

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 4.

—————◆—————
OCTOBER, MDCCCLXXI.
—————◆—————

ARTICLE I.

THE REFORMATION IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, CONTEMPLATED IN SOME OF ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS.

When we speak of second causes, it must never be forgotten that the concurrence of at least two of them is necessary to the production of an effect. Hence we speak of the *causes*, not the *cause* of the Reformation, because we are here concerned with secondary causation only. The first cause we of course acknowledge to be God. The Reformation was a great work of his holy spirit, a mighty revival of the work which he had been doing ever since the utterance of the first promise in the garden of Eden. It was a re-formation, a restoration of the Church to the word of God, which constitutes its form, as the Holy Ghost constitutes its life. But the work of God amongst men is performed under the conditions of time and place. And there are very many circumstances attending and concurring, in regard to some or all of which we might confidently affirm that they were causes *sine qua non*, conditions without which the great event would not have taken place, or if it had taken place, would not have been the same event, or been followed by the same results.

Our Saviour, in his parables, frequently likens the processes of the kingdom of heaven to the processes of vegetable and
VOL. XXII., NO. 4.—1.

particular synod would prove itself more worthy of confidence? If the synods bring their claims to manage these things in competition with those of the Assembly, why will the presbyteries not follow the example and bring theirs in conflict with those of the synods? And if the work of separation and disintegration is countenanced by the synods and the presbyteries, is it not almost certain that the churches will fall into the same current of disorganisation? And where shall we be then, but on the broad sea of Independency and Congregationalism? And how shall we work then, if we feel inclined to work at all, but on the voluntary plan, and thus dishonor the great Head of the Church, whose plan we shall ignore and set aside altogether?

ARTICLE VI.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1871.

The Assembly at Huntsville, Ala., lasted from Thursday, 18th May, at 11 o'clock a. m., until Thursday, the 25th May, at 2 o'clock p. m. It was, as is generally agreed, a good Assembly, and a pleasant Assembly. Huntsville is a beautiful town, with its grand mountain scenery, and its magnificent spring, and its refined, generous, and hospitable people. The attendance was very full and the material of the body excellent, both as to ministers and elders. This is certainly a matter of great consequence, and every Presbytery should bear it in mind when electing its commissioners. Let us put away from us completely all ideas of rotation in these elections, and let Presbyteries always send as their representatives their best men. This does not mean their oldest men or their greatest men, but the men who will in their judgment best discharge the duty.

THE MODERATOR.

The retiring Moderator, Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., delivered a discourse upon "The Form of Sound Words," from 2 Tim. i.

13, and Titus i. 9, the doctrine being that Church teachers and Church rulers must maintain a strict and harmonious conformity to revealed doctrine. Drs. Hill, Wills, Porter, Plumer, Kirkpatrick, and Mr. Berry, were nominated to the chair. Leave was granted for the names of Drs. Kirkpatrick and Wills to be withdrawn. On the first ballot the vote stood: Hill, 30; Porter, 27; Berry, 6; Plumer, 34. The second ballot was by the Moderator's ruling upon the two highest names, and it stood, Hill 44, Plumer 49. Nobody who knew him expected anything else than that, as moderator, Dr. Plumer would give entire satisfaction; and these expectations were not disappointed, for he presided with dignity and courtesy, only equalled by his skill and promptness. Possibly strangers might have supposed his venerable form and patriarchal beard betokened the feebleness of old age; but every such impression must have been dissipated as they saw his quick perception of every point that presented itself in the debates, and observed the unflagging watchfulness with which he presided, and the agility with which he rose to put every question. If it is a matter of importance to have suitable material in the commissioners to an Assembly, it is certainly important to have a good moderator. Both the comfort and the efficiency of the body depend upon it. The man who presides over an Assembly well, performs a service greater perhaps than two or three of the ablest and most industrious men upon the floor. Let us never elect for compliment, but only for service.

The opinion has been expressed that Dr. Plumer's election was contrary to Presbyterian usage, because he had once before been moderator of the Assembly. We were ourselves of that opinion very decidedly, and therefore when we first heard of Dr. Plumer's election regretted it not a little. Reflection has somewhat modified our opinion. Is our Church the same Church in whose Assembly Dr. Plumer presided before? If so, his election certainly was contrary to the usage. But we came out of that Church as truly as the Reformers out of the Church of Rome. We took a new name, adopted standards and a psalmody for ourselves, organised our Church schemes after a new fashion, and have set up no claim to any portion of that Church's funds.

These things would seem to show that we can not be said in every sense of the terms to be *the same Church*. At the same time, it is true that the very presbyteries over which Dr. Plumer presided at Huntsville were present when he sat before in the moderator's chair, and he did therefore once before preside over them as their moderator. It is also true, that we justly claim all the glorious history of the Old School Presbyterian Church in this country as in part ours, and, accordingly, all the noble line of former moderators our Church must and will claim as partly hers. On the whole, the question is an open one, and we are not prepared, after much consideration, to take very positive ground on either side of it.

THE REPORTER OF THE ASSEMBLY.

This was an officer serving informally, indeed, yet most efficiently—the Rev. Geo. L. Wolfe, of the Presbytery of Chesapeake. *The Central*, *The Southern*, and *The Southwestern Presbyterian* newspapers shared the expense and the advantage of his labors amongst them. His reports were admitted to be exceedingly full and accurate, so that multitudes not privileged to be present can read, by his labor and skill, the exact words spoken on the Assembly's floor. We wish the Assembly could always have him for reporter.

PLACE OF THE NEXT MEETING.

This business came up at the outset of the proceedings on the second day. Richmond and Wilmington were put in nomination, and the former was chosen by a majority of eleven votes. The First church was first selected, but subsequently it appeared that an invitation had been sent on from the Grace Street church (Dr. Read's) of that city, which by some accident had been mislaid. The matter being reconsidered, and the admirable accommodations which that church building offers to the Assembly having been set forth, it was chosen as the place for the next meeting.

REVISION OF THE BOOK OF CHURCH ORDER.

A report from the chairman of this Committee (Dr. Adger)

informed the Assembly that it had not been possible to obtain a full meeting of the Committee during the year, and requested a continuance of the Committee. Drs. Peck and Pryor were for discharging the Committee and indefinitely postponing the whole matter. Drs. Miller, Kirkpatrick, and Hendrick, maintained that the results of the revision thus far had been most valuable to the Church, and they urged that ample time be allowed for presbyteries to examine the work, and especially that the Committee should be instructed to confine their labors to the Book of Discipline. Leave was granted for the motion of indefinite postponement to be withdrawn, and the question recurred on the continuance of the Committee. Mr. Berry and Mr. Strahan opposed it. Dr. McInnis said we have a second order of the day much more important, and moved to docket this and take up that. His motion was lost. Dr. J. R. Wilson reminded the house that the answers of the presbyteries in 1869 had been referred by that Assembly in one mass to this Committee for examination and collation. This work the Committee had been doing, and now it was proposed to cut them off in mid career. Dr. Wills thought no good would come of this work. The new book is full of crotchets which are not Presbyterian, and will damage Presbyterianism. The Church wants life rather than law. Dr. Samuel J. Baird said the principles of Presbyterian church government are found in the Scriptures; the details as found in our Constitution are of less than one century's standing, and some of these are the results of compromises of principle by various parties, involving as a consequence the emasculation of the Church's strength and energy. Moreover, our present book is adapted in its details to the small and dense population of Scotland, and not to this country; to a period one century back, and not to this age. Missions are hardly named in our book, and the Sabbath-school is utterly unknown to it. He urged moreover that the examination of the book of ministers and laymen had been of great service to the Church, and wished the Committee continued, but not restricted in their labors; but desired that they in their wisdom select such portions of their work to be reported from time to time as it might be convenient for

the Church to consider. The motion to instruct the Committee was not agreed to, and the question recurred on continuing the Committee. Mr. Cater said the oldest member of his Presbytery had pronounced that the leading principles of the new book were neither in the Scotch standards nor the Bible. The motion to continue the Committee was agreed to.

It is gratifying to note the intelligent conservatism which thus marked the Assembly's decision. Touching the actual condition of opinion throughout our presbyteries as to this revision, there was some error in the statements of some of the speakers. It is very far from being correct, that the Church has "almost unanimously rejected the Committee's work." How could that be the judgment of the Church, and yet her Assembly year after year manifest such a different estimate? In this very Assembly several men of influence exhibited the desire to put an end to this whole undertaking, yet the Assembly refused to sustain them. *First*, there was a motion for indefinite postponement of the subject, which upon discussion was withdrawn. Then, *secondly*, there was a motion to confine the Committee for the present to the Book of Discipline; and whilst that was under discussion, there was, *thirdly*, another motion to docket this business and take up what the mover thought was "much more important." But the Assembly differed with this opinion. Then, *fourthly*, the Assembly voted not to confine the Committee to the Discipline. *Fifthly*, and finally, it voted to continue the Committee without any restrictions. These proceedings of the Huntsville Assembly, as well as those of Louisville and Mobile and other Assemblies, show that it must be an error to suppose that our Church is generally, not to say unanimously, unfavorable to the revision. But we have it on the very best authority, that a careful collation of the answers of presbyteries to the Assembly at Louisville, which were all referred back to the original committee by that Assembly, reveals a very different state of opinion amongst the presbyteries generally from what some of the speakers in the late Assembly supposed to exist. Out of some thirty-nine presbyteries which responded to the Mobile Assembly's overture, not more than three expressed

the desire to have the revision come to an end. The remainder expressed themselves generally favorable to the revision, if certain changes could be made in that document. A number of the largest presbyteries went through a very minute and thorough revisal of the revision and indicated all the changes they desired; whilst nearly all the presbyteries pointed out more generally their corrections. It may not be amiss to state here, on the same authority, that there is not one captious criticism amongst the many offered, and not one which exhibits any other disposition towards the revision than to make it as perfect as possible. And further, that nine out of ten of all the changes suggested are such as the Committee of Revision must themselves unhesitatingly approve and recommend; so that, in the language of members of that Committee, the collation manifests these two things—*first*, that the revision is at least fifty per cent. the better for the work bestowed on it by the presbyteries; and, *secondly*, that there is one hundred per cent. more ground to believe now than previously to this examination of it by the presbyteries, that it is destined to be adopted by the Church. Meanwhile it is getting to be more and more the fact, that this revision is the work not of any committee, but of the whole Church. And this, of course, is the best possible augury both for the acceptableness and the goodness of the work.

THE PROPOSED UNIVERSITY.

Dr. Wills read the report of the Assembly's Committee on the Report of the late Education Convention. It was for substance that the Assembly should adopt that report and issue it as a circular letter to all our churches. The report set forth that the promotion of education in all its departments is the duty and necessity of our Zion, and that it cannot be left to the state, or any other body, except our own Church. As to the establishment of the university, the people of our communion were probably not prepared to enter upon it at once; but the idea should be encouraged, and the execution carried out at the earliest practicable period. Colleges already in existence ought to be sustained, but the number ought not to be multiplied; on

the contrary, the effort should be to perfect those we have. Offerings of funds for endowment of the university should not be discouraged; but rather the Trustees of the Assembly should be authorised by the Assembly to hold and manage such, and for the present the interest should be used to sustain our existing colleges. Dr. Miller, when the discussion opened, objected to the principle of committing the entire work of education to the Church alone. The state and the family are both divine institutes, and each has some thing to do with education. Dr. Wills denied that the purpose was to put education or the university under the control of the Church. Dr. Pryor objected to one great university under control of the Presbyterian Church. Governor Patton said Presbyterians had fallen back in their zeal for education. Dr. Pryor denied this—it is only that other denominations have been roused to more zeal than they once exhibited. Mr. Bryson pleaded for a Presbyterian university of our own to prevent our young men from going to Germany and other European countries for education. Dr. Kirkpatrick said going to Germany for education was just *a fashion*; we have institutions of the highest grade already under salutary influence according to the strict Presbyterian standard. He was not prepared to commit the Church to this university scheme. Dr. Dabney never would be willing to see one university for the whole Presbyterian Church governed by this Assembly, but was ready to give all that is asked, namely, the countenance of the Assembly for enlightened efforts in this line by members of our Church in the southwest. There is no danger, however, of this project ending in the creation of any overshadowing institution. As for Virginia, she is certainly out of the ring, and means to paddle her own canoe. Make your southwestern university as fine as you can, we will hold our own against you. He was willing for the Assembly, in its mere advisory capacity, to recommend the experiment under consideration to all who were willing to commit themselves to it and take the responsibility. Mr. Berry urged that the Church may not defile herself with any secular affairs. Dr. Marshall thought the brother's argument destroyed itself, because if the Assembly may not found a uni-

versity, then no session can make a parochial school. Dr. S. J. Baird defended the superintendence of secular education by the Church. Mr. Cater said most of the young men who go to Germany for education, only get a little more of the "big head" and become "*greater calves*." Mr. J. W. Baker moved to strike out the words committing the Assembly to a university. The report was recommitted and came back conformed to Mr. Baker's motion. Dr. Dabney then urged, that instead of the Trustees of the Assembly holding the funds to be given, it was better that five of the very first men of our Church in the southwest be appointed. Dr. Wills preferred the Trustees of the Assembly. Dr. Miller said that at the outset the advocates of this measure had disclaimed the desire to have ecclesiastical control, but now we are to have a Board of Regents or Trustees responsible to and supervised by the Assembly. He therefore protested the second time against committing the Church to this enterprise. Dr. Peck sympathised with Dr. Miller's objections. Dr. Dabney said Dr. Miller's objection was unanswerable, if the Trustees of the Assembly were to be made rectors of a literary institution. But he was willing to appoint five men for life, and to be a close corporation, which was the safest kind of guarantee against all perversion of the funds. He sympathised fully with Dr. Peck and others who object to ecclesiastical control. It is neither constitutional nor expedient. Col. Mitchell held that the Trustees of the Assembly were the proper body, and the present the golden moment, for there are thousands of acres of land now worthless, and which our people could give now without any sacrifice, which by and by will be worth millions. Mr. Junkin preferred a Board of Trustees incorporated under a well guarded charter securing Presbyterian influence. Dr. Kirkpatrick said our Church can hold no money except through its Trustees. Mr. Cater said his investigations had been very extensive into the nature and abuses of corporations holding trust funds, and he might venture to express an opinion. He held Mr. Junkin's view. He never before had known an effort made to separate the persons who were to manage, direct, and appropriate the funds, from those who are to hold and invest them. Mr. Lynn.

was opposed, and so was his Presbytery, to any ecclesiastical control of secular education. Dr. J. R. Wilson proposed that the Trustees of the Assembly hold the funds given, until some future Assembly should determine the questions now in dispute. The Moderator decided both this motion and Mr. Junkin's out of order. Dr. Peck was reluctant to seem in opposition to any good scheme of education, but was unwilling to have any Board of Regents which should be a creature of the Assembly. Dr. Kirkpatrick urged that there could be no second Board of Trustees of the Assembly. He could see no difficulty in the control of secular education by the Church—not even when you come to the teaching of law and medicine, for both law and medicine are lawful studies. Dr. Wills most heartily concurred with Dr. Kirkpatrick. If you strike out from this report the idea of ecclesiastical control either directly or indirectly, you kill the whole movement. It will be a magnificent failure, “the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out,”—a mountain in labor, and bringing forth a “ridiculus mus.” He desired the distinct issue now made, Is ecclesiastical control of colleges legitimate or not? Rather than remove the institution from all ecclesiastical control, he would prefer to postpone the whole matter indefinitely. That would be a decent disposal of it, and better far than mangling it. Coming here to do something, and then doing nothing, is preposterous, and beneath the dignity of this body. I say, therefore, I would be glad if the distinct issue could be made to day, for I believe the majority of the Assembly is in favor of some sort of ecclesiastical control. Dr. Pryor moved the indefinite postponement of the whole matter; and Mr. Berry to lay it on the table. The latter motion was lost, and the former came up. Dr. S. J. Baird urged harmony of action. Dr. McInnis was against indefinite postponement, and said two old persons who proposed to give largely to these funds might die before another Assembly. Mr. Otts referred to other like cases, and hoped the matter would not be indefinitely postponed. He was born and brought up in the eastern part of our Church, and had heard on moving west of the eastern portion wishing to have preponderance; and he observed that opposition to this univer-

sity comes from the east. He began to be afraid there was some of the feeling alluded to. He might be mistaken; he hoped he was. Dr. J. R. Wilson said Mr. Otts was greatly mistaken. Mr. Otts said the motion for indefinite postponement came from Virginia. He hoped Dr. Wilson's motion would prevail, which postpones the issue in the Assembly, but not the whole matter. The motion for indefinite postponement was decided in the negative by a large majority. Mr. Junkin's substitute was called for; but, on motion, was laid on the table. Col. Mitchell's amendment was also laid on the table. Dr. Wilson's amendment was then called up and agreed to; and the whole report as amended was then adopted.

No subject engrossed so large a share of the Assembly's attention as this magnificent project of a great Southern Presbyterian university. Want of space has compelled us very much to shorten the admirable report of the debate, but we have endeavored to give the most important thoughts of nearly all the speakers. Reviewing the current of the debate, one discovers four varying opinions prevalent in the Assembly. *First.* There were those who held it lawful for the Church in her organised capacity to take charge of secular education. Amongst these, although on practical grounds objecting to the project under consideration, stood Dr. Kirkpatrick, who fairly and squarely insisted on the right of the Church to carry on secular education. Nor could he see any greater objection to her control of a university teaching law and medicine, than to her control of a college teaching classics; because law and medicine are lawful studies. With Dr. Kirkpatrick, there stood Dr. S. J. Baird, and at the last, though apparently not at the beginning, Dr. Wills, the chairman. *Secondly.* There were those, as Dr. Miller, Dr. Peck, Dr. Pryor, Mr. Berry, and Dr. Dabney, opposed definitely to this idea. The Church is a spiritual body, and must handle no secular interests—secular education, no more than agriculture, commerce, politics, all of which have direct and powerful moral bearings. *Thirdly.* There are those willing, with Dr. Dabney, to indicate to the Convention which the last Assembly went so far as to convene, what they supposed to be the best disposition

of the matter. *Fourthly.* There were those, and these a majority of the body, willing to receive funds for this purpose, to be held by the Assembly's Trustees until some future Assembly shall determine the questions now not possible to be settled.

Such a disposition of the matter could not be altogether satisfactory to the especial friends of the proposed university. Dr. Dabney's solution would probably have suited them better. Indeed, since the decision in the Assembly, the Convention has unanimously adopted resolutions carrying out his idea. Drs. Waddel, Palmer, and Lyon are a Committee of the Convention to constitute a medium of correspondence and agents for promoting the object. Should the Trustees of the Assembly receive by May, 1872, donations or pledges which shall give promise of success to the enterprise, then this Committee are to urge the next Assembly to instruct its Trustees to hold in perpetuity all funds given and to be given for this object under covenant, to leave to the regents the *entire management, government, and control* of the university so long as they administer the same in the interests of sound Christian education, according to the principles of our Church—the regents to be appointed by the Assembly as a *close corporation*; and in case of its failure by death or perversion of trust, the Assembly to have power to create a new board with the same powers.

In the conflict of opinion touching the first principles of the question, this was probably the best possible compromise, and one which should harmonise all minds. The great principle of non-secularisation of our church courts is saved as far as it could be expected to be saved, and the believers in that principle may congratulate themselves on its vindication. At the same time a great and noble enterprise is put upon the most permanent and solid basis possible, and a plan for its management adopted which must prove at once safe and efficient. The regents to be appointed can do all and more than all that the Assembly could have done directly for the institution.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

The Standing Committee, through Dr. Kirkpatrick, reported

an increase of students, libraries, and funds, in both seminaries, and expressed the belief that our candidates now enjoy at these schools advantages equal to any other in this or in foreign countries. The Assembly inaugurated Dr. J. R. Wilson Professor of Pastoral and Evangelistic Theology and Sacred Rhetoric in the Columbia Seminary. After he had delivered his inaugural address on the Power of the Pulpit, Dr. Peck, of Union Theological Seminary, delivered the charge to the new Professor.

DELEGATES FROM OTHER CHURCHES.

The Rev. Dr. Jno. A. Todd, Commissioner *primarius* from the "General Synod of the Reformed Church in America," commonly known as "the Dutch Church," presented to the Assembly the greetings of his Church. The Assembly through the Moderator and by resolutions responded, expressing our Church's delight at hearing of the probable extension of the evangelical labors of that venerable and orthodox Synod amongst the desolations of the Southern States. Delegates were appointed to convey our fraternal salutations to that Synod at their meeting in June, 1871, in the city of Albany, New York.

The Rev. R. P. Farris, D. D., Rev. J. L. Yantis, D. D., and Mr. Edward Bredell, appeared as delegates from the Old School Synod of Missouri, and were received and heard and responded to by the Moderator and by the Assembly also through resolutions. Delegates were also appointed to bear our salutations to the Synod.

The Stated Clerk read a letter addressed to the Assembly by the Rev. D. H. Cummins, who had been appointed by the last Assembly as a delegate to the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, reporting that he had attended their meetings, had been cordially received, had presented the Christian salutations of this Church, expressing the hope that the two Churches might be one ere long; and that the Synod had reciprocated our greeting and expressed deep interest in our welfare. He stated that the desire for organic union with us appeared to be on the increase among them, that the Moderator expressed the desire that the two bodies might be drawn closer and cooperate more

fully, and that they had appointed delegates to the present Assembly. The report was received and approved.

From the Cumberland Presbyterian Church no delegates appeared, although it is known that such were appointed. The Assembly appointed delegates to bear its salutations to both these bodies.

THE EXAMINATION RULE.

Dr. Dabney presented the following report, which was read:

The Committee of Bills and Overtures would respectfully report to the Assembly Overture No. 1, from the Presbytery of Augusta, praying the Assembly to rescind the "Examination Rule" of the Assembly of 1837. Your Committee recommend the following answer in the words of the Assembly of 1849. "That inasmuch as the General Assembly must have power to enjoin upon presbyteries the performance of any duty which they are confessedly competent to do by the provisions of the Constitution, and in requiring which no right is violated, and nothing constrained, but the discretion they (the presbyteries) had in ordinary circumstances; and inasmuch as the general utility of that resolution is not yet called in question, even by the respected memorialists themselves, therefore the Assembly declines acceding according to this request at present."

At the request of Col. Mitchell, the argument of the Presbytery accompanying the overture was read. Dr. J. R. Wilson stated, as a member of the Presbytery of Augusta, that the overture had not been adopted unanimously. Col. Mitchell, as a representative of that Presbytery, urged that there was no longer a necessity for the rule. He was always mortified as an elder to see ministers examined in whom he had confidence. Dr. Hill hoped the views just expressed by his venerable friend would not prevail. He reminded the Assembly how Absalom Peters, Secretary of the Home Missionary Society, used to control the presbyteries during the New School controversy in 1833-38, by sending them his young men with clean papers which they could not dispute. In this way he managed to regulate the election of commissioners to the Assembly according to his own wishes. Now let me suggest a case to this Assembly. Suppose our good brethren of the Northern Assembly wished to

control the action of this body. We are thrown into daily contact with them along the border; we are in much more direct and constant contact with them than you in this part of the Church are. One of them is within four miles of me; his church is beside mine; his members associate with my members; he and I associate daily. He is now a delegate to the Northern Assembly in Chicago. Suppose that in our constant associations we should get up a scheme for uniting the two bodies; and such a case is certainly supposable. I hardly ever meet with those brethren that they do not put the question to me: "You are a moderate man; cannot you suggest some way by which we can be brought together again?" I believe that is the first question put to me every time I meet them. Suppose now that our Presbytery should become desirous of uniting with the Northern Assembly. They have very ample funds at their command, and could have much more, if they desired it for such a purpose. Many of their men there, especially the Old School portion, are very anxious for a union with our body. Suppose they should find your presbyteries in this part of the Church divided on that question; suppose we are in favor of union; they put a large fund into my hand and say: "Wherever you find a Presbytery down South nearly equally divided, we will send four or five young men into your body, and you can send them down to some of the churches in that Presbytery to turn the scale; and say to every church in that Presbytery, (just as they are saying in our Synod,) 'We will give you \$600 to support them.'" Do you not see that, according to Col. Mitchell's argument, if I were ambitious and had that purse and that Presbytery at my command, I could turn the scale in every doubtful Presbytery? All that I would have to do, would be to find out such presbyteries and send into them the young men, who would come pouring down from the North. By that process, I could do just what that brother referred to was long ago trying to do with their General Assembly, by sending in his Congregationally inclined men. I could control this Assembly. I was Secretary of the Board of Missions for fifteen years, and I know the power. I do not wonder that some of those brethren are a little jealous of the action

of the secretaries. It is a very annoying position, and I sympathise with the brethren who hold it: but it does give a wonderful power. A man who has the funds, and knows where the men are, and can say quietly, without anybody knowing anything about it, Go into certain presbyteries and decide certain questions, has great power. I do beseech you, brethren, not to destroy this power that each Presbytery has to protect itself. Let the presbyteries have the power to shut men out if they choose to do so. This question may be upon you, brethren, sooner than you suspect. These brethren in the North tell me that they cannot give up so large a portion of the United States as we occupy. If we will not unite with them, then they must come down and take possession of our country. I am glad for all the good they can do; I love them as brethren; I think they are in error; that they ought to recant their error. If they recant and become real Presbyterians as we are, I should hail the day and rejoice to unite with them. But they have not done so yet; we must protect ourselves against them; and I see no other method than that which this rule gives us. You may have this question upon you in less than five years; you may have it in less than one year. You must have the means of protection. The constitutional question I heard argued when I was a boy a thousand times over; but I make these remarks, because I think I see certain influences at work that may make this rule very important. The brethren who are now anxious to break it down, may wish when it is too late that they had this power back in their hands. Dr. Burgett moved to amend by leaving the rule in force, except in cases where the applicant had been licensed or ordained by or in former years a member of the Presbytery about to receive him. He referred to cases of examination such as he wished excepted which had seemed farcical. Dr. Hendrick said the rule had worked so admirably since 1837 that we cannot better it. It had preserved us from evils heretofore to which we are likely to be exposed as extensively in the future. The argument as to its constitutionality is at too late a day. Dr. S. J. Baird maintained that the rule had no tendency to disorganise the Church, but contrariwise, was a bond of union, because ordered by the As-

sembly. Nor could any brother feel disparaged by it. He had once, along with Dr. Peck, and Lewis Green, now in glory, examined the venerable Moderator, who did not feel himself at all disparaged by it. Ruling elder Davidson said the Presbytery of Louisville does not wish this rule changed. It works no harm to any one and we prefer it to stand. Dr. Burgett's amendment was not agreed to, and the report was adopted.

Upon one observation by Dr. Hill during this debate, it is proper to offer a few remarks. Dr. Hill referred (as we understand him) to the jealousy of some of our own brethren towards our own secretaries, and admitted that they do have a "wonderful power"—they "have the funds, and know where the men are, and can quietly say, Go into such a Presbytery and decide such a question." Applying this language to the boards in our former church connexion, the statement may be perfectly correct. It is not for us to deny it, and we do not deny it. Dr. Hill says he knows the truth of it, for he held this power for fifteen years. But applying this language (if Dr. Hill intended to apply it) to our committees, the statement is altogether incorrect. The Assembly of our Church wisely conferred on our committees *no ecclesiastical power whatsoever*. Our Sustentation Committee (which answers to the one at Philadelphia to which Dr. Hill refers) is simply a central agency to divide out funds according to certain rules fixed by the Church. It can undertake no work within the bounds of any Presbytery. And it can make no appropriations concerning any Presbytery's territory, except upon *its own application*. It commissions no body to go and preach within the bounds of any Presbytery; it can divide no funds among any such commissioners of its own, if it had any such. Hence there is no such parallel between our committees and the old boards as Dr. Hill's remark implies. And hence there can be no reasonable jealousy of our secretaries or committees. Receiving a certain amount of money for distribution, they sit in judgment on the applications of the different presbyteries and divide out the sum according to rules adopted by the Assembly. This is the whole of their power.

JUDICIAL CASES.

Dr. Hill, chairman of the Judicial Committee, asked that that committee be discharged, adding that it was a subject of congratulation that there were no complaints or appeals before the Assembly. The Committee was discharged.

STATISTICS.

Dr. Dabney, from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, presented the following report:

Overture from the Presbytery of New Orleans, to the General Assembly in session at Huntsville, Alabama, May, 1871.

The Presbytery of New Orleans respectfully overture the General Assembly to reconsider the decision of the last Assembly, and found upon page 505 of the minutes, substituting in the statistical tables for the presbyterial collections, a column for the salaries of pastors; for the reason that this change was made without having been to any extent considered by the Church at large; and because in the impoverished condition of our country, a public exposure of the state of such individual churches would be injurious rather than profitable, and would be in its operation reproachful to many of the churches who are straining their utmost in accomplishing even the little they would report.

The Committee respectfully recommend to the Assembly the following answer: That the Assembly believing the evil effects deplored by the memorialists will not follow, do decline to rescind a rule so recently adopted by the Assembly, and promising good results. Adopted.

MEMORIAL ON THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

Dr. Dabney, from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, presented an overture from the Trustees of Union Theological Seminary, asking that this matter may not fail to receive attention. Dr. Kirkpatrick, chairman of the Committee to which said memorial was referred, gave the history of the matter as follows: A memorial proposing certain reforms in theological education was sent by Dr. Dabney to the Assembly, and was by it submitted to the Trustees and Faculties of the two Seminaries. The last Assembly received the action of Columbia Seminary, but not that of Union, and action was for that cause postponed.

I attended the meeting of the Trustees of Union last June, and called their attention to the matter, but for some cause there was no copy of the memorial on hand, and the Board referred the matter to the Faculty. I was prevented from attending the meeting of the Board this spring from want of time, but understand they did nothing in the matter. I do not feel that I have failed in my duty. I would prefer that the Assembly would lay this duty on some one else; but if our committee is continued, I will do the best in my power. The committee was continued.

This matter has certainly run a somewhat singular career. In 1869, Dr. Dabney sends up his memorial, and it is referred to each seminary—directors and faculty. In 1870, Columbia answers, and Union does not answer. Then it is referred to a Committee to meet at Greensboro. The chairman of that Committee tells us that he called the attention of the Trustees of Union Seminary to the matter last year, but they referred it to the faculty, and that this year also the trustees did nothing respecting it. And yet here comes an overture from them to the Assembly, and presented by Dr. Dabney himself, requesting that the subject may not fail to receive attention.

RELIEF FUND.

The Assembly adopted a report heartily endorsing the plan of this fund and requiring all the sessions to bring the matter before our churches.

SYSTEMATIC BENEFICENCE.

Rev. J. M. P. Otts presented the report, and the Assembly enjoined upon the Presbyteries:

1st. That they (the presbyteries) require from all their churches full statistical reports of what they (the churches) have done during the ecclesiastical year for the various objects of general benevolence to be sent up to their spring meeting; and, in order to facilitate this duty to the churches, that the stated clerks of presbyteries be recommended to furnish to all their respective churches blanks on which to make said reports.

2d. That all our presbyteries be earnestly recommended and enjoined to give, at their next stated meetings, earnest attention

and a thorough examination to the vital subject of systematic benevolence in all its bearings.

3d. That the presbyteries earnestly recommend all their respective pastors, stated supplies, and missionaries, to give frequent instruction to their churches as to their duty in this matter, which is not only of prime importance to the progress, but even indispensable to the continued life and permanent existence of the Church.

4th. That the presbyteries earnestly recommend and solemnly enjoin it upon all their church sessions to afford to the people in every congregation an opportunity to contribute to each and all of the objects for which collections are ordered by the General Assembly.

PRINTING REPORTS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

Rev. Edwin Cater offered a resolution to have these reports printed and laid before the Assembly, and that time be allowed each member of the Assembly to examine them before he is called on to vote, so that he may know what he endorses by his vote. After a short debate the resolution was rejected. Mr. Cater entered his dissent on the record.

QUORUM OF PRESBYTERY.

The Committee on the Records of the Synod of South Carolina reported, recommending approval.

Mr. Cater said he was not prepared to approve that Synod's decision that Charleston Presbytery was irregular in holding a meeting without the presence of a ruling elder. The Synod's decision was contrary to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church; for the General Assembly of 1843 had decided that the Presbytery might proceed without a ruling elder's presence. Dr. Hill said he was with the Synod of South Carolina, and thought the Presbytery of Charleston was wrong. The lower courts were bound by the decisions of the Assembly, but one Assembly is not bound by the decisions of another. The question had agitated the whole Church, and he hoped the present Assembly would not hastily decide it. Dr. Kirkpatrick thought the question should be passed over for the present, and moved an amendment to that effect, which was agreed to.

The distinction pointed out by Dr. Hill is an important one, but it needs a word of explanation to guard it from being perverted. When the Assembly decides any point, that is *the law*; and the lower courts are of course bound by the decision. But whilst it is for the Assembly to interpret and decide the law, and their decision must stand as law until some succeeding Assembly shall reverse it, yet none of these decisions of Assemblies are infallible. They may be in the very teeth of the Constitution or of the Scriptures. In such cases it is the right, and it may be the duty of every Synod, Presbytery, session, minister, and private Christian, to exercise their right of judgment, and pronounce the Assembly wrong. The Assembly's decision therefore is always law; but not always equity and truth. It is to be obeyed; but it may be disputed and condemned. And it never should be pleaded by any true Presbyterian in any case as decisive of any question.

“All synods or councils since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice, but to be used as a help in both.”

Confession of Faith, Chap. XXXI., 3.

ECONOMY IN PRINTING.

Dr. Dabney presented the following:

The Committee on Bills and Overtures report to the General Assembly Overture No. 5, from the Presbytery of North Mississippi, praying the Assembly to enjoin upon all its agents the most rigid economy and prudence in all contracts for printing.

Your committee respectfully moves the Assembly to adopt the following reply:

The Assembly, believing that its clerks and other executive officers are fully aware of the necessity of rigid economy and prudence in this and all other expenditures of sacred funds, and having no proof of their failure therein, deem it unnecessary to take further action upon this memorial at this time.

Mr. Cater said the Committees of Sustentation and Foreign Missions expended the Church's money extravagantly both

in salaries and printing, and proceeded to specify particulars. The Committee's report was adopted without a dissenting voice.

THE PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR.

Dr. Dabney reported the following :

The Committee on Bills and Overtures report to the Assembly Overture No. 6, from the Presbytery of North Mississippi, requesting the Assembly to rescind the rule of 1869 "allowing the secretaries of the Executive Committees, and the clerks of the Assembly, to have the privileges of members on the floor of the Assembly," as a "dangerous violation of the constitution."

Your committee respectfully recommends the following answer :

A reference to the rule (Minutes of 1869, p. 390) will show that "the privileges of members on the floor" are not conferred by it on the above officers; but only the privilege of making statements and explanations touching the trusts committed to their care. This the Assembly regards as both safe and convenient, and therefore respectfully declines to rescind.

Mr. Cater explained that his Presbytery objected not simply to the making statements, but the privileges of members in all matters pertaining to their office. The Committees report was adopted without a dissenting voice.

ITEMIZED REPORTS.

Dr. Dabney presented the following :

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported to the Assembly Overture No. 7, from the Presbytery of North Mississippi, praying the Assembly to require of all treasurers of church funds a specific itemized report of all receipts from all and every source, and also of all disbursements in the same specific itemized manner; and that the same be published in the Minutes of the Assembly.

Your Committee respectfully recommend the adoption of the following :

The detailed accounts of all the Executive Committees are annually exhibited to the Assembly, and by the Auditing Committees examined and settled. The Assembly regards these measures as substantially securing the faithful disbursement of the funds.

Mr. Cater—My Presbytery does not consider that the fact that the reports of the committees are submitted to the Auditing Committee of the Assembly is sufficient to give the Church the information that it wants. The business as now conducted, as far as the Church is concerned, is a “secret service.” It is odious to any citizen of any State to be taxed to furnish money to the Government for secret service.

Dr. Dabney—I regard the spirit of the overture as eminently wise and proper. The Committee was very near unanimously adopting a resolution to that effect, if I remember correctly. There was certainly a very considerable expression in its favor, and for this reason, that the annual reports which now contain specific accounts of all the receipts, should contain specific accounts of all disbursements, and be published to all the churches. The reason why that was not the report of the Committee was simply this: it was suggested to us that it would unfold to a sort of publicity the domestic status of many a minister’s family. We doubted whether this would be for edification—whether it might not be in many cases galling to the most praiseworthy ministers and their families. That was simply the motive that controlled the Committee. I, for one, feel no disposition to resist the adoption of that measure. Of course, your Executive Committees ought not to have the least personal motive to resist the publication of such a detailed account of their disbursements. It is not their delicacy that would be affected at all, but the delicacy of the recipients.

Dr. J. Leighton Wilson—An itemized report, such as Mr. Cater speaks of, as I stated in my report the other day, has been presented here. Every single item of expenditure is put in it. I made a motion in our Committee to print that report so as to place it in the hands of every member of the Assembly, but the Committee overruled me, and I think very judiciously. Are you going to expose here every minister, every family, that receives funds from this Committee? The report of items is here in the hands of the Auditing Committee, and the Committee on Sustentation—just as perfect as it could be made. But if the Assembly so orders it, we can publish every one of these disburse-

ments, and spread them before the world. The Committee were influenced by the very consideration to which Dr. Dabney refers. The report was adopted without a dissenting voice.

REPORTS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES.

The want of space compels us very reluctantly to omit, besides some other matters of interest and importance, all reference whatever to these reports, except those of the Sustentation and Foreign Missions Committees. And our reference to them is confined almost entirely to the question of the charges against the Committees, especially against their Secretary and Treasurer.

On the second day of the Assembly's meeting, Dr. J. Leighton Wilson presented the report on Sustentation; and along with it the minutes and two tabular statements, *not for the Assembly, but its Standing Committee*. One was printed and stated every cent contributed through the year; the other was a supplement to the Treasurer's Report, and gave a full account of every expenditure. Still another paper was submitted containing the name of every individual who had received aid from the invalid fund.

Dr. Wilson, after some remarks on the Report, said he had a painful duty to perform, which was to lay before the body another paper stating, on behalf of himself as Secretary, and of the Treasurer, that they had been charged, himself with neglect of official duty, and the Treasurer with dishonest management of the Church's funds. These charges had been made by one who was a member of the present Assembly, and circulated all over the Church in one of our papers. He asked for an investigation that the officers accused might be vindicated, if innocent; but degraded from office, if guilty. Dr. Pryor moved the reference to a special committee. Mr. Cater said he was prepared to defend himself against that paper, and was willing to go before a committee; but preferred to meet the matter directly before the Assembly. The paper was then referred to Gov. Patton, Judge Swann, Mr. Enslow, Dr. Burgett, and Dr. Kirkpatrick.

On Tuesday, the fifth day, Gov. Patton presented the following report from the Committee of Investigation:

The Special Committee to whom was referred the request of the Secretary and Treasurer of the Executive Committees of Sustentation and Foreign Missions, that the Assembly would institute an investigation concerning certain charges or complaints made and published against them through the columns of one of our religious journals, in reference to their official conduct, beg leave to present the following report :

They have carefully and diligently examined the published articles referred to and placed in their hands, and noted particularly those portions reflecting upon those brethren in their management of these great interests of our Church intrusted to their care, and in connexion therewith they have had access to all the necessary books and papers for ascertaining satisfactorily whether or not there is any ground for complaint.

After such examination, they feel compelled, in view of the facts in the case, and in justice to those brethren and the Church, which has reposed in them those trusts, to come to the following conclusions :

1. It is insinuated that they are aiming by a centralisation of power and authority to obtain exclusive control of matters intrusted to them, that they may thereby promote the welfare of one portion of the Church to the detriment of other portions which are equally or more deserving of help.

For this insinuation or complaint, in the judgment of your Committee there is not the slightest ground. There is no evidence that the Secretary or Treasurer, or those associated with them in these Executive Committees, have exercised or aimed to exercise any more power or authority than is given to them by the General Assembly ; and they are glad to know that whatever influence may be possessed, especially by the Secretary or Treasurer of Sustentation and Foreign Missions, is due to their eminent piety, to their moral worth, and their great devotion to the interests of the Church.

2. It is insinuated that the causes of Sustentation and Foreign Missions are suffering through mismanagement and neglect of the Secretary and Treasurer, because of the multiplicity of their engagements.

In the judgment of your Committee, and after an examination of the facts as furnished in the documents before us, there is no evidence that these interests of the Church are suffering in any degree by a multiplicity of their appointments.

3. It is intimated that there has been embezzlement or culpable expenditure of the funds placed in their hands, which has been covered up by false or defective reports.

From an examination of the accounts, to all of which your Committee have had free access, there is not the slightest proof of any dishonesty or careless disposal of such funds. The accounts, moreover, of each year, as every member of the Assembly knows, have all been audited by a committee appointed for that purpose, and found to be correct and sustained by proper vouchers.

4. It is insinuated that they have taken advantage of their position to pay themselves more, in the way of salaries, than was authorised or proper under the circumstances.

An examination of the books shows that their compensation for so much labor and responsibility has been only such as was authorised by the Executive Committees, and is so moderate that it is difficult to know how any person can complain of its being too large. It is ascertained, moreover, that all the expenses of conducting these important matters, including salaries, clerk's hire, office-rent, fuel, lights, etc., etc., have been remarkably economical, amounting to a fraction over seven per cent. of the whole amount—some \$73,000—received and disbursed by them.

In view of all the facts in the case, your Committee would recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That this Assembly does hereby most cordially endorse the conduct of the Secretary and Treasurer of Sustentation and Foreign Missions, the Rev. J. L. Wilson, D. D., and the Rev. James Woodrow, D. D., in their management of the trust committed to them.

2. That this Assembly condemns *in toto* all such complaints and insinuations as may have been made against these brethren, who have been so faithful and untiring in their official duties, as alike unjust to them and injurious to the welfare of the Church.

3. That the Assembly, while fully admitting the right of free discussion of its own acts and deliverances, as well as the official conduct of all its officers, does hereby most earnestly caution the editors of our religious journals, as well as their contributors, against the publication of articles reflecting thus publicly on the conduct of those who are acting as its servants, because of the injury which might be inflicted upon them personally, and upon the Church generally; and that it reminds and urges on all who have charges or complaints to make, which, if true, would result in the removal of those complained of, that the proper place for making such charges or complaints is on the floor of the Assembly.

After some discussion, at Mr. Cater's request, this report was not taken up at once, but the consideration of it postponed until

the next day at 11 o'clock. Upon its coming up on Wednesday, Dr. Hendrick moved that it be referred to a committee of three to bring in a minute which should dispose of the matter without a long debate. Gov. Patton and Dr. Pryor objected to this plan of procedure, as did Dr. Peck, who also expressed, along with Dr. Hendrick, the wish to hear from Drs. Wilson and Woodrow. Dr. Hill offered as a substitute the following :

“The General Assembly having appointed a committee to examine into the official conduct of its Secretary and Treasurer of the Committees of Foreign Missions and Sustentation, and said committee having had all the books and accounts of those committees before them, feels constrained to express its entire confidence in the perfect honesty and integrity of said officers, and their general wisdom and skill in the management of the sacred funds intrusted to their care. These officers have an arduous and difficult work to discharge, and are liable to fall into errors. Whilst, therefore, the Assembly would recognise the right of all the lower courts and ministers, elders, and others, freely and in a proper spirit of love to canvass those errors, it would recommend to all such to do it in such a way as not to shake the confidence of the churches in them, and thus inflict an injury upon the causes which they represent. The Assembly would at the same time express such confidence in these officers that they feel assured that any errors or mistakes into which they may fall, will be promptly corrected when properly pointed out.”

In the course of his remarks, Dr. Hill referred to certain censures by his Presbytery and Synod, of a part of the conduct of the Foreign Missions Committee. The young brethren sent to China from his Presbytery had not been supplied promptly with funds. He had been appointed to correspond with the Committee on the subject. He had heard their explanations, which did not fully meet, he must say, the difficulties in the minds of his brethren. He did not think Dr. Wilson was to blame; but that Dr. Woodrow had had so “many irons in the fire” that he could not give the required attention to these young brethren. That is the opinion of a large number of the brethren in Kentucky. The suffering entailed was partly the fault of the young brethren themselves, partly of the missionary since deceased; but

the Treasurer ought to have had sufficient knowledge of the mode of transmitting funds to have supplied the wants of the missionaries. Why, those missionaries had been compelled to borrow money for six or eight months from missionaries of the Northern Board! Yet he had perfect confidence in Dr. Woodrow, who would no doubt do his duty in the future, though he had not done it in the past.

Dr. J. Leighton Wilson said that Mr. Cater had yesterday promised statements in substantiation of his charges, and desired that they should be made before Dr. Woodrow should begin his defence. But Mr. Cater replied that Dr. Wilson had misunderstood him; he had no statements, and was no complainant; and had not accused any party of any crime. Dr. Pryor then urged that, while Dr. Hill's statements, emanating as they do from the Synod of Kentucky, were fresh before us, Dr. Woodrow should now make his explanations.

Dr. Woodrow thanked the Assembly for their courtesy in inviting him to appear and make a full statement of his official conduct, not only during the past year, but the former years in which he had been serving it. He considered himself honored in standing thus before the whole "Presbyterian Church in the United States." Yet it was strange he should be standing there to *defend* himself against charges not intended, it is said, to affect his character—only charges made by one "friend" against another—mere inquiries into his official conduct. He acknowledged the Church's right to make these inquiries. He courted investigation. But he claimed that he must either be vindicated as the Assembly's servant; or else condemned and cast forth as a vagabond with a mark on his brow more infamous than that on Cain's. His brother Hill had said we must not be too sensitive; but when that was touched which was as dear to him as virtue to a woman, he could not but be sensitive. If but a small portion of the charges uttered and published far and wide over this land and through the Church be true, he was so degraded that he should be passed by in the street as too polluted to be noticed, except to seek to rescue him from eternal degradation. He would proceed to show what were some of these charges. First.

There had been published all through the Church in the *Christian Observer* by two ministers of our Church, in an article signed N. R., that the Committees of Sustentation and Foreign Missions—being some of them Professors in the Seminary, and Editors of the *Review* and *Southern Presbyterian and Index*, and holding in their hands the fund for the relief of Disabled Ministers, etc., and also the new Assurance scheme—were wielding “a power that may eventually crush out liberty of thought and freedom of speech in the Presbyterian Church,” and had also clearly “manifested their disposition in that direction.” Again. It had been charged that the officers of these Committees, himself and Dr. John Leighton Wilson, were “immersed in other business—beloved men anxiously willing to ‘toat’ every thing.” If immersed in other business, they must be unfaithful in the discharge of the duties committed to them by the Church. Now *he* was directly pointed at in these charges, which made him out guilty of the attempt to use the power committed in part to him, in a direction “dangerous to godliness and sound doctrine,” and tending “to crush out liberty of thought and freedom of speech;” and of neglecting what had been given him to do, because “immersed in other business.” But, further, it had been alleged and published, that while Dr. Wilson mentioned in his report one thousand dollars as appropriated to one thing, he (Dr. Woodrow) had charged the Treasury twenty-seven hundred dollars for the same item; and, again, that a bond for one thousand dollars had disappeared. Again. It was charged that “Prof. Woodrow was already employed by the Church for the whole of his time in one direction, and she pays him \$3,000 for it.” Now, what would the Assembly think, if he (Dr. W.) were to say of a clerk, that he employed him for the whole of his time for \$600, and then that he was working for others in his time and getting paid for it? Would that be a charge affecting his honesty and integrity? He saw men of business around him, and he asked, what they would think of one paid by them for the whole of his time, and then selling portions of it for money? Would *swindling* be too strong an expression for the crime? Would *embezzlement*? Whatever is the word which

expresses the taking of money which does not belong to you, *that* would be the right word. It is taking money which did not belong to him that he was charged with. Yet he was told that he was too sensitive in wishing the Assembly to investigate the matter to see whether or not it was true. And then as to the "bond for \$1,000 which had disappeared." If money were put into his hands, and if it disappeared in any way, he cared not how, he ought to be regarded as appropriating to his own use. Money does not disappear from one's hands accidentally. Such things never occur. Thus he had, by reference to these last two points, established that charges had been brought against him, which, if true, ought to blast his character forever.

But he had been told by brethren on many hands that nobody believes such charges. He was firmly persuaded that nobody who knew him could believe them. Yet they were brought in such a way that he could not afford to despise them. First, they are brought by one who is a member of this body; and he could not despise any charge by any one who can sit in this body. Nor could he afford to despise charges by any one who represents a Presbytery—nor by any one whom he heard spoken of in the speeches made as "brother," "the excellent brother." Moderator, if any one charges you with stealing, I will not call him brother; and yet "an excellent brother," as I hear him called on all hands, has done this very thing to me! And there was still another circumstance he could not omit to mention. These charges had not been made in private, but circulated by thousands of copies. No, this was a matter he could not pass lightly by. The Assembly must either visit him with a condemnation which should follow him with its blighting influence to the grave; or else give him a vindication such as will prevent a repetition of such accusations. As had been said by a venerable father in this body, these charges are such that they must be fatal to the peace of conscience of him who made and those who published them on the one hand, or of himself on the other.

But before he would enter upon his own vindication, he would observe that the antecedent probability of such charges depends on the character of him who makes them. If the peace-loving

Isaac attack, it may be supposed there is good reason for it; if Isaac's brother make the attack, there is no such presumption. He submitted, therefore, that it was proper for him to require whether his assailant were the peace-loving Isaac, or his brother [Ishmael]. But before this could be considered, there was still another question: Were the charges by one person or by many? Are they fresh charges or a reiteration of old ones? Dr. Woodrow proceeded to speak of the repeated assaults which had been made upon him and the various names assumed by the one person who had made them all, and introduced a comparison of what had occurred to him, with what happens sometimes to the traveller in Africa, who hears in one direction the terrific roar of the lion, and in another the yell and shriek of the tiger, intended to drive him from his tent, and then when both these fail, there comes from another quarter a plaintive wail, a cry for pity to move the traveller's compassion and bring him forth. All, however, comes from *one* animal, not many; and in like manner all the various persons who had assailed him were embodied in that single person of Mr. Edwin Cater. He proceeded to detail a variety of circumstances in the past intended to show that his assailant was not the peace-loving Isaac, but his brother. But our space is limited, and we pass them over. He was proceeding to reply to the statements made by Dr. Hill relative to the missionary funds, when Dr. J. Leighton Wilson interposed and requested him, in the interest of the cause of missions, to desist. He was yielding to the Secretary's suggestion, when Dr. Pryor said he hoped Dr. Woodrow would proceed. Dr. Hill said the same. Dr. Woodrow replied: Since Dr. Hill hopes I will proceed, I shall do so. He passed a high eulogium upon the three missionaries, Houston, Stuart, and Helm. He knew no three ministers in our Church he could more surely trust, and if at any time any one of them had used any expression to his detriment, he was confident they had done it through misapprehension. Dr. Hill had said the mission in China had frequently been left without funds. If they had indeed been very nearly left without funds, it would not be strange in the history of this Church; for that had been the case with most of us. He proceeded then to

VOL. XXII., NO. 4.—8.

read a letter from Mr. Stuart, of date Sept. 24th, 1869, saying that his "wants had been abundantly supplied," and that he "had never feared" on the score of his support; also from Mr. Inslee, Nov. 9, 1869, saying he "never intended any such interpretation as that of our being in personal want," and again, Dec: 12, 1869, stating that they had "never been in personal want, though once or twice were run rather close." Then he read from a letter of date July 6, 1870, by Mr. Thomas E. Converse, (since returned to this country) as follows: "Your mission here is a set of beggars. The mission treasury has not had one cent in it for the past four months;" but the Mission Treasurer, Mr. Inslee, on the 7th June, 1870, wrote that he had just received two thousand Mexican dollars. He was proceeding with more of the same sort of extracts, when Dr. J. Leighton Wilson again interposed, and Dr. Woodrow desisted. Dr. Pryor, however, requesting him to explain again the misunderstanding betwixt himself and Mr. Inslee about the transmission of funds, he stated that at Mr. Inslee's request he had deposited money in New York subject to his draft, supposing that Mr. Inslee knew that the directions he had given to the Treasurer were correct; but it turned out that he was in error in one important particular, and hence could not draw upon the money kept for him in New York.

Coming back to the allegation of Mr. Cater, that he had charged the Treasury \$2,700 for \$1,000, he showed that Dr. Wilson's statement and the Treasurer's had not referred to the same thing; and that Mr. Cater had made a similar blunder regarding the thousand dollar bond which was lying at that moment in the church-safe in his office.

Dr. Woodrow proceeded: You have been told in these articles, and you have been told by Dr. Hill that he believes it to be true; that I have "too many irons in the fire." Well, as you have seen, I *have* a good many. First, I am a Professor in the Theological Seminary. I did not fix my salary; and when I became your Professor in your Theological Seminary, I did not sell you all my time, if I did get three thousand dollars from you. I do not perform the work of my professorship in that

way. I do not "work by the day;" I "work by the piece." You did not buy all my time, and you know you did not. It is asked, How do you know it? You appointed me, when I was already Professor, to be Treasurer of Foreign Missions in 1861. Well, I did not want any more money. I had enough. I had not very much, it is true; for I had a wife and some children to support, and I had use for all the money I could honestly get. But I did not want any more from the Church. (You have forced me to speak of myself; I cannot help, in vindicating myself, presenting these personal matters.) When you call upon me to perform any duty, I obey you. The voice of this Assembly is to me the voice of God. You bade me take care of the funds of the Foreign Mission Treasury, and I did it. I did not want any money for it. Then, in 1863, you made me your Treasurer of Domestic Missions, and I begged that no salary should be attached to that office. So I served for three years. But Dr. Dabney, when he was chairman of one of your standing committees at Charlotte, in 1864, brought in a report, in regard to which I knew nothing beforehand, saying in effect that this was not right—that I must receive a salary; and the General Assembly ordered the Committee to pay me a salary. You thus taught me that you did not think you had previously paid for all my time. If, therefore, it is stealing your money to take pay for work I do, on the ground that you have with \$3,000 paid me for all my time, it is *you who did it*, not I. This is all I get from the Church. But I work for it. I did not sell you all my time, and you said I did not. I submit, therefore, that to charge me before the world and before the Church with taking your money twice for the same thing, is something that a "good brother," an "excellent brother," a "cordial friend," a representative of the Church of Christ, ought not to do.

That was not all, however. "You have ever so many other small irons." Well, that was so—he had. He was editor of the *Southern Presbyterian*. How did that happen? It was necessary for some one to take up and carry on the paper—in all the broad region where the paper circulates, there was but one opinion as to the necessity of it for fostering all the enterprises

of the Church. But who should do it? You know the condition of things at the end of the war. We had no money; I had none. I had only a will to serve the Church with whatever of gifts God might bestow upon me. I had no money; but I have a brother, a noble brother—Thomas Woodrow, of Chillicothe, Ohio—who had money, and who placed it at my disposal for myself; or for my Church, if I loved her more. I accepted it, and established the paper; I trust, by the help and with the approbation of my Master in heaven.

But I am, also, the publisher and one of the editors—the junior, the least important editor—of the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. Well, what was the state of things at the end of the war with respect to this? Here Dr. Woodrow made similar statements as in reference to the paper. But he had “also a Depository”—Yes, he had. Before we had any Committee of Publication, he began a little Committee of Publication on his own account, and for the little he had done in this line, men had thanked him whose thanks any one might be proud to receive. But when communication became easy, and there seemed to be no longer any imperative call for his little Committee, he had given it up. There was still a little of that iron sticking in the fire, but he had taken it out just as far as he could. But he had still another iron. “You have a printing office.” Yes, I have a printing office, and a good deal of work is done there, and there is something made at it. But no one will say that having a printing office is in itself a very bad thing. But you have other irons. “You are teaching outside the Seminary.” He explained how he had accepted, after much solicitation, with the advice of his colleagues, and of elders and ministers all over the State, the vacant chair of chemistry in the University to save it from being unworthily filled. He had had that small iron in the fire ever since. But was it a sin? He thought it could not be very bad to have scientific proclivities. He referred to some which Mr. Cater had manifested in former years, and recounted how he had sought in vain to get this very chair. It could not, therefore, be so very wrong for him to hold it, sustained in the acceptance of it by the persons he had named.

Dr. Woodrow went on to explain how it happened that all these things could be done by one man. Well, he was not very strong—they saw he was not very big! But he had consecrated himself, with all that he was and all that he had, to the service of his blessed Master. And he cheerfully endeavored to serve him up to the utmost limit of his strength. He had in this view considered it a privilege to give up the pleasures of society. The Moderator knew he had not been able to accept *his* invitations—no, not those of *his own sister*. And he had verily thought he was doing God service in giving up to him the time he might have spent in the pleasures and duties of social life. Then, all men have a right to rest; but he had cheerfully relinquished his needed rest in order to keep some irons from burning. Also he had offended many brethren whose letters on private business (not the business of the Church) he had failed to answer. And she, whose “whose price was above rubies,” aided him in all he undertook, she too relinquishing for this purpose the pleasures of society. And yet it has come to this, that because we have united in reverently laying upon the altar of God our whole strength and all our time, my name (and my name is her name) is made a by-word to be mocked at.

But it is reiterated, you are making too much money. He did make a good deal of money. What did he do with his money? He might say this is no other man's business. But before the Church of God, as he thought he was now standing, he assumed no such attitude. He had never told any but his most intimate friends what he did with his money. But what was he doing with it? Are not the Trustees of the Southwestern Depository right in their opinion, that to publish a religious newspaper is one important means of glorifying God? Does not the Synod of Mississippi do well to appropriate funds in the hands of these trustees to that noble project? Was it not right for the friends of religious literature in Mobile to collect and expend ten or twelve thousand dollars to establish a religious journal there? Moderator, I cannot establish a religious paper for nothing any more than any one else, and God forbid that I should boast; but I am forced in vindication of my own character to say, that I

have spent between thirteen and fourteen thousand dollars of my own hard-earned money in establishing the *Southern Presbyterian*, and between three and four thousand more in continuing the SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. Have I sinned in so doing?

I am glad that I appear in this Assembly, not only for the reasons I have given, but for others as well. A pale and delicate boy—scarcely more than a boy—twenty-two years ago landed upon the southern shore of this State. He had not one friend within hundreds and hundreds of miles; but he believed that in this and in the contiguous States, though he was born across the Atlantic on a foreign shore, there would be those who would welcome him in due time, if he was worthy of welcome. And I have been welcomed. And I stand not now before strangers, but before those who have been observing my course from that day to this, and who have without ceasing bestowed upon me every mark of confidence and affection. I am happy to see in one of the members of this Assembly a member of the church with which I first united in this State soon after I reached it—the elder who is now representing the Presbytery of Tombeckbee [Mr. R. F. Houston.] The beloved brother who is sitting before me, now from Lexington, Virginia, [Rev. Dr. J. L. Kirkpatrick,] was the first minister in this State to extend to me the elements of the broken body and shed blood of our ascended Redeemer. Father McCorkle, who is present in this house, though not a member of the Assembly, was the first along with other brethren, twenty years ago, to intrust to me the first official position which I ever held in the Church. Father Wilson, and others who are here from the Synod of Georgia, more than eighteen years ago called me to a still higher position. And here, let me say, I never thrust myself higher. I never sought any office of honor or profit which I have ever received; and I have received many from the Church, and I have received the offer of many from the different States. And so I have gone on, step by step; and I rejoice that there are multitudes of brethren here who have been observing my course day by day. There are a number of my students here, too—an unbroken succession from 1853 to this

day—those whom I have delighted to take by the hand and lead in the paths of knowledge, whether secular or sacred. To them I appeal, whether I have ever neglected any of my duties performed under their daily scrutiny. It is not before strangers that I stand to-day, therefore, though that boy was a stranger. It is before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, which has for many years and in many ways honored me with its confidence. I beg you that you will not withdraw your confidence, unless you see good reason so to do. But as you opened your arms to receive the young foreigner and confided in him, so now thrust him from your embrace, and cast him down to the lowest depths of the infamy which he deserves, if he has proved unworthy—if he has betrayed any of the trusts which you have so lavishly confided to him.

But, Moderator, I beg that you will not by any neglect, by “faint praise,” by any praise accompanied with exceptions, unless you now go fully into the investigation of the exceptions, leave any stain upon the name I bear. Moderator, that name is very dear to me. In 1525, in the western part of Scotland, Patrick Wodrow, just after the beginning of the Reformation, began to preach the same glorious gospel that it has been your privilege so long to preach. At the close of the “Revolution,” James Wodrow, in 1688, was made the first Professor of Theology in the University of Glasgow, after he had been hiding from his persecutors, preaching the gospel as he might, for twenty-five years. You are indebted to Robert Wodrow for the *Annals of Scotland*, in so far as relates to the memorials of those days of bloody persecution that have come down to us a precious heritage. The venerable Thomas Wodrow, now under my own roof, has been preaching the gospel from the Orkney Islands to the south of England, from the snows of Canada to the warm plains of South Carolina, for more than fifty years. Another Thomas Woodrow has offered his purse to this Church through me; and this Church through me has received it. Moderator, the name is dear to me; and I would fain transmit it without a stain to the little band of prattlers now at my fireside—to the four little ones who for these past weeks

have been gathering around me, attracted by the conversation of their elders, and asking questions with their eyes full of wonder—"What is this? what are they saying about you? what do they mean by 'bond disappearing from the treasury'? And do they say you took money twice for the same thing? What do they mean by these things which we are hearing?" And then, "Do they mean that you took the Church's money? that you have been doing wicked things? You—*you?*" And then they cluster around me, twining their little arms around my neck with loving caresses to shield me from harm, if there is no one else to protect my fair name. And shall that name be dishonored which she whose "works praise her," in the proudest hour of my life consented to receive as her own? Shall I be permitted to transmit to these little ones an honored name? or shall it be tarnished by such rumors; by such attacks; by such—I will not characterise them. Is it, is it, fathers and brethren, to be my fate to transmit this honored name received from honored ancestors to a disgraced posterity? I appeal to you, fathers and brethren, to judge whether I have deserved this at your hands.

Dr. J. Leighton Wilson said he had come that morning expecting to make an extended speech, moved to that resolution, because a respected member of the Assembly had said no man had any complaint against him, but some did except to my associate Dr. Woodrow. That determined me to speak, and perhaps speak long; but I feel that the necessity is removed. He proceeded to state that he had been charged with occupying his time in conducting a large school. His school was a charity institution, which cost him every year between five hundred and one thousand dollars. He had only the general care of it, and, except to open it with prayer, he had not spent four hours in it for four years. But he had felt after the war that his region of country was gone, unless female education could be promoted. And he had the satisfaction of knowing that he had educated about thirty girls, daughters of ministers and of widows unable to educate them. Dr. Wilson went on to say, however, that this was not his line of defence against the charge made; but he held, that when any officer of the Church discharges the duties

of his office, the Church has no right to inquire what becomes of the rest of his time. There was not one prominent official in the Church who could not be convicted, if this principle does not stand. Referring again to his accused associate, he said he must tell some things which his own modesty had prevented his disclosing, and which even now he had not his permission to tell. Then he recounted the loss of \$3,000 of the Committee's money by failure of a banking-house in New York, which Dr. Woodrow insisted on bearing himself against the protestations of the Committee; and how he had advanced, with the aid of his noble brother, Thomas Woodrow, \$5,500, to meet drafts coming from Brazil and China, and which our Church had not in her Treasury. Yet, this is the man some want to tumble out of doors, and put a mark upon him! He closed by saying, that he had nothing to live for but his Church and his family. It had been one of the profoundest sources of enjoyment to him that his Church had been so harmonious; and he deplored the fact of the springing up in the midst of it of such elements of discord.

At the close of Dr. Wilson's remarks, Dr. Hill's substitute was laid on the table, and the Assembly adjourned to meet at 4 o'clock p. m. In the afternoon, Dr. Dabney, from the Committee on Bills and Overtures, presented a report on the overture from the Presbytery of Memphis, asking for the "return of the Committees of Education and Sustentation to the places where they were first located, and from which the war necessitated their removal—the Committee of Education to Memphis, and Sustentation to New Orleans." The Committee recommended the following answer: "That there appears no evidence that the above changes are required by the general sentiment of the churches and presbyteries, and the Assembly therefore respectfully decline action at this time." Mr. S. B. O. Wilson had been instructed by the Presbytery of Memphis to urge this removal, but felt a delicacy in doing so in the peculiar circumstances of this meeting of the Assembly. The matter was not new, but had come before this body last year. There is danger in centralisation. He did not urge the removal from any lack of confidence in the brethren at Columbia, but with an eye to

the benefit of the Church. Mr. Lynn, of the same Presbytery, made similar remarks. Dr. Kirkpatrick would adopt the report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, but hoped the time would come when the business of our Committees would require a Secretary for each, and he would then favor their dispersion. Mr. Cater said the question was of more consequence than the Assembly seemed to think. Dr. Porter said the Synod of Texas was against the removal of the Sustentation Committee to New Orleans, although specially interested in that Committee's doings; and that he understood the judgment of the brethren at New Orleans was likewise against the change. Dr. John Leighton Wilson said the brethren at Columbia were stated in the public prints to be opposed to the removal, but he did not know of one of them who had ever uttered in public any opinion or written a line on that subject. On the contrary, he had brought the matter himself before the Assembly at Baltimore, which declined to remove it. The separation of the two Committees would relieve him from a great amount of labor. Mr. Tenney (Eastern Texas) differed from Dr. Porter as to the feeling in Texas, but himself desired no removal. Dr. Baird said the Committee of Education had never conversed at all about the matter, and he had never undertaken to influence any one on the subject. All he desired was the good of the Church. The report was adopted.

On the next day, when the report of the Investigating Committee came up, Mr. Cater said he had prepared himself to make some protracted remarks, but he should make but few, and then dismiss the subject. It had caused him a great deal of distress and anxiety of mind. There has been a great conflict in my heart. I perhaps had a vast struggle with the "old Adam;" and I trust the grace of God has enabled me to overcome him. After some further remarks of this nature, he concluded by begging permission of the house to withdraw every remark which has been wounding to the feelings of his brethren. And more, sir—I beg leave to say, that I do, from my innermost heart, forgive everything which they have said, so harshly, as I think. God give me grace ever to pray for them.

Dr. Woodrow—Mr. Moderator, I earnestly pray God that he

will inspire me with that wisdom from above which is "first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated." If, as has been intimated by the member who has just spoken, my purity was not intended to be assailed, and if it has been vindicated before this Assembly, and so before the Church, and the world, I would have naught but peaceable thoughts in my heart; and I therefore here declare myself satisfied with the explanation that has now been made. And I further say, that if I have gone one step beyond what He who is not only the God of truth and righteousness, but the God of love, would fully approve, I here, without reserve, withdraw it.

Dr. Kirkpatrick offered the following resolution, to be adopted in place of the Committee's report:

Resolved, That the General Assembly having received the report of the Special Committee appointed to investigate the charges or complaints respecting the official conduct of the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Executive Committees of Foreign Missions and of Sustentation, in compliance with the request made by those officers, and having received full and explicit information concerning the several matters involved in said charges or complaints, does not deem it necessary to take any further action in the premises than simply to declare, as it does hereby declare, in the most emphatic and unqualified terms, that it finds nothing in any of the facts brought to its view to shake, but much to strengthen, the confidence hitherto reposed in the fidelity of the said officers to the trusts committed to them, and in their wise, vigilant, and successful management thereof.

Governor Patton heartily assented to the substitution. And after some remarks from Drs. Hill and Pryor, the resolution was unanimously adopted. Dr. Marshall moved that the Moderator lead the Assembly in returning thanks to God, which was agreed to; and, through the Moderator, the Assembly did accordingly, and with much feeling, offer devout thanksgiving for the happy result which had been reached.

PRESBYTERY OF SAO PAULO.

Dr. Hendrick presented the following:

The Committee on Foreign Missions would report in regard to the organisation of a Presbytery in Brazil:

1. That Rev. G. Nash Morton, Rev. Edward Lane, Rev. James R. Baird, and Rev. W. C. Emerson, with the church in Campinas, be detached from their presbyteries; and they hereby are constituted into a Presbytery to be called the Presbytery of Sao Paulo, in connexion with the Synod of Virginia.

2. The boundaries of said Presbytery shall be commensurate with the limits of the kingdom of Brazil.

3. The Presbytery of Sao Paulo is directed to meet in Campinas on Saturday before the second Sabbath in January, 1872, at 11 o'clock a. m., and be opened with a sermon by Rev. James R. Baird, or, in case of his absence or inability, by Rev. Edward Lane, who shall preside till a moderator is elected.

Adopted.

VALID BAPTISM.

The report of the Committee was read as follows :

The General Assembly of 1870 resolved as follows :

"That a Committee be appointed, which shall present to the next Assembly a report of full and clear instruction to the Church, on the whole subject of valid baptism, and the extent to which baptism administered by other churches should be recognised."

"This Committee was appointed to consist of the Rev. Drs. R. L. Dabney, Thos. E. Peck, J. B. Adger, and Geo. Howe." Minutes 1870, p. 537.

Your Committee, in fulfilment of the duty above assigned them, would beg leave to refer to the Assembly's Digest, Book III., Pt. I., Chap. 2. This chapter, from the enactments of previous Assemblies, presents what appears to us to be a safe and scriptural collection of rules concerning valid and invalid baptism. We are there taught that baptism is in no case to be administered by any save a minister of the Church of Christ, called to be a steward of the mysteries of God. See Directory for Worship, Ch. VII., § I. That baptism, by a clerical imposter, who has, in fact, never received ordination to the ministry in any Church of Christ, or by a minister duly suspended or deposed, is invalid, and so, null and void. That although the personal unworthiness of a minister officiating in any church of Christ does not invalidate the ordinances of that communion, yet peculiar and intentional profanity in the administration of a particular baptism may properly render it invalid; but in this case the church session and pastor are the best judges, and must decide from the particular circumstances whether to re-administer the sacrament in a regular manner; and that all baptisms ad-

ministered in the Unitarian and Popish communions are invalid. We respectfully recommend to the Assembly to reaffirm all these rules.

The Assembly of 1870, being asked whether persons who have been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity in the "Christian Church," (commonly called Campbellite), and applying for membership in our Church, shall be invariably re-baptized, did, from the same principles, answer this question in the affirmative; whereupon was adopted the resolution appointing to the undersigned the present duty.

If any other instruction to the churches is needed on "the whole subject of valid baptism, and the extent to which baptism administered by other churches should be recognised," we would respectfully submit the following:

Inasmuch as contact may hereafter arise with religious denominations now having no relations with our churches, or not even in existence at present, this instruction cannot now be given by a complete specific enumeration. It can only consist of the statement of scriptural principles, which determine each case as it arises.

Our Church has always held, agreeably to the Scripture, that the administration of baptism may present irregularities or imperfections which are not to be approved, but the sacrament may still have substantial validity. It is plain from the Scriptures, that baptism has, by the Lord Jesus Christ, been given to his true visible Church catholic,* and cannot be out of her pale. The administration of this sacrament may be in two ways invalidated; either by the apostasy of the body wherein it is exercised, so that this society is no true part of Christ's visible Church; or by the utter change or corruption of the element and doctrine of the sacrament. And our Assemblies have correctly held, that the form called by the Popish communion "Christian baptism" has ceased, for both reasons, to be valid; because that society is declared in Scripture to be Antichrist, and Babylon, and apostate, out of which the Lord requireth his "people to come, that they may not be partakers of her plagues;" and because she hath, with superstitious design, substituted a mixed element in place of water, which Christ ordained to be used as the emblem, and hath utterly corrupted the doctrine of holy baptism into an incantation working *ex opere operato*.

In other societies, as the Unitarian, their rites may have due

*See Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; Acts ii. 41, 42; 1st Cor. xii. 13: Book of Gov., Ch. VII.; Dir. for Worship, Ch. VII., § 1.

regularity of outward form, and yet be no valid baptism; because these bodies are not true parts of Christ's visible Church. The validity of such cases therefore depends upon the claim of the communion in which they are administered to be true Churches of Jesus Christ. But the scriptural mark of a true Church is its holding forth the word of God.* In view of the fact that several Churches hold grave errors in connexion with much saving truth, and that perhaps no Church receives in everything the exact mind of the Spirit, it may be asked: With what degree of strictness or liberality this mark of a true visible Church is to be applied? It seems to us consonant to the Scriptures and the judgment of charity to answer, that so long as any communion so retains the essential truths of God's word, and the aids of the Holy Ghost, as to save souls by its ministrations, it shall be held a true, though imperfect, member of his visible body. Though it may omit or impugn some principles which we have received from God, and may even deny to our ordinances all recognition, and to our communion all church character, yet we may not imitate its uncharitableness; so long as Christ visibly intrusts it with his saving word and Spirit, we are bound to recognise it as of his visible body, notwithstanding its errors, and to pray for its attainment of a more peaceable unity in the bonds of the truth. But in judging the tendency of its ordinances to save souls, it is obviously proper that we shall estimate those ministrations as a consistent whole, as set forth by this communion. If their only tendency as a whole, taken as it expounds them to its members, is destructive to souls, then we cannot admit that it is a pillar and ground of saving truth, merely because of some disjointed fragments of the gospel-verities, mixed with heresies which, if heartily accepted by the people as taught, must be fatal to souls; or because a few persons, through the special teaching of God's Spirit leading them to select the spiritual meat and reject the poison, actually find Christ under those ministrations. For, the proper function of a visible Church is instrumentally to communicate to its disciples spiritual discernment, and not to presuppose it. And the happy escape of these souls from damnable error is due to the special grace of God shielding them against the regular effect of these ministrations, rather than employing and blessing them. If this rule of judgment be denied, then might a valid church character possibly be established for an association of infidels investigating parts of God's word only for purposes of cavil; since the Al-

*See Rom. iii. 2; 1st Tim. iii. 15; Book of Gov., Ch. II., § 2; Con. of F.. Ch. XXV.. § 3.

mighty Spirit might, against those purposes, employ those parts of the word to awaken and convert some member.

When we examine the numerous societies founded by Mr. Alexander Campbell and his coadjutors, we find that their distinctive principle is a rejection of all use whatsoever of creeds or symbols of faith of human composition as antisciptural and infringing liberty of conscience and Christian unity. But none the less do we find, in the teachings of their recognised founders and leaders, a particular theological system which has generally among them the virtual force of an accepted creed, even to the extent of being employed as a test of ministerial standing and rule of expulsion. The leading points of this system we find to be the following :

The inspiration of the Old and New Testaments is admitted, but the authority of the former as a rule of salvation under the new dispensation is superseded. The death of man's soul in sin, and his inability of will unto all spiritual good, are denied. A temporal sonship of Christ, with his divinity and vicarious sacrifice, are held, as also the personality and mission of the Holy Ghost as Comforter. Justification, which is defined to be remission of sins only, is on account of the merit of Christ's sacrifice alone; and this merit received by faith is first applied and sealed to the believer only in immersion; than which no other water-baptism is recognised. This faith, when genuine and justifying, always worketh by love, producing repentance unto life. But the renewing and quickening agency of the Holy Ghost in producing this faith and repentance, is expressly denied, save as he exercises a moral suasion, by holding forth inducements thereto in the Scriptures; and the sinner is required to quicken himself unto the exercise of these saving graces of his own free will. For it is declared that no man can receive the Spirit until after he hath received Christ and been reconciled to him in immersion. The mission of the Holy Ghost is therefore, according to them, only to promote the comfort and sanctification of the believer after his adoption by dwelling in his soul. Regeneration is taught to be no more than the introduction of a person into an estate of reconciliation. This, taken with other preceding propositions, manifestly abolishes the whole doctrine of effectual calling. As faith is made prerequisite to baptism in every case, infant baptism and the membership of the children of believer's in Christ's Church are utterly repudiated. And as the only faith required for adult baptism is the temporary faith of the soul exercising solely its native powers, (whereas the Scriptures require of adults a living faith in order to baptism,) it is hard to

see what part of the doctrine of baptism is left uncorrupted. While this is the system of faith which distinguishes their body, they require as the only declared basis for Christian communion the reception of the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation, expressed and sealed in immersion.

If your Committee may believe the current testimony within and without these societies, while some who are admitted to them hold more, many hold less of God's saving truth than is embraced in the above erroneous and fragmentary doctrine. Such must be the result of their rejection of all symbols of belief. If this first principle be consistently carried out, any one who is willing to attest in immersion a profession of his faith in Jesus Christ as God's Son and his Saviour, must be admitted to communion, and may be admitted to the ministry; whatever may be the sense in which he construes the terms "faith," "Messiah," "Sonship to God," and "salvation;" although that construction may be Sabellian, Arian, Pelagian, or Socinian. To this must be added the fact, that these societies admit no theory of church government, save the Independent, and no superior church courts of review and control. Whatever, then, may be the excellence of one member, or one congregation, in this denomination, the Christian world has no evidence or guarantee that the next is not of a far different character.

In such circumstances, even if the Assembly admitted that the system above delineated contained sufficient substance of saving truth to redeem the soul embracing it, this difficulty would remain: This communion refuses us all guarantee that the person baptized into its pale held at the time even that fragmentary outline. We are persistently left in the dark, whether both he and the minister who baptized him, and the congregation which received him, may not have apprehended the Trinity whose name was used, the faith professed, and the salvation embraced, in the sense of the unbelieving Pelagian or Socinian, unless we happen to have the incidental evidence of a personal acquaintance with these several parties. In these circumstances, there appears no way for the Church to protect the testimony and sacraments of her divine Head from disparagement, (a sacred duty in the performance of which no option is left us,) except to refuse to recognise in that body, as a whole, a part of Christ's true visible Church. Believing that it embraces many individuals and some congregations who are true saints of God, we sincerely regret, for the sake of these, the necessity of assuming this ground. But it is a necessity which they create, in refusing to separate themselves, by a definite testimony, from those who teach.

“another gospel;” for our sovereign Lord has strictly forbidden us to bid God-speed to such.

Dr. S. J. Baird was prepared to adopt this report without a word said. Mr. R. T. Berry was not ready to vote for it. Some of its positions were extreme ones. His chief objection was to the ground taken in regard to Roman Catholic baptism. First, that Church comprises three hundred millions of souls professing themselves Christians. He was not prepared to unchurch so many. Secondly, this Church, whatever its errors, holds the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. They hold the Apostles' and the Nicene creeds. Again, this Church is the historical Church of the world. Again, in regard to order as well as doctrine, they hold the same fundamental principles that we hold, viz., that the fundamental and original order of the ministry is the presbyter. Again, the Reformed Churches have never denied either the orders or the baptism of the Church of Rome. Again, that communion to this day holds the doctrines of Christianity more soundly than Protestant communions which deny the divinity and the atonement of Christ. Dr. Wills proposed to amend the report by substituting a resolution of thanks to the Committee for their able explanation, and to have it published in the Minutes for the information of the Church. There was a great deal of learning in the report, more than could be digested at that time. He thought the conclusions of the report sound, but there was not time now for their discussion. Dr. Peck explained that the last Assembly had not appointed this Committee to report whether Campbellite baptism is valid or invalid. It decided that question, reaffirming the decision of the Assembly of 1814 against Unitarian baptism, and that of the Assembly of 1845 against Popish baptism, and it merely appointed this Committee to expound and vindicate the position taken. As to Mr. Berry's argument, he considered it extraordinary; and he was surprised to hear his statement that his view was that held by the Reformed Churches. His reading of history had been very different from that. He read, then, from the deliverance of the Assembly of 1845 to show that Mr. Berry's charge of ultraism belonged to that venerable body no less than to us. After

VOL. XXII., NO. 4.—9.

some further remarks from various brethren, Dr. Wills's substitute was rejected, and the report adopted. At a late hour, on Dr. Wills's motion, the Committee of Publication was directed to publish the report for circulation.

Here we are compelled to arrest very summarily this review, commending our Church and all her interests and affairs to the guidance and blessing of her adorable Head.

ARTICLE VII.

THE PRACTICAL EFFICIENCY OF OUR CHURCH.

As a Church it is well not unfrequently to recur to the inquiry, are we fulfilling the end of our high calling and meeting the demands of our day? This does not imply that we are now specially inefficient; much less is it designed to intimate that positive evil is promulgated in any department of our system or its practical working. Neither is it intended to raise the question of efficiency as compared with other periods of our own history, or with other Christian communions; nor to depreciate the necessity and importance of enlarging our contributions and increasing our ministerial force. Such inquiries would of themselves open interesting and profitable fields of inquiry; but we do not design in this article to enter any of these. Our design is to raise *the bare question of practical efficiency as attained in our present actual state with our present effective strength.* It is well to consider the question of enlarging the outward and divinely appointed means of efficiency. The Lord honoreth the increase of these means when rendered in honor to him, used in humble reliance upon him, and that to promote his glory. Yet it is even more pertinent to inquire into the efficiency of our Church as it is. It is not by might, nor by power; an increase of the outward and formal elements of strength is not necessarily