderator then put the question on the adoption of the paper as prepared by himself, when Judge Moore reminded him of the amendment. Dr. Briggs, amid some confusion in the house, called attention to the complications brought in by Judge Moore's amendment, "which operated, he said, as a virtual reconsideration of the former action. The words 'but it explains' mean something." "If," he inquired, "it neither modifies nor explains, what does it do?" [A conundrum, we respectfully suggest, only second to the one raised by the Moderator, *i. e.*, How can it explain without modifying?]

The stenographic report shows more of desultory talk, amidst which the Moderator called upon the Assembly not to become excited over a minor point. At length Judge Moore is reported as saying: "I find a great many of my friends prefer that I should withdraw the amendment, and I am willing and do withdraw it." [Great applause.]

Now from this it is clear: (1.) That the Moderator's paper touching "loyalty and the rebellion" was adopted as a sort of compromise among themselves, and with the full understanding

¹An evident error for "but it explains."

that it did not affect us and was *not* to be sent to us. Dr. Johnson's words are: "*It is no part of our action in reference to the Church, South.*" Again, in reply to an inquiry as to whether it was to be sent to us, he said distinctly, "*No, sir.*" (2.) It is also clear that the mind of the Northern Assembly was in a state of *obfuscation*, hardly equalled by that even of the Atlanta Assembly, or of its Committee. (3.) The telegram marked "Personal" was sent by Dr. Johnson to Dr. Smoot, on his own *responsibility* (which we imagine he meant to vindicate by the word "Personal"), and without the action of his Assembly, or even its knowledge.

These things being so, we for our part are heartily glad that Dr. Johnson changed his mind about his ill-advised paper, and notified us of it. He has managed, no doubt with the best intentions, to create about as much trouble and confusion as any good man is likely to have the chance of doing between this date and the end of the nineteenth century; but the mischief done is of small consequence to what might have happened had our Assembly been allowed to act in ignorance of that paper. A moderate show of manliness and good temper will set this all right; the other might have been serious indeed, by bringing reproach upon Christian honesty and candor. As it is, we are sure that our brethren tried to do right, though they failed egregiously. Indeed, neither Assembly did what it intended to do. One adopted a paper which it imagined did not concern its sister, and was not to be made known to her at all. But it *was* made known to her all the same, and it proves to be of the deepest concern to her good name. The other, in her haste, takes action upon it that, if left to stand, will forever prove a barrier in the way of cordiality between many of the children of the two families.

Further explanation is needed, and of a very different sort, if we may say so without offence, than the riddle sent back to us by the Northern Assembly, at the instance of its Moderator. That paper on "loyalty and the rebellion" "*means something.*" Dr. Briggs, in his wisdom, said so, and the bewildered Assembly seems to have agreed with him by failing to adopt Judge Moore's

amendment to strike out the words "but it explains." Had the amendment prevailed, the enigma would have been solved most happily, for their reply to us would then have read: "The action referred to does not modify the Concurrent Resolution;" that is, our brethren would then have said in effect: "We stand by all our principles, but withdraw all abusive imputations against your character." The purpose of the resolution on "loyalty and the rebellion" would under that explanation be only to let their own people see more explicitly what the Concurrent Resolution guarantees to both parties. But it so happens that the worst things (if there can be degrees in such sweeping condemnations) that they have said of us are precisely under the head of "loyalty and the rebellion." We find a sample in one of our religious journals which is in point. In 1865 they said: "A large number of Presbyteries and Synods in the Southern States whose names are on the roll of the General Assembly as constituent parts of this body, have organised an Assembly denominated 'the General Assembly of the Confederate States of America,' in order to render their aid in the attempt to establish, by means of the rebellion, a separate national existence to conserve and perpetuate the system of slavery." But such deliverances as these—the most horrible of all—our brethren have seemingly exempted from consideration when they adopted the Concurrent Resolution. They stand, not only as testimonies of their opinion upon the *political* question which divided the country—the question whose solution depends entirely upon the *nature* of that government which our fathers established by means of that instrument known as the Constitution of the United States—but also as their solemn declaration of the purposes for which our General Assembly was organised. With their political opinions we have no concern whatever in this connexion. The Concurrent Resolution exempts them. But the ascription of a political end to our Church's very being is a matter that demands attention. There can be no fraternal relations which deserve the name while they refuse to consider that offensive aspersion with a view to its withdrawal. Progress has been made, but errors require to be corrected. In this work our

brethren are as much interested as we are. They can no more afford to encumber their records with such enigmas as, in their perplexity, they allowed Drs. Johnson, Niccolls, and Briggs to persuade them to adopt, than we can afford to remain in doubt as to the imputations which cluster about their enactments as to "loyalty and the rebellion." Christian candor and self-respect require a full understanding between friends.

WM. E. BOGGS.