

THE
AMERICAN
PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

NEW SERIES. No. XXIII.—JULY, 1868.

ARTICLE I.—COMPLETENESS OF MINISTERIAL CHARACTER.*

BY WILLIAM ADAMS, D.D., PASTOR OF THE MADISON-SQUARE CHURCH, N. Y.

A class of young men emerging from a Theological Seminary, having completed a course of preparatory studies extended through many years, and about to enter upon the active prosecution of their profession, is a spectacle of no ordinary interest. This is so, not merely because they have reached an epoch in their personal history which has long been anticipated—the transition, as it were, from the Georgics to the Eneid of life—from preparatory culture to earnest action—a critical time of mingled hopes and anxieties; but chiefly because it is the *introduction of a new force* into society, which will inevitably be felt by many for good or evil, for this life, and the life which is to come.

My thoughts instinctively recur to a class of some forty members who graduated at another Seminary thirty-eight years ago. One became eminent for rare and accurate scholarship, especially in Sacred Literature which he adorned as a teacher. None who knew BELA B. EDWARDS will cease to admire and love that rare specimen of modesty and learning. One devoted

*An address delivered before the Union Theological Seminary, New York, May 10, 1868.

THE MEN AND TIMES OF THE REUNION OF 1758.

BY REV. E. H. GILLET, D. D., Harlem, N. Y.

In 1741, the Presbyterian church in this country, then represented by the Synod of Philadelphia, which numbered on the roll of its constituent Presbyteries some forty-three clerical members, was rent asunder by the operation of a Protest which superseded all judicial forms, and excluded from the Synod the leading members of the New Brunswick Presbytery, and all who adhered to them in their ecclesiastical sympathies.

The Protest was an act of injustice, plausibly defensible only on revolutionary grounds. It was the act of a majority, triumphing by the force of numbers, and justifying themselves on the plea that the members of the Synod with whom they declined longer to sit and act, had contemned the authority of the body, and by persistent and avowed violation of its rules, had forfeited their own ecclesiastical recognition.

It is unnecessary here to dilate upon the provocation offered by the one party, or the character of the summary measure adopted by the other. It may be said, in brief, that both parties were in the wrong. The New Brunswick brethren, with a zeal not according to knowledge, had, on various occasions, indulged in indiscriminate denunciations of the Christian character of their ministerial associates. They had published or endorsed discourses, which, like the famous Nottingham Sermon, had more in them of prophetic invective and fanatical bitterness, than of gospel wisdom or charity. They had embodied their views in papers and protests which seemed studiously designed to exasperate. They had intruded, without invitation, into the parishes of their ministerial brethren, members of the same synod, and justified their intrusion by the insulting assumption that it was their right to feed flocks which their own pastors had starved. Some of them had manifested an unscrupulous insubordination to synodical author-

ity, had refused to attend as members upon the sessions of the body to which they belonged, and had aspersed the motives by which the majority had been governed in their action. Their course was exasperating and divisive. It tended to prejudice people against their pastors, to introduce discord into congregations, to rend churches asunder, and to spread abroad bitter animosities.

The great body of the Synod had no sympathy with them, if we except their zeal for the general revival of pure religion. The New York Presbytery, almost to a man, stood between the New Brunswick party and the Protesters. They disapproved their divisive principles and practice, their violent language, their extravagant charges, while they respected their honesty of purpose, and the undoubted sincerity of their religious fervor. In the absence of that presbytery from the Synod in 1741, the division was accomplished. A scene of confusion followed the presenting and signature of the protest, and the New Brunswick party, to their own dismay, after having appealed to the test of numbers, found themselves in a minority, and withdrew from Synod.

The division was accomplished. Neither party would confess its error or retrace its steps. The New York Presbytery, absent from Synod in 1741, but present in 1742, were anxious to devise and to secure the adoption of healing measures. Wisely and patiently did they prosecute their aim. They remained, till 1745, in connection with the Synod of Philadelphia, evidently with the hope of securing the restoration of the New Brunswick brethren by some compromise which would harmonize both parties, and secure the renunciation of their errors by the excluded party. When at last they perceived that their efforts in this direction were destined to prove futile, they declared their purpose to form a new Synod to which the excluded members should be admitted, yet they took every proper precaution against allowing the movement to wear a partisan aspect, and parted from their associates of the Philadelphia Synod on the most friendly terms, and with the distinct expression of their fraternal and coöperative spirit

The new Synod of New York, constituted of the Presbyteries of New York, New Brunswick and Newcastle, met at Elizabethtown, Sept. 19th, 1745. The New Brunswick Presbytery, with candidates supplied from Tennent's Log College, had increased in strength, and now numbered nine members. That of Newcastle numbered four, while of the twenty-two members present in Synod, nine belonged to the Presbytery of New York. The junction of the latter with the others gave the Synod of New York a strength in numbers equal to that of the Synod of Philadelphia after its loss of the New York members. When it met (1746) after the withdrawal of these, it had a clerical membership of twenty-two upon its roll. The two bodies, therefore, at this date, may be regarded as very nearly of equal strength, although in the Philadelphia Synod there were several, who, in matters which concerned the Protest and the excluded members, were in strong sympathy with New York Presbytery.

This latter body signalized its zeal for reunion in the very basis upon which the Synod was organized. That basis secured the provision of subscription to the standards "in such manner as was agreed unto by the Synod of Philadelphia in the year 1729." It stipulated that in matters of discipline the determination should be by the major vote of ministers and elders, with which vote every member should actively concur or passively acquiesce; that there should be no propagation of scandal against ministerial character, but that persons objected against should be dealt with according to the rules of the Gospel, and known methods of discipline; that all persons having a competent degree of ministerial knowledge, orthodox in doctrine, regular in life and diligent in Christian activity, should be cheerfully admitted; and that "factious separating practices or principles" should be in no respect encouraged. The disposition of the new body was also evinced by the adoption of a measure for correspondence with the Synod of Philadelphia, and the delegation of two members to meet them at their next Convention, and concert

with them such measures as might best promote in this land, the interests of the Kingdom of Christ.

It is easy to discover in the distinctive features of this basis, the enlarged and liberal views of the members of the Presbytery of New York. They would not unite with the New Brunswick party on any terms which could, even by implication, be understood to endorse "the factious separating practices or principles," with which the latter stood publicly charged. They would not allow an individual or party to belong to the Synod unless such individual or party would actively concur, or passively acquiesce, in the decision of the majority. They would not suffer their own organization to assume an aspect of opposition or rivalry, while the resolution not to supply ministers or candidates to parties separating from Presbyterian or Congregational Churches, unless the matter was submitted by both parties to their jurisdiction, was a peace measure in two directions,—with respect to the churches of Connecticut on one side, and those of the Philadelphia Synod on the other.

In acceding to these terms, the New Brunswick party made a virtual confession of the errors they had committed, and the wrongs they had done. They cheerfully surrendered to the New York brethren what the authority of the Philadelphia Synod could not extort. In conjunction with their new allies, they now extended the olive branch to their former antagonists. A great point had been gained—by whatever influences or motives—when they were willing to renounce their former violent and divisive courses, discountenance the use of invective and slander, and abide by the decision of a majority of the body to which they belonged.

It is not difficult to recognize in the terms of the Synod's basis, the shaping influence of a master mind. The Synod met at Elizabethtown, and Jonathan Dickinson of Elizabethtown was chosen moderator. For nearly forty years he had occupied here his post of pastor, and he had long been the leading member of his Presbytery. Probably no minister then living within the bounds of the church, was his superior

in ability, or exerted a more commanding influence. As an author he had not his peer in the membership of both Synods, and his acknowledged productions attest the vigor of his pen. As a controversialist he had met the various forms of religious error which threatened the purity and peace of the church. He had vindicated Presbyterian ordination against Episcopal assumption as early as 1724, and the Boston ministers, able as they were, did not scorn to accept his championship of theirs, a common cause. He had in various publications attacked Infidelity, Arminianism, Antinomianism, Moravian errors, and the fanatic excesses of the Great Revival. Anonymous productions of his pen, which Dr. Green never discovered, and which Dr. Sprague has not catalogued,* attest the extent of his historical research, and the vigor of his prolific and tireless pen. When the Adopting Act of 1729 was first proposed, he came to it fresh from the study of the subscription controversy abroad, and of the bondage to forms and ceremonies imposed by the zealots for Episcopacy on this side the ocean. Andrews undoubtedly had him specially in mind when he wrote (Ap. vii. 1729) to Colman of Boston, in reference to the proposed subscription to the Westminster confession: "Our countrymen say they are willing to join in a vote to make it the Confession of our church; but to agree to making it a test of orthodoxy and term of ministerial communion, they will not." Three days later Dickinson had completed his "Remarks on a Discourse entitled An Overture," which was forthwith sent to the printer. The Overture represented the condition of the church, without subscription as like that of defenceless Laish,† but Dickinson insisted that poor defenceless Laish would not be

* Among the works of Dickinson published anonymously, and which have not hitherto been generally credited as his, we may mention, "The Scripture Bishop;" and "The Scripture Bishop Vindicated," the last a 12mo. of 126 pages, fine print, and identified as his by a note quoting it in a later treatise by Beckwieth of Lyme, Conn. Dickinson's "Letters to Experience Mayhew," and his Remarks upon the Postscript to a Defence of a "Modest Proof," may be also mentioned in this connection. There are some other unrecognized works of his, also, I believe, but I am unable to recall them at the moment.

† Hodge's His. I. 138.

bettered by the wall of subscription, which would fall if a fox went over it.* Her true defence, he declares, is the thorough examination of candidates on the saving work of grace in their hearts, in reviving ancient discipline, in bringing offenders to account, and being diligent in preaching the whole counsel of God. He argues that there may a bond of union without subscription, that the Synod had already a bond of union in the general acknowledgment of the truth, and that subscription always causes disunion. To shut out of the ministry non-subscribers, is to make the Confession, not the Bible, our standard, and is an invasion of the royalty of Christ. Dickinson was evidently familiar with the entire history of the subscription controversy in England and Ireland, and doubtless felt himself justified by the facts of that controversy in the use of the strong language which he employed.

We may judge, therefore, with what spirit he entered, five months later, on his duties as a member of the committee of Synod in whose hands the overture for subscription was placed, and by means of whose report the Adopting Act was so harmoniously passed. We may be sure that his carefully considered and well matured views had not changed. He had given them in print to the world, and he never recalled them. He evidently considered the Adopting Act of 1729 as fully sufficient for any emergency the church would be called upon to meet, and it doubtless marked the utmost limit to which he would consent to go. Andrews' remark, "I think all the Scotch are on our side, and all the English and Welsh on the other, to a man," indicates the hearty support which Dickinson must have received from his own countrymen, and the accommodating spirit with which the views of the two parties were finally harmonized by the Adopting Act of 1729.

Later events showed that this measure was not of itself adequate to exclude errorists from the ministry of the church, not because it was not strict enough, but because unscrupulous men would be hampered by no subscription. In 1735,

* Webster 106.

Samuel Hemphill, from the Presbytery of Strabane, came to this country and was invited to become Andrews' assistant at Philadelphia. He was young, a ready and pleasing speaker, and soon became highly popular with a certain class. But some of the congregation were disgusted with him, and refused to attend upon his ministry. Andrews charged him before the Synod's Commission with erroneous teaching. Franklin, who was one of Hemphill's admirers, defended him in his *Gazette*. "Supposing," he said, "our fathers tied themselves to the Westminster Confession; why should not a Synod in George the Second's time, have as much right to interpret the Scriptures, as one that met in Oliver's time? If any doctrine there maintained, is, or shall hereafter be found to be, not altogether orthodox, why must we be forever confined to that or any other confession?"

The Commission found Hemphill guilty of the charges preferred, and Franklin came once more to his defence. He contends that the Commission, in order to uphold Andrews, would have declared any doctrine "necessary and essential." It fell to Dickinson to defend the Commission. He could honestly do it even on the principles of the author of the overture, in which the Adopting Act originated, and which he had himself attacked. That author had found fault with those who, "by a kind of indifference and mistaken charity," "think they ought to bear with others, though differing with them in opinion about points which are mysterious and sublime, but not practical nor fundamental, such as predestination. Now, although I would rather grant that the precise point of election and reprobation be neither fundamental nor immediately practical, yet, take predestination completely, as it takes in the other disputed points between Calvinists and Arminians, such as universal grace, the non-perseverance of the saints, foreseen faith and good works, etc., and I think it such article in my creed, such a fundamental of my faith, that I know not what any other articles would avoid that could be retained without it." To all this Dickenson would have cordially responded, but he found Hemphill's case more

glaring than the theoretic one of Thompson's overture. He vindicated the Commission, and then appended the Adopting Act, "to convince the reader that we govern ourselves according to the principles here asserted and pleaded for."* Lesser differences of opinion in extra-essential points would not serve to debar a man from the ministry. But if he adopts errors disqualifying him for the faithful discharge of his trust, he can not be admitted without unfaithfulness to God and conscience.

Hemphill contemned the Synod's authority, declaring that he had adopted the Confession only in its "essential and necessary doctrines," even while it was notorious that he inclined far toward Deism. His course necessarily excited alarm, and this too not only among weak and timid minds, but among many who regarded the phrase of "essential and necessary doctrines," as the gap by which the offender had forced an entrance. Scattered among the congregations there were Presbyterians of the Covenanter class, who were jealous of any relaxation of the severest terms of subscription. Nothing could have occurred more opportune to excite their fears than the case of Hemphill, and it was but natural that when he appealed to the terms and tone of the Adopting Act, pastors who would give their people assurance of their own orthodoxy, should be prepared under the influence of the emergency to give to the Adopting Act the most rigorous interpretation possible.

How far the dissatisfaction extended, we are not able to say. It drove the father of Dr. Moses Hoge over into the ranks of the Seceders. It commanded a popular sympathy to which Alexander Craighead could appeal, a few years later, for support. It was so extensive and permanent as to leave results behind it which commanded the attention of a certain branch of Reformed Presbyterians at the opening of the present century. It created little less than a panic among some of the members of the Synod, and when that body met at Philadelphia in 1736, in the absence of nearly the entire

* Webster, 112.

New York Presbytery, they found that "many persons of our persuasion have been offended with some expressions or distinctions in the first or preliminary act of our Synod, relating to our receiving or adopting the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms." They declare, therefore, "that in order to remove all offence and all jealousies that have arisen or may arise in any of our peoples' minds, on occasion of such distinctions and expressions, the Synod doth declare that the Synod have adopted and still do adhere to the Westminster Confession, Catechisms and Directory *without the least variation or alteration, and without any regard to such distinctions.*" They add, "we hope and desire that this our Synodical declaration and explication may satisfy all our people, as to our firm attachment to our good old received doctrines contained in said Confession, without the least variation or alteration, and that they will lay aside their jealousies that have been entertained thorough occasion of the above limited expressions and declarations as groundless."

This declaration was unanimously approved. It may well have been understood to imply more than it asserted, which was in substance the entire acceptance of the standards by the members then present. Yet it should be remembered that the original overture from which the Adopting Act sprung, had proposed "that if any minister within our bounds shall take upon him to teach or preach anything contrary to any of the said articles, *unless first he proposed the said point to the Presbytery or Synod to be by them discussed,* he shall be censured so and so." There was thus left even in the overture itself, as violently as it was first opposed, a liberty which the Adopting Act certainly was not intended to restrict, and which is historically important as throwing light upon the *animus* of the measure itself. The assertion therefore that the Synod "*have adopted*" etc., "without the least variation or alteration," may be left to stand for what it is worth—an interpretation simply of a historical act, while it does not profess to prescribe any new terms of ministerial

communion, but only sets forth the attitude which the Synod for the time being chose to assume.

It is very evident that Dickinson, who did not appear again in Synod till two years later (1738), did not think it worth while to meddle with the declaration, and it is doubtful whether he attached much importance to it. But now, when the Basis of the New Synod was to be shaped, we find its first article declaring the agreement of the body "that the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, be the public confession of their faith *in such manner as was agreed unto by the Synod of Philadelphia, in the year 1729.*" There is no mention of any subsequent interpretation or explication, and the fact that there is none speaks for itself. Dickinson in defending the Synod's commission against Hemphill, did nothing inconsistent with his former positions, and perhaps the reason why he was selected for the task was not merely his superior ability, but the superior advantage which, with his well-known views, he possessed to meet the charge that the commission had "no pattern for their proceedings but that hellish tribunal, the Spanish Inquisition." We may be sure that in a document like that of the Basis of the New Synod, every provision was carefully considered, and every word was duly weighed. Dickinson and his associates were not the men to forget the language employed by the Old Side Protesters, only four years before. "We protest that no person, minister or elder, should be allowed to sit and vote in this Synod, who hath not received, adopted, or subscribed the said Confessions, Catechisms and Directory, as our Presbyteries respectively do, *according to our last explication of the Adopting Act.*" The language of the Basis of 1745 is as distinct a repudiation of this position as anything can be by means of implication.

Nor was this repudiation a mere concession to the well-known liberal views of Dickinson and his associates. It indicated the shape which deliberations for that reunion which the New York brethren kept ever in view must necessarily

take. It brought up logically, as it did historically, the question about essentials.

It would be tedious to dwell minutely upon the successive steps by which the two Synods of New York and Philadelphia approximated to their union platform. Correspondence was maintained more or less regularly between the two bodies, and year after year terms of union were proposed and discussed. Some of the gravest difficulties had been already met in the very organization of the New York Synod. The New Brunswick party, in accepting its basis, had by implication condemned themselves and their divisive courses. Nor was the change one either of policy or constraint. It was undoubtedly sincere, and the result of clearer light and larger experience. The history of the Separates in New England as well as in Westchester County, N. Y., must have tended to open the eyes of men like the Tennents, the Blairs, and Finley. A letter from Gilbert Tennent to Dickinson, within a few months after the exclusion of the New Brunswick brethren, shows that he had already begun to recover from the impetuous zeal and rash violence of his Nottingham Sermon. The excluded brethren, before the organization of the New York Synod, had become wiser and better men, and their new associates helped them on to larger and more peaceable views.

The field of discussion for terms of reunion, was thus greatly narrowed, and at length, in 1749, a Commission from each Synod met at Trenton. David Cowell, a member of the Old Side, pastor of the Trenton church, and a former controversial antagonist of Gilbert Tennent, was chosen moderator. Cross, Alison, Cathcart, Boyd, McHenry, Cowell, Griffith and Thorn, were present from the Synod of Philadelphia, and Pierson, Pemberton, Gilbert and William Tennent, Treat, Samuel and John Blair, Lewis, Finley, Roan and Arthur, from the Synod of New York. Each party had its strong men there. Fierce combatants of former years were met to determine the conditions of peace and union. Tennent came face to face with Cowell; the protesters of 1741 were confronted by their excluded brethren. It seems scarcely possible

that fresh memories of conflicts so recent, should not be awakened anew. The attention of the united Commission was first called by the New York members to the protest of 1741. They pronounced it "one principal bar to union," and insisted that by some authentic and formal act it should by the Synod be made null and void. Excited debate ensued, and there was no prospect of agreement. The Commission, unable to come to any common terms, could only agree that both Synods should more fully prepare proposals for an accommodation which they should interchange, meanwhile studying to cultivate a spirit of candor and friendship. Three points were specified, in regard to which mutual satisfaction should be sought and given. One was the Protest, another was the disposal of the Presbyteries that had been rent in-sunder, and the third had respect to "that paragraph about essentials," which the New York Synod had embodied in their proposals for reunion. The other suggestions of the Synod, which they had already for the most part embodied in their basis, seem to have been approved without question, or to have excited little remark.

A great change had come over some of the leading men of the New Brunswick party. Gilbert Tennent was called to Philadelphia in 1744, and very soon the impetuous exhorter and thrilling extempore preacher began to read his sermons. He no longer discarded the wig. His hair was no longer left loose and unpowdered. He laid aside his large great coat with its leathern belt. Philadelphia civilization had captured and tamed the lion of the Nottingham Sermon. His theology grew more mellow—to use a word which to some would convey a double sense. He assumed that persons of moral life, possessed of a knowledge of the principles of the Christian faith, should be admitted to the communion, and argued strenuously against his own former practice. Almost contemporaneously with the meeting of the joint commission at Trenton, he preached and printed his "Irenicum, a Plea for the Peace of Jerusalem," and an argument for Synodical Reunion. Already his life seemed to embody the history of

two different men, and when Rev. John Hancock (uncle of the more famous signer of the "Declaration," of the same name) issued his stinging pamphlet, *Gilbert vs. Tennent*, and allowed the two men who had dwelt successively in the same physical organization to contradict each other, the Philadelphia pastor must have felt that he had more to fear from the New Brünswick pastor than from any other gentlemen of his acquaintance. By the force of circumstances, and the reaction of his former excessive zeal, he had become a very respectable Old Side man, and was as open as Thomson or Boyd to the firebrands and arrows which he had hurled abroad at random in his Nottingham discourse.

Indeed, not a few of the New Side members held what we should now denominate emphatically Old Side opinions. The Half-way Covenant was popular with them, even after it had been fiercely assaulted in New England by Edwards and Bellamy. The Synod of New York drew to itself very considerable accessions from the old churches on Long Island, and the new organizations springing up east and west of the Hudson. In 1747 the Presbytery of Suffolk was formed, and added new strength to the Synod. Its churches had copied New England usages, and for the most part were strongly attached to the Half-way Covenant. Dickinson and Burr favored an admission to the sacraments of all who seemed desirous of leading a godly life. Jacob Green of Hanover, the father of Rev. Dr. Ashbel Green, for a time fell in with their Stoddardian teaching. Until 1753, Samuel Sacket of Bedford, N. Y., seems to have practiced on the principles of the Half-way Covenant. John Blair of Wallkill, agreed with Dickinson and Blair in their Stoddardian theories, and his views were republished in the year 1812, by Dr. J. P. Wilson of Philadelphia.*

* *Sacramental Selections; or the Nature and Design of the Lord's Sacrament with the Preparatory Self-Examination and Subsequent Walk of Communicants.* From various Authors. By the Rev. James P. Wilson, D. D. Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. W. W. Woodward, Philadelphia, 12 mo. pp. 300. Beside John Blair, the authors of the "Selections" are Drs. Duncan, Pike and Hayward, Mr. Doolittle, Dr. Owen, Dr. Earle, Dr. Haweis, Dr. John Erskine, etc.

When men like these—leaders of the New Side—were so wedded to notions and practises for the legitimate results of which the Old Side were blamed and denounced, we can scarcely be surprised that, as the fervor of the revival period died away, they looked with a cooler temper on the differences which they had once been tempted to exaggerate. On both sides, by the testimony of each, there was a growing disposition favorable to reunion. Each side studied conciliating measures. When Alison of the Old Side went to supply vacancies in Virginia and North Carolina, and when others accompanied or followed him, they were recommended “to study in all their public administrations and private conversations, to promote peace and unity among the societies, and to avoid whatever may tend to foment divisions and party spirit, and to treat every minister of the Gospel from the Synod of New York, of the like principles and peaceful temper, in a brotherly manner; as we desire to promote true religion, and not party designs.”

In such a spirit as this, which seems to have been fully reciprocated by the New Side, the difficulties which appeared insurmountable at Trenton, gradually assumed a diminished importance. The Protest was disposed of by the Synod of Philadelphia declaring that it was not a Synodical Act, and that as a Synod they could not withdraw what was only an act of members exercising their own right of Protest. With this concession the Synod of New York in 1756 declared itself satisfied, and declined further to insist upon the point. They were satisfied with the assurance of the Philadelphia Synod, “that when an union is made, they will carry toward these (New Side) brethren, as though neither this, nor any of the other protestations standing now in our records, or any other ground of difference on either side, had ever been;” as it belonged to the protesters alone to withdraw the protestation, the Synod, they said, could not do it, thus making the Protest no longer to be considered as the act of the Synod.

It was at this stage of the correspondence (1755,) that the

Old Side commended the policy of "letting bygones be bygones." "We should," they say, "mutually forgive and forget, and wholly bury all these things in perpetual oblivion, and endeavor in the strength of God to treat each other hereafter as though these things had never been. And as the Synods are two distinct judicatures now, and in present circumstances are not accountable to each other, they should unite as two contiguous bodies of Christians, agreed in principles, as though they had never been concerned with one another before, nor had any differences, which if the truth as to a great part of both Synods; and should now join the Synods and Presbyteries upon such Scriptural and rational terms as may secure peace and good order, tend to heal our broken churches, and advance religion hereafter."

The Synod of New York, which met at Philadelphia in October (1755,) expressed regret that the Philadelphia Synod had not descended to particulars, as had been suggested by the joint Commission at Trenton in 1749, and more especially, as some things which they regarded as "Scriptural and rational terms," the "circumstances considered," had not been consented to by the Philadelphia Synod. One of these was "the continuance of Presbyteries and Congregations as they now stand, and the terms of ministerial communion mentioned in the year 1749," while others were the "paragraph about essentials" and kindred points.

The Synod of Philadelphia evidently had no desire to be specific, and were prepared to accept re-union as a foregone conclusion. We shall see ere long that they were in no condition to insist on terms, or attempt to refuse what the New York Synod might consider necessary to union. They preferred, therefore, that a joint commission of the two bodies should prepare the basis of reunion, and that on the completion of their work the two bodies should meet together as one. Of course, nothing further was to be said, preliminary to the union, or the subject of remodelling the Presbyteries, and thereby blotting out the memorials of past division; and all the points specified by the Synod of New York,

which they declared "we esteem to be always rational and Scriptural terms" were tacitly conceded.

"What were these "rational and Scriptural terms" which the New York Synod—after all the previous correspondence, disposing of the protest, etc.,—desired thus to emphasize? Again and again they are brought up; by the Commission at Trenton in 1749, and by the New York Synod 1750, 1751, and 1755. In their own words they are as follows:—"That all matters shall be determined by a majority of votes, to which determination all shall submit; but if any member or members can not in conscience submit to any particular act or determination of the body, he or they shall be obliged, after sufficient liberty of reasoning and modest remonstrance, to withdraw from our Synodical communion. Provided always, that this last article shall not extend to any cases but such as the Synod shall judge to be essential in doctrine, worship or discipline." In the next year (1751,) the matter takes this form. "Though the Synod should make no acts but concerning matters of plain duty, or opinions relating to the great truths of religion, yet as every thing that appears plain duty and truth unto the body, may appear at the same time not to be essential, so we judge that no member or members should be obliged to withdraw from our communion upon his or their not being able actively to concur, or passively submit, unless the matter be judged essential in doctrine or discipline."

At first, (1752) the Philadelphia Synod met these "rational and Scriptural terms" with a cool *non placet*. They declared themselves "not convinced that the alteration in that article proposed by you, about what is essential, and what is not, is necessary; nay we apprehend that such an alteration as stated by you, has a bad aspect, and opens a door for unjustifiable latitude, both in principles and practice." But this reluctance of the Philadelphia Synod to yield the point, impels the Synod of New York to make the matter still more specific, and characterize it anew as "rational and Scriptural terms." After the protest, it was evidently the one thing upon

which the whole project of reunion hinged. When the two Synods left the matter to their joint committee to prepare the way for the united meeting of 1758, this matter again came up for a final disposal, and it is quite evident that the Old Side still made at least the show of surrendering at discretion.

In the reunion plan of 1758, the old condition insisted on by the New York Synod still preserves its perfect identity, although under the disguise of new language. "Determinations" takes the place of "acts," "essential" appears as "indispensible," and "doctrine and discipline" have been fashioned into "doctrine or Presbyterian Government;" so that the whole paragraph reads—"That when any matter is determined by a major vote, every member shall either actively concur or passively submit to such a determination; or, if his conscience permit him to do neither, he shall, after sufficient liberty modestly to reason and remonstrate, peaceably withdraw from our Communion, without attempting to make any schism. Provided always, that this shall be understood to extend only to *such determinations as the body shall judge indispensable in doctrine or Presbyterian Government.*"

Thus the New Side had secured the *thing*, while less scrupulous about the form. They had acted in consistency with themselves throughout. They made the Adopting Act, *as received in 1729*, the fundamental position which they resolved to occupy. They allowed a latitude in what they accounted non-essentials. Davies' exposition of their policy, as given by him in England, in 1753, was an honest one, and by others as well as himself, thoroughly understood. This was the general understanding alike by friends and foes. Gallatly, representing the dissatisfaction of seceders like Craighead and Hoge, understood the matter well. In his "Detector," aimed at the New Side, and published not long after the Old Side had objected that the paragraph about essentials "opens a door for unjustifiable latitude both in principles and practice," he assumes that "the charges of laxity which Craighead had made against the New

Side were true." He warmly assailed the paragraph about essentials, and the assumption that one may be a true follower of Christ who did not believe all that Christ had taught, or regard all that he had commanded, as necessary duty." * His charges of laxity were based on inference, and not on facts, and may therefore readily be set aside, but he was not mistaken in his view of the importance which the New Side attached to the paragraph about essentials. With them, it was a vital matter ; it was a point which even for union sake they would not and did not surrender.

It has been argued† somewhat elaborately, that the term "essential" must be understood as implying what was essential to the integrity of *Presbyterian* doctrine and discipline. It is obvious however, in view of facts already given, that the final insertion of the word *Presbyterian* before "government," and the leaving of the word "doctrine" to stand unqualified by any epithet, was not without design. It was the result of a compromise between two parties, where one, with dictatorial power in its hands, was resolute upon the point at issue, and would concede nothing which was vital to its maintenance. Undoubtedly the "doctrine" referred to was Christian doctrine, and the men who used the word recognized distinctly in Christian doctrine its Calvinistic features. But they used the word unquestionably in the sense in which it was current in their own time, and in which it had for two generations been familiarly used in England and Ireland. Richard Baxter might have scrupled at some things in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, but it is doubtful whether Davies or Dickinson would have made his scruples a bar to ministerial communion. The term "essential" had already come to possess in English controversy a distinct historical sense, and any one who will be at the trouble of perusing the voluminous publications on the subscription controversies which, from 1716 had agitated English and Irish dissenters, will be at no loss to discover it. Enforced subscription to the Prayerbook, with all and everything it contained, to all

*Webster, 248.

†Hodge's History, i, p. 140.

the forms and ceremonies of the Church of England as well as its articles, led English dissenters to examine somewhat carefully the distinction between "essential" and "non-essential," and John Howe undoubtedly spoke the mind of the men "in and about London" who sent Makemie, Macnish and Hampton to this country, when he said, "To sum up all: then shall we be in happy circumstances, when once we shall have learned to distinguish between the essentials of Christianity, and accidental appendages; and between accidents of Christ's appointing and of our own devising; and to dread affixing of our own devices to so sacred an institution. Much more, when every truth or duty contained in the Bible, can not be counted essential or necessary; when we shall have learnt, not only not to add inventions of our own to that sacred frame, but much more not to presume to insert them into the order of essentials or necessities, and treat men as no Christians for wanting them."

The question of "Fundamentals" was engaging deep and wide attention for many years after Jonathan Dickinson was settled at Elizabethtown. To cite only a single pamphlet of the time to illustrate the meaning of the term: in 1720, at the height of the subscription controversy, "A Discourse concerning Fundamental Articles of Religion," translated from the Latin of J. A. Turretin, "Professor of Divinity at Geneva," was published at London. It needs but a glance at its pages to see how impertinent would be the gloss that should add "to the Westminster Standards" the word fundamental." The New Side employed the word as "indispensible" to the integrity of Christian truth, and they were honest though liberal Calvinists themselves. They allowed the word "Presbyterian" to be prefixed to "government," but they would not stultify themselves by qualifying the word "doctrine" with it or its equivalent.

That the New Side had everything pretty much their own way is manifest from the course which they pursued, and the firmness and success with which they insisted upon their terms. But a survey of the relative position and prospects

of the two parties from the time of the division will show the despondent submission with which—if they had been averse to re-union,—they must have bowed to what seemed like the mandate of necessity. From the moment that the New York Presbytery turned from them, and allied themselves with the New Brunswick brethren, they had lost the majority in numbers, while their spirit was chill and inert by the side of the zeal and fervor shown by the friends of Whitefield and the Revival. Their very position was also a misfortune. They numbered in New England, at this date, perhaps as many friends and sympathizers as the New Side, but the New Side interposed between them and New England, and intercepted candidates and ministers that might otherwise have been placed over their vacant congregations. New settlements at the South or West, anxious for supplies, could not appeal to them with any hope of securing aid, and hence were under the necessity of passing by them to invoke the missionary compassion of the Synod of New York.

It is easy to see that when the wonted supply of foreign ministers had ceased, as it did for the most part through the period of the division, that the party which could have readiest access to the New England hive, would have the best opportunity to swell its numbers. The New Side rapidly increased, while the Old Side, year after year, found it difficult even to hold its own. Some time before reunion was consummated, the numbers of the New Side to the Old Side had become about that of three to one. During the thirteen years of the existence of the Synod of New York, the rival Synod of Pennsylvania had not made a single permanent addition to the number on its roll. Twenty-two clerical members were connected with it after the New York brethren withdrew (1746), and twenty-two clerical members in 1758 were prepared to merge their synodical interests in those of the reunited Synod.

But with stationary numbers the spirit of a young church in a new field can not remain stationary. It will inevitably decline. But the discouragements of the Old Side were

aggregated by their futile, though noble efforts in behalf of general as well as ministerial education. They established and encouraged their schools, and they endeavored, though unsuccessfully, to open the way to the founding of a college. The New Side, with more zeal and enterprise, were more successful. They established Princeton College, and, favored by circumstances, they secured a charter, and procured from Great Britain a very considerable endowment. They placed at the head of the college their ablest man, and the mere name of Jonathan Dickinson was a tower of strength in New England and Scotland. He fell early at his post, but not before he had given it character and reputation. Some of the Old Side, like Cowell of Trenton, were the fast friends of Princeton College, and, in friendly zeal to promote its success practically withdrew coöperation in educational enterprise from their own party.

But with the upbuilding of the college, the party which held it was master of the field. In the first ten years of its history, it numbered among the recipients of its academical honors, a list of ministers considerably greater than that of the entire roll of the Philadelphia Synod. Among them were such names as those of Ayers, Thane, Brown, Hoge, Moffat, Todd, Houston, McAden, Hait, Case, Peck, Bostwick, Kirkpatrick and McWhorter—names memorable in the history of the church. It is not strange that, with the sympathy for the college that existed among some of the ministers of the Old Side, and the educational privileges which it opened for their candidates, the prospect of a reunion, which would secure to them the advantages it offered, should have been especially welcome.

But, beyond all this, the mutual relations of the two parties were subjected to the inevitable changes of time. As in other denominational or religious controversies, death proved a powerful peacemaker. There was forcible truth in the suggestion which came from the Old Side in 1755, that the two bodies should unite "as though they had never been concerned with one another before, nor had any differences ;

which is the truth as to a great part of both Synods." The Old Side had lost by death (or removal) before 1758, ten members, among whom were Andrews (1746), S. Evans (1747), Cavin (1750), Conn (1752), Griffith and Cathcart (1754), Elmer (1755), McHenry and Thomson (1757). The New Side during the same period had lost eight members, William Tennent (1746), Dickinson and Gould (1747), Lamb and Wales (1749), Nutman and Samuel Blair (1751) and Aaron Burr (1757). Nearly half of the members of the Synod of 1741 had been removed by death, and several others were quite infirm or on the borders of the grave, while others still, like Pemberton and Chalker had withdrawn from the bounds of the Presbyterian church. Meanwhile the Old Side had received an accession of 14 new members, against 79 who had contributed to swell the roll of the New Side. Of the aggregate (93) seven had been educated at the Log College, five at Harvard, twenty-seven at Yale, twenty-two at Princeton, while thirty-two could boast no college honors, at least from any institution in this country. Not a single accession to the Old Side was the graduate of any American college.

The very causes of the original controversy had also vanished even before the champions that appeared in them. The Revival with its good and evil had passed away. Itineracy, except for missionary purposes, had become a thing of the past. Intrusions into parishes of neighboring ministers were no more heard or complained of. The differences between the two Synods were traditional and theoretical. Antipathies personal or doctrinal, and local antagonisms still existed, but there were no points left on which such a division of feeling or opinion existed as to warrant extensive alarm, or excite even a general interest.

But the loud call for missionary service which came from all along the border, and from distant Southern fields, summoned all parties to lay aside their antagonisms and mutual prejudices, and engage with heart and hand in a common work. At every meeting each Synod was besieged with ap-

peals for aid, and nearly all the younger class of ministers of 1758 had been trained by actual service as itinerant missionaries. There are unpublished records of their toils which attest the apostolic devotion and power with which they performed their work. Not all that might be told has been narrated of John Brainerd, even by the pen of his accomplished kinsman. There are names that have never found a record in history that are worthy of the highest honor by the Presbyterian church. We do not even know of Charles Fafary Smith—over whose early death Samuel Buell of East Hampton mourned almost like a stricken father—where he received his education,* or whether he ever attained to the least academic honor, but his unpublished letters confirm the truth of Buell's eulogy of him as "very eminently possessed of gifts and graces," indefatigable in ministerial labors which God crowned with his "Signal blessing." Doubtless it is true that "multitudes in the Southern Provinces had great dependence upon his good influence for the introduction of ministers and hopeful candidates among them." His published letters show the zeal with which he sought to procure men to supply the wants of Virginia, and how he longed after greater efficiency in his own sphere. Subsequent to the re-union of 1758, he visited portions of the Southern field where no Presbyterian minister had gone before. A new leaf for Bishop Meade's Old Churches of Virginia might be found in his correspondence. "My labors hither to," he says, "in Virginia have been confined to the Episcopalians, and blessed be God, not without some success. The churches upon this Eastern Shore are open to me, and the people have no prejudice against Presbyterians. And altho Arminianism has been the native growth and staple commodity of these pulpits, yet they receive Calvinism (without) Censure and opposition. New and strange as the doctrine is, yet being backed and supported by their own articles, they accept it as current sterling coin, and I believe they never heard so much of the 39 Articles in their lives as of late. Next Sabbath, the

* He was probably a pupil of Dr. Wheelock.

Church Parson (he writes from Northampton) is to read prayers, and I am to preach. Perhaps some bigots will call this trimming, but I rather think with the Apostle Paul it's becoming all things to all men that I may gain the more. I have long entertained a mean opinion of the clergy of Maryland, and Virginia, but also, Sir, they are much worse than I ever imagined. The most of them are grossly scandalous and enormously vicious, and the few that are called moral have but little even of the form of religion. I lodged with one this week, whom I prevailed upon (for he is one of the best of them) to pray in his family at night, but (mirabile dictu) not in the morning. Oh Sir, it would make your heart ache and your eyes flow with tears to relate what I see and hear. Pray, pray for them, for the clergy are as bad, and I think much worse than the people."*

*Shortly before going to Virginia, Mr. Smith, then occupying a portion of John Brainerd's broad field in New Jersey, wrote as follows :

EGG HARBOR, March 30, 1764.

"* * * I have been among these swamps and pines about three months, and serve three places successively on the Sabbath, the extremes of which are thirty miles apart, and though that makes it something fatiguing, yet it often gives an opportunity of preaching four and five times in a week, which has occasioned a release from the shackles of notes—but alas, little success attends a preached Gospel among the white Heathen, as well as among the sermon trod and gospel glutted! How awfully are divine influences suspended from divine Ordinances! How loud the call upon every friend of Zion, upon every minister of Christ, earnestly to wrestle for the outpouring of the Spirit! But while I have so much reason to lament the little success of preaching in general, and of my own poor labors in particular, yet there is a prospect of doing some good here (if not saving good), and the day of small things is not to be despised. The people flock to public worship, behave decently, and often appear affected. By putting forward subscriptions they have been prevailed upon to raise enough to build two meeting houses, which I hope will be soon erected, besides fixing up another which has long stood useless: and last week procured subscriptions sufficient to build a third at Cape May. So that there is a prospect the Gospel may e'er long be introduced and settled in this place, which has always been in a state of Heathenism. I have just prevailed upon them at one meeting house to meet every Sabbath, and carry on social worship when they have no preaching—they are able and seem willing to support a minister, could they obtain one; but alas, the harvest is very plenteous and the faithful laborers are few and scarce. Oh! that they might be increased and abundantly multiplied. It makes my heart ache to think that New England swarms with supernumerary candidates, while there are such multitudes perishing for lack of vision. What a pity is it that your preachers should be obliged to take to secular callings, while these Southern Provinces abound with occasions numerous almost as the locusts of Egypt! O must this part of Christ's vineyard be overrun with thorns and briars? Shall Satan possess his strong holds unattacked, and every species of ungodliness triumph? Shall thousands be posting blindfold to destruction, and unnumbered souls be like sheep without a shepherd, while in Connecticut there are ministers and to

This is one only of many letters penned by a man whom Samuel Hopkins of Great Barrington, designated as *the* man to go with Occum to England to plead the claims of Dr. Wheelock's Charity School. Amid the band of pioneer labor-

spare, yea preachers that can find no employment, but after they have put their hand to the plough look back and follow secular business. Do the gentleman and the statesman spend their time and fortune in traveling, and think their education incomplete till they have made a tour through many countries? Could it then be any damage to Candidates to visit these parts, should they not finally settle here, or rather would not the acquaintance with mankind and the knowledge of human nature they would there acquire, be of unspeakable advantage to them throughout the remainder of their lives in whatever station Providence should place them? Why then can't the young gentlemen in New England at least visit the lost wandering sheep of Christ's flock before they are nailed down in the narrow circle of a parish, where they can't preach above twice a week if they want to? Is it because they are ignorant of the state of the Southern provinces? Pray be so kind as to undeceive them: and let me tell you, sir, not eighty miles from York there begins a settled country on the sea shore, which runs an hundred and forty miles: (the length of your government) before you can find one gospel minister. "Are the most of candidates under such circumstances as can't support the expense of traveling?" Why may they not go forth as Christ sent his disciples? Is not God able to maintain all whom he employs? Will that Providence that takes care of sparrows and feeds young ravens let ministers starve? But, sir, it requires a stretch of faith to be an itinerant preacher, for the people I believe are universally willing to support the Gospel, and usually make or offer to make collections as often as there is preaching, and its probable a person might travel to Georgia and back again, with a heavier purse than he sat out with. "But is that a very precarious uncertain subsistence?" Could there be procured one or two persons of piety, zeal and competent popularity to embark in the good cause, they might have a support sure as the Bank of England. As I came here last fall, I was proposing to my friends in New York a scheme for raising a salary for the support of a minister in the itinerant way, and one of my correspondents there, in a very late letter inquires thus: "Can you light on a preaching companion that is like to suit? I believe we can make out a salary for him: the scheme meets universal approbation, and it is thought there is a greater prospect of two or three young men that are zealous and engaged, doing more good that way, than by settling in any vacancies whatsoever. If, sir, you know of any that would answer, please to acquaint me with it." "But the gentlemen are of too slender a constitution to bear the fatigue of traveling." Is it not better to wear out than rust out? If we are about our Master's business, may we not expect as much health as will be necessary? What would have been the case of the world had the apostles been so choice of their health as never dare change their climate, but cooped themselves up in their native air, lest they should have endangered that mighty Dagon called Constitution? Are not souls as precious now as then? Is not God's honor as dear to him as ever? Is not Christ's kingdom still to be promoted? Is there not almost as much occasion for itinerancy to the Southward as in the apostles' time? Or had not those poor fishermen ambition enough to aspire after, or wit enough to procure the fattest livings and the richest flocks? Or did they nobly despise them all for the sake of doing greater good? But I shall weary your patience though I have not half exhausted the subject, yet I could not forbear saying thus much, hoping it will not only prompt you to pray for this vacant part of the vineyard, but also to attempt affording it some assistance—but my sheet is almost out, and I must try to crowd in what remains. I long to see you, your family, school, parish, &c., but whether it will be this side Heaven is uncertain. I am going this week to Barnat, from there fifty miles further to Tim-

ers in the Southern field, he is by no means conspicuous in contemporary documents, but his letters are significant as presenting before us the aspect of the home mission field in that day, and suggests how completely all party questions of Old Side and New Side must have sunk to nothing before the Macedonian call, which the younger ministers were especially called upon to heed. A force of Christian influence gathered up from the crying needs of scores of destitute congregations, was brought to bear upon the members of both synods, crushing down before it ancient prejudice and every party line. There was no occasion now to complain of intrusion when every itinerant might have an almost limitless circuit through southern fields. There could be no fault-finding with itineracy, when that itineracy was directed, by the necessity of the times, into new and almost wholly unexplored channels, and when the superabundant energy of ministerial labors scarcely began to meet the ever increasing and pending demand.

The New Side had been bent upon reunion from the first.

ber Creek, and am called to more vacancies than I fear I can visit this summer, and in the fall propose to go to Virginia and perhaps Georgia; however if you write to the care of Mr. Nath. Hazard, at New York, our correspondence may notwithstanding be continued—but pray borrow a little paper if you are unable to buy, and dont starve me with those half sheet Letters, or rather tickets.

Copy of the Letter which covered the Original of the above.

MY DEAR SIR:

I propose as leisure and opportunity presents to inform all my correspondents in New England, of the melancholy circumstances of the Southern provinces as I get acquainted with them, hoping thereby to excite them to prevail upon some of their acquaintance to come down here and help this distressed Macedonia, and let me add to the within scroll, that in my opinion Itineracy is a very agreeable life, and so far from being prejudicial to that great Diana called Health, it is the most salutary step a Hypochondriacal or Valetudinary mind can take, of which I can say probatum est, and confirm it by experience. It is not long since Physicians judged me in a Hectick, but traveling about 2,300 miles a year, all points of the compass, constantly preaching every week, I am become as hearty and plump as "Stalled Theology," but I need add no more. Your zeal for the welfare of Zion will suggest a thousand arguments and engage your rhetoric in pleading the cause of Christ and persuading his ministers to visit these parts.

I am as much as ever

Yours sincerely,

C. J. SMITH.

REV. MR. WHEELOCK.

The above is from the collection of WILLIAM ALLEN, D. D. of Northampton, Mass.

This was the platform of New York Presbytery, so far as it had any, and the New York Presbytery—especially after the withdrawal of Gilbert Tennent, from New Brunswick, (1744) was the most efficient and decisive in regard to the policy to be adopted by the New Brunswick brethren. The Old Side had sense enough to perceive, that though for a time they might hold out against union, their persistence would only doom them to a fate lingering indeed, but not more slow than sure. They were really in the lands of the New Side, and yet, if the case had been otherwise, though they might have modified yet more the terms of union, they could not have obstructed permanently the inevitable result. So many diverse causes were cooperating to bringing it about, that like a wound in the living flesh it seemed to summon all the residuary healing forces of nature to the task of restoration. From the moment the blow was struck, and those rent asunder whose interest, duty and delight it should have been to cooperate, forces were steadily at work to reunite the separate parts, and combine them in a beautiful organic whole. The scar of 1741 long remained, and for years after the reunion of 1758, there were jarrings and discords, especially in Donegal and Philadelphia Second Presbyteries, which claimed the attention and interposition of Synod. But these could not permanently disturb the general harmony, and when the local irritation had passed away, they were heard of no more.

Many who participated in, or mourned over the division were not spared to witness the reunion. The venerable Andrews of Philadelphia, the moderator of the Synod of 1741, went to his rest in 1746, and was followed the next year by Dickinson. Though on opposite "sides" they were brothers still, and had Andrews survived, Dickinson would probably have had no more sincere mourner to cherish his memory. Cathcart and Thompson, who signed the Protest—both of them doubtless good and faithful, as well as able men, and so acknowledged by their opponents when the heat of the controversy was past—were called away when the

prospect of reunion was opened. But among those who witnessed, and must have exulted in it, we find not a few whose names have come down to us with honored associations. There was George Gillespie, of the Old Side, now an old man, who wavered for a time, at the crisis of division, but whom Alison, who knew him well, called "that pious saint of God." There was Treat, of Abington, still in the vigor of his years, who had given up his hope of hearing Whitefield, and, along with Campbell, had waited to speak till his lips were touched anew with a live coal from off the altar. There was Cowell, of Trenton, the bosom friend of Burr, as he had been the controversial antagonist of Gilbert Tennent, and whose ministry at Trenton, closing two years later, invited the eloquent eulogy of Samuel Davies. There was Francis Alison, the foremost scholar of the Old Side, and a gentleman of the old school, joining with the New York Presbytery in demanding a review of the proceedings of 1741, and anticipating modern philanthropy by setting free all his slaves. There was Robert Cross, Andrews' colleague at Philadelphia, more generous and less rancorous than he had credit for being, and whose term of public ministry was rapidly drawing to its close.

And then there were new men, strangers to the division by any personal experience, whose memory comes before us with the fragrance of Christian usefulness. Dr. Buell, of East Hampton, most rarely gifted, and perhaps in public speech as well as wit and humor not inferior to his successor, Dr. Lyman Beecher, had come into the Synod of New York after the formation of the Suffolk Presbytery (1747); and it was of him that President Stiles is reported to have said, "that man has done more good than any other man who ever stood on this Continent." Samuel Davies, subsequently President of Princeton College, was unquestionably, for the brief period of his public ministry, at the very head of the pulpit orators of this country, and like Dickinson and Burr and Jonathan Edwards, who preceded him in the presidency at Princeton, merely excited by his promise fond hopes that were doomed

to sudden extinguishment. Time and space would fail to dwell upon the career of the cultivated and polished Bostwick at New York; of John Blair, a pioneer at Walkkill, N. Y., and an able author as well as speaker; of John Brainerd, whose name has been embalmed by kindred affection as well as a genial pen; of John Rodgers, subsequently the venerated patriarch of the New York pulpit, but now kindling the fires of revival in the wastes of Delaware; of Elihu Spencer, a cousin of the Brainerds, a kindred spirit, and in ability a fit successor of Dickinson at Elizabethtown; of Finley, the patriarch of Western Pennsylvania; of Robert Smith, of Pequa, two of whose sons were presidents respectively of Union and Princeton College; of Nathaniel Whitaker, who was finally selected to accompany Occum to England, and whose Presbyterianism, even in New England, was as rigid as his Hopkinsianism, and as obnoxious to Salem Independents as his overwrought Calvinism was to men like Stiles and Hart; or of McAden, Duffield, Keteltas, Prime, Patillo and a score of others, who have obscured each other's distinction by the excess of their common light, and thus formed the constellation of the Presbyterian fathers which claims a rank second only to that of the founders of the church.

Undoubtedly the reunion gave occasion for the secession which was signalized by the formation of what was known as the Associated Presbytery of Morris County, and of other Associate Presbyteries. At the head of it stood Rev. Jacob Green of Hanover, the father of Rev. Dr. Ashbel Green of Philadelphia. He disliked the tone of authority assumed by the Synod, and preferred an ecclesiastical system which associated the churches and let licensure and ordination to the associated pastors. But he had other grievances. Scarcely had Jonathan Edwards gone to his rest, before, having abandoned the Half-way Covenant scheme inculcated by Burr and Dickinson, he declared himself an *Edwardian*. He was perhaps the first man in this country to employ the term. From this time he was zealous in inculcating his peculiar views, and his publications provoked controversy which com-

manded extensive notice. By the article of the union basis, which required those who differed from the Synod's determinations actively to concur or passively to submit, or in case they could do neither, peaceably to withdraw, he felt constrained to leave his former ecclesiastical associations, and unite with some few others who shared his peculiar views. The secession thus originated did not take shape till some twenty years after the organization of the united Synod, but the causes which eventually produced it had been at work long before. Even this movement, however, reached its climax after a few years, and ere long the elements it had combined were dissolved and restored to their original connections.

In the reunited church we discern the result reached after its elements had been subjected to the trying ordeal of controversy, and the original causes of division had been purged away. It planted itself on the ground of the Adopting Act of 1729, for to suppose that the large Synod of New York changed its basis on its combination with another body which constituted less than one-fourth of the aggregate of both, would be utterly inconsistent with the history of negotiations for reunion, and utterly unwarranted by any thing to be found in the fundamental articles of the united Synod. It persisted firmly to the end, and against no moderate share of opposition, in contending for "rational and Scriptural terms" by which the paragraph concerning "essentials," is repeatedly described. It gave permanent shaping to the policy and spirit of the American Presbyterian Church, and entitled it, at the same time, to the epithets Calvinistic and liberal: Equally removed from bigotry on the one hand, and laxity on the other, it has left behind it a history which we need not blush to record.