

The Independent.

Entered at the Post-office at New York, as Second-class Mail Matter.

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE ENTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XLIII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1891.

NUMBER 2217.

The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

A DREAM OF ROMANCE.

BY MAURICE THOMPSON.

THE day is but a breezy dream,
The sky is like a bloom;
Life flows, a fragrant, bubbling stream,
Along a lilled flume.

The wandering butterfly is lost
In films of mystery,
From supple flower to flower is tossed
The worried bumblebee.

On high some idle spirit sings,
Half sleeping, as it flies,
Dropping from its charmed wings
The dews of Paradise.

The pines are dozing, and the sea
Is murmuring in its sleep;
All round the sky rim drowsily
Some shadowy wonders creep.

The mosses drop their curtains low,
The far ships settle down,
And tenderly the Gulf-winds blow
O'er Bay Saint Louis town.

And lo! am I, a mote to dance
And shimmer here and there,
Where faded beams of old romance
Strike slantwise through the air!

A weltering sound, remote and vast,
Comes to my drowsy ear;
The Gulf-waves rolling from the past
Suggest the Buccaneer.

A corsair sloop, hull down, retires
With mysteries in her hold;
Her sails, against the wizard fires
Of morn, are torn and old.

The buccaneer! The buccaneer!
My boyhood dreams come true;
What wild uproar is this I hear
Across the waters blue?

"Welcome! my brawny, bearded one,
Salute!" the caverns boom,
And the merchant-men, far-scattered, run
To give his ship sea-room.

He answers with a growling throat,
Out leaps his rusty blade,
And one dull, echoing thunder-note
Bounds from the carronade.

Lo! all the world stands by to gaze
And lean and look askance,
What time the sturdy tars upraise
The banner of romance.

Merrily, merrily, sing the crew;
Dusky and grim are they,
Against the islands soft and blue
And the grizzly ocean spray.

What is her name? What is her name?
This ship so dark and strong,
Oh, she was christened Lady Fame,
And built by King o' Song.

And she is manned by frowzy men,
Bohemians eke, who love
To fight at odds, like one to ten,
And reck not where they rove.

And who is captain, tell us true,
Of this good Lady Fame?
Shouts every tar of all the crew:
"WILL SHAKESPEARE is his name!"

Oh, welcome, goodly ship, in haste
To bring us prize and cheer
From all the boards that tempt the taste
Of lawless buccaneer!

Ay, we will build us crafts galore,
Like Shakespeare's they shall be,
And we will plunder every shore,
And every ship at sea.

All round the deep, wave-tossed and blown,
Led by the Lady Fame,
Our fleet shall make the world its own,
Reckless of shame or blame.

The South, the North, the East, the West,
Our shout and rout shall hear;
Oh, who shall foil, or who arrest
The ruthless buccaneer?

'Twas thus I dreamed, one balmy day,
When dim ships went hull-down,
Against the sky-line far away,
Off Bay Saint Louis town.

There sapphire islands, held aloof
In films of dream and chance,
Between sea-floor and blue sky-roof,
Are steeped in wild romance.

So in this town I linger long,
And watch and wait—alack!
Never a breath of golden song
Can blow the old time back!

Oh, leave me thus, a mote to dance
And shimmer here and there,
Where faded beams of old romance
Strike slantwise through the air!

BAY SAINT LOUIS.

THE AGED BRAHMIN PILGRIM.

A SIXTY YEARS' QUEST FOR RELIEF FROM SIN.

BY JACOB CHAMBERLAIN, D.D.

NEVER shall I forget an interview that I had, thirty years ago, with a venerable Brahmin pilgrim, an earnest seeker after relief from the burden of sin.

It was in February, 1861, that two of us missionaries were out on a preaching tour, in a part of the Telugu country lying on the edge of the Mysore kingdom, a region in which the gospel of salvation through Jesus Christ had, so far, never yet been proclaimed.

Our tent was pitched under a spreading banyan tree. We had been there for several days, and had preached in all the villages and hamlets within three miles of our camp. That morning we had left our tent before sunrise and gone out several miles to preach in a cluster of villages nestled in among the hills. In each village, after the oral proclamation, we had offered Gospels and tracts in their own tongue to the people who had listened; but only a few would receive them, so suspicious were they, at that time, of everything new.

We returned to our tent weary with our morning work. The burden of our thoughts was: Lord, "who hath believed our report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?"

As we came near we saw a venerable gray-haired Brahmin, engaged in his devotions, on a large stone platform around the central trunk of an adjacent banyan tree, where there was a small shrine. Slowly, with beads in hand, he performed his circumambulations, keeping his face toward the shrine, reciting his *mantrams*, his prayers, his petitions. Each time that he came in front of the shrine he fell prostrate upon the ground, performing the *sashtaugam* of the Hindus, and then, sliding one bead on his rosary, he would slowly and reverently go around the tree again.

Much struck by his reverent demeanor and evident earnestness we watched him through the corded meshes of our tent window, and when he had finished his devotions, and had sat down to rest, we went out, and, courteously addressing him, asked him what he sought by these prayers and circumambulations.

"Oh, sirs!" said he, in a tone that struck us as one of intense earnestness. "I am seeking to get rid of the burden of sin. All my life I have been seeking it; but each effort that I make is as unsuccessful as the one before, and still the burden is here. My pilgrimages and prayers and penances for sixty years have all been in vain. Alas! I know not how my desire can be accomplished."

Then, in answer to our inquiries, he gave us the story of his life. He told us how in early life he had been sorely troubled by the thoughts of his unexpiated sins; that his parents had both died when he was seventeen years of age, leaving him, an only child, sole heir of their wealth; that the priests whom he consulted told him that if he would give all his property to endow a temple the burden of sin would be removed.

He gave his property—all of it. He endowed a temple. But the burden of sin was no lighter. His mind was not at peace. Obedient to further advice from the priests, his counselors, he made the pilgrimage on foot all the long way to Benares, the holy city of the Hindus, lying on the banks of the sacred Ganges. He spent two years in the precincts of the temples in worship. He spent two years in bathing in the holy Ganges. "But," said he, "the Ganges water washed the foulness from my skin, but not the foulness from my soul. And still the old burden was there un eased." He told us how he had gone from thence, on foot, all the way to Ram-eshweram, begging his food all the two thousand miles—for he had given all his money to the temple—and thence again to Srirangam, and thence to other holy places.

He told us how he had spent his whole life in these pilgrimages, and in penances and in desert wanderings, apart from his kind, living on roots and nuts and jungle fruits, remaining for years at a time in the forest jungles, in the vain search for relief from the burden of sin.

"And now, sirs," said he, "my life is almost gone; my hair is thin and white; my eyes are dim; my teeth are gone; my cheeks are sunken; my body is wasted; I am an old, old man; and yet, sirs, the burden of sin is just as heavy as when, a young man, I started in pursuit of deliverance. Oh, sirs, does your Veda tell how I can get rid of this burden and be at peace? Our Vedas have not shown me how."

How gladly did we tell him of our gracious "Burden-bearer," and of his loving call "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." How eagerly did he listen, as we told him of Jesus Christ, the God-man, the Saviour of the world, and told him what he had done for our salvation. How gladly did he pore over the Gospels we gave him, and what earnest questions did he ask during the day as to points in their teachings which he did not quite understand. During that night he left and went upon his way, taking the Gospels with him, and we never again saw him.

Tho so many years have intervened, his earnest, reverent countenance remains photographed in my memory, and I shall look for him up there among the redeemed; for I believe he was in earnest in seeking deliverance from the burden of sin—in vain, indeed, as he said, through Hinduism. I trust not in vain through the Gospel of Jesus Christ; for that is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

MADANAPALLE, INDIA.

WILLIAM T. STEAD.

A CHARACTER SKETCH.

BY ZADEL BARNET GUSTAFSON.

TAKE George Francis Train, who must not be touched, and Walt Whitman, in touch with all things; Anthony Comstock and Leon Tolstoi; Robert Ingersoll and the present Archbishop of Canterbury; Lord Salisbury and the three Johns—Bunyan, Brown, and Burns; Ibsen, Matthews, and Most in haphazard proportion; flavor with large pinches of Gladstone, Michel, Olga Novikoff and a *souppon* of Voysey, Disraeli, and the maid of Domrémy—and the compound will be, not cake, but a composite human character, which, in the slang parlance of the day, "takes the cake," and its name is William T. Stead. Those who recall the salient characteristics of each of the famous persons named, and also know Stead well, are not likely to dispute this receipt, of which Nature has and keeps the copyright.

Stead has many partial resemblers, but no *doppelgänger*. It is his intense consciousness of this, and the want of poise and repose—component of such anomalous moral complexity—which keep him always a little uncertain toward himself and his fellows.

It is with him in a serious sense touch and go—it is not touch and hold. Persons and crises approaching him as if to close with him, really touch him only to leave him, only to be left by him; not of purpose but of inevitableness.

He is always in earnest, but not long sustained in any given direction; deeply sincere, but peculiarly unreliable; a lover, liver and teller of the truth, yet by reason of quicksilver impulse and a chameleon quality of

Religious Intelligence.

PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRD MEETING AT DETROIT.

PROFESSOR GREEN ELECTED MODERATOR.

THE REVISED CONFESSION REPORTED.

ORDERED TO BE SENT DOWN TO THE PRESBYTERIES.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

THE STORY OF THE ASSEMBLY.

BY GEORGE P. HAYS, D.D.

WHEN the General Assembly of 1890 appointed the Revision Committee there was active competition for the location of the meeting of 1891. It was supposed then that the Revision Committee would make its final report this year, and that the discussion of the Revised Confession would come at this meeting. Everybody was anxious to be present at that debate, and the people of Detroit expected their city to be made historic by the fact that in it the Standards of the Presbyterian Church were revised. When now the Revision Committee announced its preference that this General Assembly should accept this report, now made, simply as a "Report of Progress, and send it down to the presbyteries to be considered by them and their suggestions forwarded to the committee for its final report in 1892," it became quite obvious that no important revision debate would come this year. Immediately anxiety to be elected to this General Assembly disappeared through the presbyteries. Those who were sent were not infrequently brethren who were urged to go against their own wishes, because it was supposed that it would be quite an unimportant meeting. The good people of Detroit are not unreasonably, therefore, much disappointed that the expected historic event is not to occur in their city. The attendance of outsiders is very much smaller, in consequence than could have been expected originally. It is, however, still so large that some of the leading hotels which had entered into a written contract to receive 200 of the delegates at a specified price have broken the contract and stopped at fifty, because they could get full price for all the rooms they had to spare. The only thing that human nature has to do in the work of making Presbyterians, is to supply the human depravity. It is obvious, therefore, that Detroit is a fine field for Presbyterian mission work.

This year the plan of having Presbyterian Assembly trains on the leading railroads was perhaps more general than in any previous year. This has its advantages, but is liable to have also some disadvantages. It gives the delegates from various directions a good chance to become acquainted and to compare views. It is liable, however, to open up a very tempting door for campaign work, either for Assembly offices, or for Assembly policies. There was no motive for any special electioneering about the moderatorship this year. One of the facts which tended largely to assure Dr. Green's election to the moderatorship was the fact that his writing regularly the "Lesson Helps" for the *Sunday-School Times*, and frequent articles in the various periodicals upon the Sunday-school lessons. The Elders (who are nearly all Sunday-school workers) became, therefore, perfectly familiar with Dr. Green's name, and unconsciously were warmly attached to him through these comments upon the lessons they were specially studying. No one else did stand as a candidate against him, and it would have been perfectly useless for any one else to have done so. He makes an excellent moderator, being quiet and fair and kindly. The other routine work of the Assembly has been very quickly dispatched, so that by the evening of the first afternoon several reports, which are not ordinarily read before Friday, had already been received and acted upon.

The number of permanent temporary committees is becoming a matter of considerable criticism by the brethren. These committees are appointed one year to report to the next Assembly, and, tho they may not have any plans to be continued from one year to another, yet the number of these "hold-over" committees is becoming singularly large. There seems to be no help for it in the case of the committee on "The Church at Home and Abroad." But then there is the Committee on the Consensus Creed, on the Pan-Presbyterian Council, on the Presbyterian Seal, on Vacant Churches and Unemployed Ministers, on the Increase of Candidates for the Ministry, on Presbyterian Comity, on Presbyterian Unity, and especially with the Protestant Episcopal Church, and, of course, the Revision Committee, and the Committee to Revise the Proof-Texts of the Confession of Faith and Larger Catechism. There is quite a widespread feeling among the members that the number of these permanent temporary committees (if that is not a contradiction in terms) ought to be seriously reduced by the consolidation of some of them and the

discharge of others. It looks now as if something would be attempted in that direction before the Assembly adjourns. Such committees are an expensive luxury.

The Moderator's sermon was evidently prepared under the pressure of general anxiety about the outcome of the meeting. Many excellent points of it will be overlooked in the attention given to such parts of it as bear upon the burning questions before the Assembly and the Church. One or two sentences from his discussion of the clamor for legislation, for the prevention of crime and the reformation of society, deserve to go into the proverbs of the nation: "If good law, even so perfect as that made by the Divine mind, could preserve the morality of the human race, the race would not have been lost. If law could save it, it would not have needed a Saviour." As a discussion of the object of the Saviour's mission it was comprehensive, clear, and very convincing. It may do somewhat to bring John iii, 17, into some of the prominence in the mind of the Church which is now given to John iii, 16.

The sermon was evidently prepared with a view to the revision question; but the report of the Revision Committee passed without any discussion that really amounted to anything. Dr. W. C. Roberts, the permanent chairman of the Revision Committee, in presenting the report, read it so distinctly and threw in it so aptly his minor suggestions and explanations, that when it was finished everybody knew the main purport of the revision, and, so far as your correspondent could judge, had made up his mind that the report, when finally presented by the Revision Committee, would be adopted by the presbyteries at large. There may be minor verbal changes in it here and there, but there will be no large and important and marked matter of controversy. The papers are already showing that Arminians are not getting out of it the comfort which they anticipated. The ostentation with which anti-Calvinistic denominations, and skeptical writers especially, heralded the resolution of the Assembly to revise the Confession of Faith as a resolution to eliminate Calvinism from the Standards of the Church, has already suffered a violent collapse. The motion to adopt the report was made by a former radical anti-revisionist in a commendatory speech, and was seconded by another speech equally commendatory from another former anti-revisionist. There may be some in the Assembly who were dissatisfied with it, because they think it is an abandonment of the old faith of the Westminster divines and of Apostolic days; but they have scarcely been heard from. A Nebraska "farmer" made an earnest protest against it; but it was obvious to the Assembly that he was laboring under a misapprehension about its real tenor, and, by some oversight of the Moderator, his motion to amend was not put to the house, and the motion to "accept the report as a report of progress, print, and send down to the presbyteries, in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee," was adopted unanimously.

Already symptoms of antagonism to the report from these who wanted an ultra-revision are appearing in various directions. The conservative revisionists will probably fare roughly at the hands of the radical wing of their former friends; but there is no possible doubt that the antagonism of those who wanted the "Reformed system of doctrine" revised out of the Confession, and either Arminianism let in by implication, or broad churchism explicitly avowed, will greatly help the prospect of its unanimous adoption when finally submitted next year to the presbyteries.

Last year the delegates to the General Assembly were elected with a view to the question of Revision. It is just as obvious that the delegates to this General Assembly were elected with reference to the Briggs controversy in New York. On every hand there is profound regret that this question should have been precipitated upon the Church when it was in the midst of the serious and delicate duty of revising its Standards. The two questions are completely distinct and ought not to have been brought on together. To many it looks as if it was the purpose to raise the question of authenticity, inspiration and inerrancy when the Church was halfway across the stream in the matter of revision and so measurably helpless. If the Church undertook to condemn the views, the plea could be made that it was revising its own Standards, and that, therefore, nothing could be contra-confessional at that time. If, on the other hand, it passed the Inaugural without remark, everything contained in the Inaugural, either explicitly or implicitly, would be considered as included within the revised confession. If this was the plan it could only have been made under a very mistaken impression of the temper of the Church at large. The emphatic disapprobation excited by the document had widespread expression in the newspapers, until the phrase, "anvil chorus" has become proverbial; but that was the external expression, and was probably not nearly so decisive as the quiet resolution that went through the church members and officers and quiet ministers throughout the denomination. No large number of prominent men are in the Assembly; but the quiet pastors and unknown men who are here are never for one moment to be understood to be men whose reading has not kept them up with the times. It is a slander on them to say that they have not read these "books" enough to know their contents and are not posted on the questions raised.

The real trouble is that they have read them so thoroughly that they have definitely and finally made up their minds that not even by indirection shall the Church at large be supposed either to indorse them or to license them. One of the peculiar phenomena of the advocates of the extreme wing of higher criticism is that in all cases they explain their difficulty of making themselves understood by charging it to the ignorance of the people whom they address. The real difficulty is in making the great mass of the Presbyterian Church believe that anybody has ideas or arguments in his head so massive and profound and delicate that the English language is inadequate to their expression. When they listen for a season to a man and can metaphorically see nothing in what they hear, they are apt to believe that the trouble is in the man that is trying to say something when he has nothing to say.

If there is a coherent party of any considerable extent in the Assembly disposed to defend the theories of the Inaugural and the Catechism of the Trustees and the Brooklyn speech at the Congregational Association, they are not ready yet to make themselves visible to the naked eye. A large number of persons are present urging that no action shall be taken. The plea is constantly made that it will affect the action of the Presbytery of New York, but two distinct questions are up and these questions belong to separate jurisdictions. The "fitness to teach in a Theological Seminary" is to be determined by the General Assembly. Ministerial orthodoxy is to be determined by the New York Presbytery. If the decision of the Assembly on its question is liable to affect the New York Presbytery in determining its question, no less is it true that if the decision of the New York Presbytery is reached first that will greatly embarrass the General Assembly in its later action on its question. One of them must act before the other. The General Assembly must act now or be precluded from action hereafter. The Presbytery can act at any time; at least, this seems to be the theory of a very tremendous majority of the members of the Assembly. There does not now seem to be much doubt that the Assembly will veto the appointment. The legal effect of that veto the Assembly does not feel called upon to consider. If it amounts to nothing, in the view of the civil law, it amounts to this before the Church at large, that it completely exonerates the General Assembly from any responsibility in the matter. There may be a split in the Church if the Assembly does act, and there is just as likely to be one if it does not.

Of course, if there is a split in the Church, the advocates of the errancy of the Scriptures, and the mistakes of Moses, and the incorrectness of the statements generally, will go off into a company by themselves and will need a name, which will suggest itself to all thoughtful people, namely, the Errant Presbyterians. Much curiosity will be excited to see their reconstruction of the Confession of Faith, and also of their new edition of the Scriptures. That new edition will, of course, be printed in various forms of type, and all matters which affect faith and practice will be printed in bold type; all mistakes will be printed in italics, and all corrections will be printed in small capitals; and a Bible Society will be organized for the distribution of this reconstructed Bible among the masses, through the agency of the Salvation Army and other expert organizations of scholars and linguists. It is surprising to what an extent this method of reasoning, so earnestly recommended in Whewell's "History of the Inductive Sciences," is employed by the members of the General Assembly. On all hands the question is asked, "What then?" and the effect of that inquiry as to the future form in which the critical Bible will be gotten up for the use of the common people is very large.

Theoretically this question and all others under discussion in the General Assembly ought to be kept out of the popular meetings and of the addresses delivered thereat; but when a subject is in everybody's mind it is very apt to come out of everybody's mouth. Several speeches have already been made on the floor of the Assembly and at the popular meetings, where allusions to this question were seen to be measurably forbidden by this law of propriety, yet in nearly every one of them somewhere there would be forms of expression and modes of statements that indicated the speaker's views. The audience at these popular meetings have so far shown the profound interest that the Presbyterians in Detroit and the vicinity feel in the meetings. Neighboring pastors always crowd in to a meeting of the General Assembly, but the outside public now represented here is drawn from a range of five hundred miles in every direction through the United States. Except on the question of moderator no indication has yet been given of the temper of the Assembly, except that unconscious indication which is met on the street, at the hotels, and at the tables.

The young people's work is likely to claim very large attention from the Assembly. Our Sabbath-schools have brought a very intelligent crop of young people into earlier middle life, and the Young Men's Christian Association, and especially the Endeavor movement, have given them a form of activity into which they are going with great spirit. No indication has yet been seen as to what the mind of

the Assembly will be upon these subjects, but it is very certain that they will have a mind on them. But these prognostications are uttered with a full belief in the infallibility of ancient predictive prophecy and the fallibility of modern predictions.

DETROIT, MICH., May 23d, 1891.

REGULAR REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

BY THE REV. J. B. DEVINS.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America began its 103d annual meeting in the Fort Street Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Thursday, May 21st. At 11 A.M. Dr. Wallace Radcliff, the pastor of the church, accompanied Dr. W. E. Moore, of Columbus, the Moderator, President F. L. Patton, of Princeton University, and the Rev. J. T. Smith, of Baltimore, to the pulpit. The front of the platform was richly trimmed with hydrangeas and palms, while a large bowl of cut flowers rested on a table in front of the desk.

Dr. Radcliff invoked the divine blessing, led the audience in repeating the Lord's Prayer, and then read the hymn, "All hail the power of Jesus' name." Dr. Patton read the sixtieth chapter of Isaiah, and Dr. Smith offered prayer. After an anthem by the choir, Dr. Moore began the delivery of his sermon, which was prefaced by this statement:

Fathers and Brethren: A year ago, my honored predecessor, in opening the Assembly, said: "The beloved Church which you and I have the honor to represent, is undergoing a severe ordeal." History repeats itself. Upon us, as upon them, rests the responsibility of deciding the gravest questions which agitate the Church. Their problem is not yet solved. Ours is not yet fully defined. That Assembly put itself under the power of the Holy Ghost. It sought wisdom of God. It found it in the harmony of its discussions and in the substantial unanimity of its decisions. Shall not this Assembly follow the memorable precedent, and, with the full surrender of ourselves to Him whose we are and whom we serve, say: "Thy will, not mine, be done?" And may "the peace of God which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Amen.

The theme was "The Purpose of God to Save the World through Christ," the text being, "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." (John iii, 17.) After explaining what is meant by saving the world, and explaining God's purpose in sending his Son to earth, the preacher referred to the history of the Church as a confirmation of this purpose, called attention to the unrest in the world and in the Church, which is prophetic of progress, mentioned the instrumentalities through which human society is to be saved—the family, the State and the Church—and closed as follows:

I have thus, Fathers and Brethren, endeavored to set before you no new truth indeed, but one which needs to be emphasized in this age of unrest, which, in great measure the Gospel itself has excited, when men are asking, with such intense earnestness, for the true remedy for the evils which all acknowledge. We have seen that the Father of us all, the true Ruler of this world, purposes its salvation through the righteousness of its citizens, its legislators and its magistrates, secured by their conformity to his righteous will.

We have seen, too, that these blessings of peace and purity and justice are to be given to the world through his Church, as she faithfully holds forth, in her teaching and in her living, the Word of life, seeking first of all the conversion and sanctification of every man. Her sole weapon is "the sword of the Spirit," which is the word of God." Other weapons have been tried, and proved to be disastrous failures. God's word "shall not return unto him void; but it shall accomplish the thing which he pleaseth, and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto he sent it."

The gravest questions which will demand the attention of this Assembly are those which pertain to our Standards, both the subordinate and the supreme, which is none other than the word of God. Both are before us for counsel and action.

We are reminded by our venerated Confession, that "the Supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture." Of him our Lord says: "When he is come, he will guide you into all truth." To us surely he will come if we seek him and obey him.

May I not, from this place, and in this opening hour of the Assembly, pray you to approach these momentous questions in the spirit, at once of unwavering loyalty to the truth, as the Holy Ghost, who presides over this Assembly, shall make it known to you; and of that fraternal charity which accords to all our brethren that honesty of intent and purpose, and that loyalty to the word of God, which they claim for themselves, and which each one of you claims for himself?

ELECTION OF MODERATOR.

After the sermon, which occupied fifty-five minutes in its delivery, Dr. Moore constituted the Assembly with prayer, and the body adjourned until afternoon. Prof. W. H. Green, of Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. Charles A. Dickey, and Dr. George D. Baker, of Philadelphia, and Dr. J. G. Mason, of the Presbytery of Elizabeth, N. J., were the candidates mentioned for the Moderatorship, but it was generally understood that if Dr. Green would allow his name to be used he would be elected. The election of a Moderator being the first business in order, when the Assembly convened at 3 P.M., the Rev. Charles A. Dickey, D.D., of Philadelphia, addressed the commissioners as follows:

Mr. Moderator and Brethren: I do not think extended speeches of nomination are for edification, and yet there may come occasions when a word of explanation may lead us in directions in which we would be delighted to go. I have no doubt, Mr. Moderator, that every member of this Assembly responded to the prelude of your impressive sermon. I have no doubt that our retiring Moderator was led of the spirit of God to break the silence of this day by the suggestion which he made. Any who were present in the last Assembly, who went up in great trepidation and anxiety, remember well the impression that was made upon that great body and the spirit which was put into that body in the providence of God by the keenness of the deliberation which resulted in the unanimous choice of this Brother beloved. Doubtless that act and that choice and his spirit, under God, had much to do with the peace of the Assembly and with the results which were so gratifying to the Church. I am constrained by my own convictions, and I am solicited by many friends who share those convictions, to place in nomination at this time and in this same

spirit the name of another brother beloved whose name is in all the Church, whose reputation is in all the Christian World. It may be that we will need caution, calmness, quietness of soul in this Assembly, that we may handle the things concerning the Kingdom of God, with firmness and with regard to righteousness, yet with tenderness and love. It may be that we may find differences of judgment when we come to consider questions of policy. It may be that there shall not always be unanimity, either in our deliberations or in our conclusions, yet let us try at the beginning to make such unity in the spirit of God as shall help us, at least, in our effort to preserve that same unity in all our deliberations. And, therefore, without making any allusion to any question that may come before us, without anticipating any opinions that may be expressed, without any commitment as to results or opinions, in the conviction, Mr. Moderator, that I would name a name in which we all have such confidence, of firmness and fairness, as to give us this good hope, I present to this Assembly the name of William Henry Green, of Princeton. [Applause.]

George D. Baker, D.D., of Philadelphia: *Mr. Moderator:* I rise to second, with voice and heart, the nomination of my honored and beloved predecessor, Dr. Green. Never as a Presbyterian has a more grateful privilege been given to me than the privilege which is mine at this minute. Dr. Green does not need that anything should be said with reference to his qualification for this high office. The Church owes him a debt and will be glad to acknowledge this debt, so far as it may be possible, and to pay it, I am sure, in elevating him to this high office. And my great desire is that he shall be nominated by acclamation. [Applause.] That no other name shall be presented upon this floor. And I sincerely hope and pray, Fathers and Brethren, that this will be the sign and the prophecy of the unanimity and harmony which is to characterize this Assembly throughout. I most heartily and cordially second the nomination.

Israel W. Hathaway, D.D., of Jersey City: *Mr. Moderator and Brethren:* There were a goodly number of the Commissioners of this Assembly who had resolved to put in nomination and press or the suffrages of the Commissioners of this Assembly, the name of Dr. Mason, of the Synod of New Jersey and of the Presbytery of Elizabeth. We were about to present this name, sir, as a representative young man in the active pastorate, and a representative also of the progressive conservatism of our Church, and also a man of Southern birth and Northern adoption—in every way worthy of the suffrages of the members of this Assembly. Many other items might be mentioned had it not been for the circumstance which has thus arisen. The presentation of the honored name of Doctor Green, so changes the conditions that I am sure I voice the sentiments of Dr. Mason and his friends in withholding his name, and in heartily seconding the election of Dr. Green by acclamation. Many of us, sir, who have been the pupils of Dr. Green would not for a moment permit any other course to be taken. [Applause.]

John J. Francis, D.D., of Cincinnati: *Mr. Moderator:* We have heard from the East. Coming from the dividing line between the North and the South, on the banks of the Ohio, and nearest of any of our great cities to the center of population of our land, and voicing, therefore, I trust, the entire circumference, I second the motion for the election by acclamation of Dr. Green.

George P. Hays, D.D., of Kansas City: I venture to make a motion that further nominations and nominating speeches be dispensed with, and that the vote on the nomination for Moderator be taken by rising.

The motion prevailed, and further nominations were dispensed with.

Moderator Moore: The next question is the election of the only nominee, the Rev. William Henry Green, by a rising vote. Those in favor will signify by rising. If there are any in opposition, they will manifest it by rising also. The election is unanimous. [Prolonged applause.] I would name Dr. Dickey and Dr. Baker to present the candidate for installation.

The newly elected Moderator was then escorted to the platform, where he was welcomed by the retiring Moderator in the following words:

My dear Brother: It gives me inexpressible pleasure to welcome you to this office with this manifestation of the spirit of kindness, love and honor in this Assembly. My prayer is that you will find it as responsive to your touch as it was to mine. It is perhaps a significant fact that no gavel has been furnished me to put in your hand. The truth probably is that but little influence of that kind is needed; but here is the Confession of Faith, the Form of Government and the Book of Discipline for your guide in this matter. [Applause.]

Dr. Green, the new Moderator: I am profoundly grateful, Fathers and Brethren, for this distinguished and most unusual token of your confidence. I feel constrained to surrender for the moment my Protestant right of private judgment in the submission to your will. I accept the high position to which you have invited me by your suffrages, tho it is with much inward reluctance, and tho it is with a deep sense of unfitness. But I am re-assured by the confident belief that I shall be aided in all the duties which are imposed upon me by this position, by your general co-operation; and that your kind forbearance will condone and supplement my deficiencies. It shall be my earnest endeavor to the utmost of my ability to fulfill the trust which you have placed in my hands; and I hope that my errors and my failures will be attributed to inadvertence and to inexperience, and will be either overlooked kindly or be promptly corrected by your superior wisdom. From the very nature of the case the task of presiding over such an Assembly as this must be comparatively light, where all the members are animated by one spirit, are seeking one great end, and have as their supreme desire the promotion of the glory of God and the advancement of the kingdom of our blessed Saviour. In all the differences of judgment that may arise with regard to the questions that shall come before you for consideration it may be expected that brotherly love will prevail and that each will recognize, and regard the feelings and the motives by which others are actuated. In regard to any question that shall be exciting arising, it shall be well for us if the admonition given by the Apostle is borne in mind, to be "swift to hear, slow to speak, and slow to wrath." We are sure that the most kindly spirit will prevail. We are sure that where there is an earnest adherence to principle, and where there is an earnest seeking of that which is conscientiously felt to be right and to be true, nevertheless, there will be nothing said and nothing done that shall wound feelings or that shall create any needless irritation, or that shall do any injury that cannot be easily corrected. Brethren and Fathers, the eyes of many are directed toward this Assembly, and many prayers have been offered to God for this Assembly. May the God of all wisdom and of all grace so replenish every member of this body with his Holy Spirit and so guide in all our deliberations and so direct all our conclusions that all may issue for the furtherance of his Word of Truth, for the purity and the peace and the prosperity of our beloved Church and for the glory of His own great name. [Applause.]

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

The Rev. Dr. Radcliff, the pastor of the Church, took the floor and spoke as follows:

We are glad to see you here. We have thought about you and prayed about you. We have anticipated your coming with exceeding interest and hope for ourselves, for our homes, for our churches, and for the city and for the State to which you come. We are glad to see you, ministers and elders of the Christian Church, bound as we are by a faith in our common Lord, whom we love and whom we serve,

by a lealty to our common Christ, and by our devotion to the one Word of truth and true interest in the aggressiveness of his work and in the hope of his work for the world. But we are especially glad to see you because you are ministers and elders of the Presbyterian Church, the Church which has testified its life and its vigor in many a dungeon and on many a blood-stained heath and at many a fagot—the Church whose lineage is not of a day, whose doctrines we have learned at the feet of the Great Teacher, and whose government we believe we have learned from the pattern shown in the Mount, the Church of our birth, to many of us the Church of our love and our consecration.

We welcome you to our city—not a new Western city. Don't imagine you have come West. You have just begun to get West. This is an old city, older than New York, older than Boston, older than Philadelphia—one of the oldest and most historic cities of our land; and we welcome you to a State original and noble in its enterprises, in its achievements and its possibilities. We welcome you to our hearts and to our homes. And it is right, brethren, that I should say in behalf of so many who have been compelled to close their homes at this time, there are very many who are exceedingly disappointed because by sicknesses that have been severe, by bereavements in their households, homes that have been accustomed to throw open their doors in a very wide and generous hospitality, are at this time closed to the regret of none more keenly than those who have had to close their doors. And if any of you have had any trouble in the last twenty-four hours don't blame the Committee of Arrangements, and if you have had any annoyances try to forget them in the contemplation of the exceeding energy and thrift and fertility of resources, shown by one or two gentlemen of the Hotel Committee. But we hope you will be at home with us. We welcome you and rejoice in your presence. We anticipate health, instruction, energy, enterprise to our Church in this city and throughout the State because of the presence of the General Assembly.

It is my pleasant duty, also, Mr. Moderator, on behalf of the Committee of Arrangements, to respond to the lack which the retiring Moderator expressed and to present to you a Michigan gavel, Michigan throughout! The handle is made of the wood of an historic tree, the old Pontiac tree, which, in 1637, looked down upon that dreadful struggle and massacre—a tree then in the wilderness surrounded by Indians and the hostiles, but now almost in the heart of the city. And it seems to me it is a good thing that in the very wood of our gavel we should have a reminder of the tremendous advance made in our Christian civilization, and a promise of the blessing that is to come for Christianity in its honored march as it is carrying the larger and the more enduring influences of peace to all our civilization. And then we have made the head of the gavel from the wood of the old Fort that stood over in the old days close to the side of this church—not at all intimating that Presbyterianism is given to struggle, but that Presbyterianism is tenacious of its views; it is sometimes, in fact all the time, not only aggressive in that which it conceives to be true, but having done all it can it holds the fort. [Applause.] And then the ornaments are of Michigan production. We have imbedded in it Michigan silver, Michigan gold, Michigan copper, Michigan iron—no brass; we haven't any. [Laughter and applause.] Not at all implying, Mr. Moderator, by introducing these metals into the gavel that we have any desire to intimate that the Presbyterian General Assembly ought to be on its mettle. It always is, in the interests of truth and righteousness—but that it might perhaps give us a faint promise or a prophecy that the Presbyterian Church in its rule more and more in this day even as of olden times, the gold and the silver were numbered—the gold from Ophir—and the Queen of Sheba brought her gems. So that the gold and the silver may more and more exalt the weak and beneficent influence of our Presbyterianism. So, Mr. Moderator, it is our pleasure to put this Michigan gavel in your hand—and especially a pleasure to me, Mr. Moderator, to put it in the hand of my honored and loved predecessor [Applause] in the assurance that it will be in your hands and for this Assembly a symbol and a scepter of peace and dignity, and the assurance in your hands to us that this General Assembly, in its presence here will manifest peace, harmony, devotion to the interest of truth, of righteousness, of law, of liberty; and that as you depart you will leave a lasting blessing upon the Church, and with us especially a benediction and a fragrant memory. [Applause.]

The Moderator: The General Assembly are profoundly grateful, both in their individual and general capacity, to the Committee of Arrangements for the labor which they have extended and for the pains they have shown in all ways and in this particular no less than in others, and that in this matter of providing what belongs to the external paraphernalia of the Assembly even this should be put in my hands, not for use but merely for exhibition. [Laughter and applause.]

Dr. W. E. Moore, the chairman of the Consensus Creed Committee, read a report, which was adopted, in which he related what had been done toward the preparation of a new creed, and asked to be continued. The committee has sent the following letter to all the Presbyterian churches holding the Reformed system:

Fathers and Brethren: The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, during its session, May 21st, A.D. 1890, took action on the report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures, with reference to the subject of a Consensus Creed, the report being in the words following: "The report was adopted and is as follows: The Committee recommend that all overtures on a New and Consensus Creed shall be referred to a committee of nine (9), who shall invite the co-operation of the Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian system to prepare a short creed containing the essential articles of the Westminster Confession, to be used as a common creed of these Churches, not as a substitute for the creed of any particular denomination, but to supplement it for the common work of the Church—especially the mission fields—to report to the next General Assembly, and that the Moderator of the Assembly be the chairman of the committee. The committee appointed by said General Assembly to carry out its desires is constituted as follows: Ministers: the Rev. William E. Moore, D.D., Moderator, and pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Columbus, O.; the Rev. William H. Roberts, D.D., LL.D., Stated Clerk of the General Assembly and Professor in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, O.; the Rev. Howard Crosby, D.D., LL.D., ex-Moderator, and pastor of the Fourth Avenue Church, New York City; the Rev. John Dewitt, D.D., LL.D., Professor in McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; the Rev. Francis Brown, D.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City; the Rev. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. With ruling elders: Edward B. Durant, Esq., Henry Day, LL.D. and Robert M. Wilson, LL.D. The Committee met at the call of its Chairman, the Rev. Dr. Moore, in the City of New York, December, 1890, and directed the undersigned, as Secretary of the Committee, to communicate the above action of the General Assembly to the several Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian system in compliance with the direction thus given, this communication is addressed to the ———, accompanied by the request that at its next meeting, if the way be clear, it appoint a committee to enter into correspondence with the Committee of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., with a view to the consideration and preparation of a short creed, containing the essential articles of the Westminster Confession, to be used as a common creed of these Churches, not as a substitute for the creed of any particular denomination, but to supplement it for the common work of the Church." Into the question of the advisability of a Consensus

Creed the Committee of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. do not feel called upon to enter, but prefer to leave its consideration to the several churches interested or to the representative committees which they may respectively appoint. It is understood, however, by the Committee, that the creed which may be formulated by the labors of the joint consensus committees will have no binding force in any of the reformed or Presbyterian churches except as first submitted to and approved by the judicatory or judicatories in whom such power of approval is vested by the laws of these churches respectively.

Tendering to your Honorable body the fraternal regards of your brethren of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., I am, very respectfully yours,
Secretary of the Consensus Committee of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

The Rev. Dr. Samuel T. Lowrie, of Philadelphia, read the report of the Committee on the Proof Texts of the Confession of Faith and the Larger Catechism, which will be discussed later. It closed as follows:

In respect to the acceptance of this report, and the disposition to be made of your Committee's work, the Assembly will necessarily consider the following subjects:

- (1) Since this Revision of the Proof Texts was instituted, the Confession of Faith itself has been submitted to revision with a view to possible "alterations and amendments."
- (2) Shall the changes in the Proof Texts recommended by your Committee be adopted by this Assembly?

In respect to the first of these considerations, when it is remembered that the Revision of the Confession of Faith now in progress is expressly limited "not (to) propose any alterations or amendments that will in any way impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system of doctrine taught in the Confession of Faith" (*Assembly's Minutes*, 1890, p. 86), it appears that the most of the work done by this Committee is unaffected by the Revision of the Confession of Faith; and it may be assumed that for the most part the Proof Texts recommended by this Committee will still be found appropriate in places where the text of the Confession of Faith may be modified. The readjustment of them, with such omissions or other selections as may become expedient, might be referred to this Committee.

With regard to the second consideration above, your Committee would remind the Assembly that the present Revision of the Proof Texts was instituted in view of the following facts, viz.:

First. Since the selection of such texts by the Westminster divines, two-and-a-half centuries ago, much light has been shed on the texts used by them, and on others not so used, and, especially, much has been done to settle the correct text of the Scriptures, particularly of the New Testament. Consequently, some changes of the proof texts had become important.

Second. The proof texts as printed by authority of our Church differ much from the original proof texts furnished by the Westminster Assembly. That Assembly did its work in a very thorough way. Referring it first to special committees, the proof texts recommended by these were canvassed in sessions of the Assembly extending through many days and even months. The finished work of that Assembly was then reported to Parliament, and approved and adopted by it.

Third. No one can suppose that a work of revising those texts could be attempted by one of our General Assemblies in the fashion used by the Westminster Assembly. This was not thought necessary by the General Assemblies of 1792-4, that brought about the revised proof texts that our Church has printed ever since. But the method used at that time was faulty. The preparation of proof texts was assigned to a small committee, and the actual work appears to have been done by only two ministers, one of whom did the work on the Confession of Faith, and the other that on the Larger Catechism. On their report and recommendation, the Assembly of 1794 adopted the proof texts and ordered their printing, in the form the Church has used to the present. (See *Presbyterian Review*, July 1888.)

Fourth. The Assembly that instituted the present revision of the proof texts improved on the methods of the earlier revision by appointing a committee of nine ministers, all but one of whom have been able to devote much labor to the work. The Committee was intended to be fairly representative of the whole Church, by the character, qualification and position of its members and by their geographical distribution, and by numbers not to be practically co-operative. The Committee, as their reports show, have done the work of revision by methods that have exacted the attention of every member to the whole of it, while by parts it has been subjected to particular study. Leaving it to the Assembly to vindicate the selection of the workman that was made, the Committee itself trusts that it will be approved as having used due diligence.

Having these facts before it, the Assembly can judge whether a more perfect work may be achieved by a further process. For ourselves, having experience of the comprehensive consideration, the patient scrutiny, and deliberate wisdom required in this work, and supposing that by our combined knowledge, with the use of commentaries and theological works, we have been confronted with the criticisms that it may encounter, and that we have paid due attention to such different views, as it was our aim and duty to do, we are of the opinion that any good that might come of submitting our work to a wider scrutiny and judgment would not justify the pains and cost of the printing that would be necessary, nor be commensurate with the confusion and trouble that would attend such a course.

We therefore conclude with the following recommendations for adoption by this Assembly:

- First. That this Report be printed in the Minutes of this Assembly.
- Second. That the changes in the proof texts reported and recommended by your Committee, as the same are entered in the margins of their Official Copy of the Confession of Faith, be adopted; subject, however, to such modification as may be necessitated by possible changes in the text of the Confession of Faith and Larger Catechism that may result from the Revision of the Confession of Faith now under consideration.
- Third. That the change recommended by your Committee in the Note attached to the Title of the Shorter Catechism, as the same has been marked in their Official Copy of the Confession of Faith, be adopted.
- Fourth. That the method of printing the proof texts recommended in the foregoing Report be adopted.
- Fifth. That, in view of the Revision of the Confession of Faith, and other circumstances that make it impossible to treat the Revision of the Proof Texts as a completed work at present, the Committee on Proof Texts be continued.

Dr. John S. MacIntosh, chairman of the committee on the denominational magazine, *Church at Home and Abroad* presented a report calling for an increased subscription list in order that the cost might be decreased. The report ended with a tribute to Dr. Howard Crosby, and the appointment of his successor.

It becomes, alas! the painful duty of your Committee to report what is for us, and with us our whole Church, an irreparable loss in the death of our beloved friend and most efficient associate, Howard Crosby. Among his many devoted labors in behalf of our Presbyterian Church, few engaged his interests more deeply, few won

from him more thought, few showed the touch of his master hand more markedly than did this *Church at Home and Abroad*; it gained from him its very name. Ever faithful in attendance, eagerly watchful of all affecting for weal or woe our work, freely giving his time and labor to the advancement of the magazine, he will be remembered by us all with a tender affection, he will be missed through all the future history of this magazine—the honored friend, the wise counselor, the devoted servant of the Lord.

Your Committee would respectfully suggest the name of the Rev. George Alexander, D.D., of New York, to fill the vacancy thus created. In order that we may carry forward this work, that we may develop our plans, that we may add fresh interest to the magazine, and secure for it a larger circulation, your committee recommend that the special committee on *The Church at Home and Abroad* be continued, with the same powers which have been already conferred, and be directed to report to the Assembly of 1892; and that the expenses of the committee be paid out of the funds.

SECOND DAY—MORNING SESSION.

The Moderator: The time has arrived for the order of the day—the Committee on Revision.

W. C. Roberts, D.D.: *Mr. Moderator*: You know, sir, that this is not a finished report. It is a report of progress, with the desire that the Committee should be continued, and also that you should ask the presbyteries to give us a little more light upon the subject, that we may be able to finish it during the coming year. I would say also that this is the only correct report. The reports will be distributed at the close of this session; but they are not correct, all of them, and I hope, therefore, that the commissioners will make two or three changes, so as to make them agree with this report which I shall read to you. The Committee regret that some of the daily papers were able to get, in some way, we do not know how, a copy of the report—which is a little imperfect, too—and published it in advance of the reading before the General Assembly.

Dr. Roberts then read the report.

REVISION OF THE WESTMINSTER CONFSSION.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

The Assembly's Committee on Revision of the Confession of Faith begs leave to submit the following report:

In pursuance of the Assembly's instructions (see Minutes of 1890, p. 85) the first meeting of the Committee was held at the call of the temporary chairman, in the library of the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Penn., October 14th, 1890. The first half hour was devoted to prayer and consideration of the gravity of the situation, the importance of the work to be undertaken, and the best interests of our beloved Church.

When the roll of the Committee was called, twenty-three members answered to their names, and letters were received from the remaining two expressing regret at their inability to be present on account of ill-health.

After completing the organization of the Committee by electing by ballot the Rev. William C. Roberts, D.D., as the permanent chairman, and the Rev. William E. Moore, D.D., as the secretary, the tendered resignations of the Rev. Thomas S. Hastings, D.D., of New York, and of Barker Gummere, Esq., of New Jersey, were accepted, and the Rev. Robert R. Booth, D.D., of New York, and Morris H. Stratton, Esq., of New Jersey, were elected to fill their places. Upon learning of their election, the new members repaired at once to Allegheny City, thus making a full attendance of the Committee.

The following rules were adopted for the regulation of the Committee, namely: That the General Rules for Judicatories be made the rules of the Committee; that the first half hour of each day be spent in devotional exercises; that each session be opened and closed with prayer, and that no alterations or amendments be proposed that would in any way impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system of doctrine taught in the Confession. These regulations were strictly enforced during the sessions of the Committee, both at Allegheny City and in Washington.

At the second meeting, held in Washington, February 2d to 16th, 1891, all of the members of the Committee were present.

In order to allay any fears that might be entertained in regard to the thoroughness of the work of revision, the whole Confession was read before the Committee and an opportunity afforded to note every word, sentence and paragraph suggested by the presbyteries, or desired to be considered by any member of the Committee.

This was followed by taking up in order for discussion, omission or alteration every one of these noted passages. The omissions and alterations then decided upon were considered only tentative, in order to afford time for further reflection and consideration. The venerable Confession was thus subjected twice to the closest scrutiny. All the changes and amendments recommended in this report have been forged by the heaviest hammers that your Committee could wield. Those favorable to revision and those opposed to it did not array themselves in hostile bands, but labored as brethren anxious to perform satisfactorily the duty committed to them by the General Assembly. The harmony and brotherly kindness which characterized all its deliberations were not due to a determination to agree, whatever interests might suffer, but to the evident presence of the Holy Spirit guiding the passions and the feelings, as well as the mind and heart. At every session was displayed the glittering of the polished steel of the professor, as well as the practical judgment of the experienced pastor. The clear-cut analysis made by the skilled dialectician called forth no greater applause than the pathetic appeals of the shepherd to let down a tender grass of the Word sufficiently low to afford the lambs of the flock opportunity to feed thereon. The keen blade of the layman did as effective work as the broadsword of the clergyman. Neither time nor labor was spared in the prosecution of the work. It is proper to add that as to some of the most important changes, such as those in the third and tenth chapters, there were decided differences of judgment in the Committee; some members being opposed to the changes therein recommended and voting against them.

The Committee does not flatter itself with the hope that all the presbyteries will be satisfied with its work, as submitted to this Assembly. Some, beyond doubt, will feel that the pruning knife has been too sparingly used, and many will allege that not a few precious limbs have been lopped off. In view of the condition of things in and out of the Church, the Committee did not deem it needful nor wise to use the reckless penknife of Jehoiakim, nor, on the other hand, to spare passages that are unnecessarily harsh or misleading. If the presbyteries will devote sufficient time to inquire into the reasons why some objectionable paragraphs have been left untouched, whilst others considered less so have been eliminated, they will find that the Committee was governed in its discrimination by restrictions imposed upon it by the Assembly, or by what it believed to be the views held by the majority of our ministers, elders and private members.

To meet a want felt by individuals and presbyteries, of a clearer and more specific statement concerning the common operations of the Spirit, and the universal offer of the Gospel, the Committee has judged it wise to devote to these subjects two entire chapters. The bringing together under one head of statements that would otherwise be inserted here and there throughout the book, does not increase its bulk, while it makes it far more convenient for reference. Since the conversion of the heathen was hardly thought of in the days of the Westminster Divines, there is evident propriety in adding a chapter to mark the progress which the Church has made in evangelistic ideas and Christian work during the last two hundred years.

It may not be out of place in this connection to furnish the Assembly with a brief explanation of the changes that will presently be given in detail.

The Committee, without request from any of our presbyteries, thought it wise to recognize in Chapter I, the commonly accepted external evidences of the Divine origin of the Scriptures.

It will be seen that Chapter III, which has been regarded by many as the pivot around which revision revolves, has been altered more than any other portion of the Confession. It has not, however, been completely rewritten, as some presbyteries have asked, but so recast that the expressions most objected to have entirely disappeared. It was thought that further alterations in the same direction would, in the opinion of some, impair the validity of our Reformed or Calvinistic system.

Finding that the latter part of Section I of Chapter IV was not true to fact, or in keeping with the teachings of God's Word, a slight but important change has been proposed. The frequently misunderstood Section 4 of Chapter VI in regard to the ability of man to perform any deeds acceptable to God, is so amended as to confine his inability to spiritual good. The "means" through which the Lord offers unto sinners life and salvation is added to Section 3 of Chapter VII, and the whole of Section 4 is stricken out on the ground of its not being supported by facts of Scripture. In Section 5, Chapter VIII, "Divine Justice" is substituted for "the Justice of His Father," because this attribute is common to the three persons of the Godhead.

Section 3 of Chapter IX is so altered as to leave no doubt in regard to the responsibility of man as a free moral agent.

In order to discriminate between the two operations included in effectual calling, Section 2, Chapter X, the passivity of the subject is confined in the amendment to the "act of regeneration." The frequently discussed and openly denigrated sections concerning the condition of infants dying in infancy is so altered as to take away forever what has been to many a rock of offense. The section on the works done by unregenerate men, in Chapter XVI, is so amended as to express the fact in the light of God's Word. Owing to the impossibility of knowing who have sinned the sin unto death, the Committee has so changed Section 4 of Chapter XXI, that it reads, "the forgiveness of all sins, except the sin unto death." The word "popish" is stricken out of Section 7, Chapter XXII, on the ground of its being an epithet, and therefore weakening in its effect, and the expression "nursing fathers," in Section 3, Chapter XXIII, is dropped, because civil magistrates in this country cannot be said to hold that relation to the Church. Without passing judgment on the question whether or not "papists" are idolaters, the Committee was of the opinion that our church members might without falling under Scripture condemnation enter into marriage relations with some members of the Romish Church, and therefore propose, as a substitute for "papists, or other idolaters," in Section 3, Chapter XXIV, the words, "the adherents of false religions." Tho the Committee has no disposition to tone down in the slightest degree the objectionable features of the Church of Rome, yet it has changed Section 6 of Chapter XXV, so as to make it agree with accepted facts. Instead of reading, Section 2, Chapter XXIX, "the popish sacrifice of the Mass," the revised Confession, if adopted, will read, "the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass." The unqualified statement in Section 2, of Chapter XXX, that the officers of the Church "have power respectively to retain and remit sins," is so modified as to read that the power thus given them is "ministerial and declarative." A few changes of important words also have been made, but the reason for the same is so clear as to need no explanation in this connection.

Communications from various sources were received by your Committee asking for the publication of this report before the spring meetings of the presbyteries, in order that it might be considered at that time, and commissioners to the Assembly be elected who would fairly represent the views of the majority of the members on the proposed changes. It was impracticable to accede to this reasonable request. But, to meet the case in fact, if not in form, the Committee would recommend that the General Assembly send this report down to the presbyteries for consideration, criticism, or amendments, with the request that they forward their criticisms and amendments in print or typewriter form by December 1st, 1891, to the Secretary of the Revision Committee, and that said Committee be instructed to consider these communications and prepare its final report for adoption, modification or rejection by the General Assembly of 1892. Such procedure will have the happy effect of securing the co-operation of all the presbyteries in a work that is felt by all to be the most difficult, far-reaching and important, and of affording your Committee time to review and, if necessary, revise in a new light the changes which they have made.

THE CHANGES RECOMMENDED.

The alterations, amendments and additions which the Revision Committee is prepared to recommend to the General Assembly are the following:

CHAPTER I.

OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture. And the truthfulness of the history, the faithful witness of prophecy and miracle, the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word, in our hearts.

[The words italicized are new. No other changes are made.]

CHAPTER III.

OF GOD'S ETERNAL DECREE.

(Revision.)

(Old.)

Sections I and II unchanged, Sections III and IV stricken out; and Section V amended so that Section III will read:

III. God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath predestinated some of mankind unto life, and hath particularly and unchangeably chosen them in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes, moving Him thereunto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace.

Section VI remains unchanged

III. By the decree of God for the manifestation of His Glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

V. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of His will, hath chosen, in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without

and becomes Section IV. Section VII was amended and becomes Section V, and is as follows:

V. The rest of mankind, God was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, not to elect unto everlasting life, but to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice; yet so as thereby neither is any limitation put upon the offer of salvation to all upon condition of faith in Christ; nor is restraint laid upon the freedom of any one to hinder his acceptance of this offer.

VI. Section VIII remains unchanged and becomes Section VI.

[Section III of the revision contains no new matter, but consists of Sections III, IV and V of the old chapter, recast. Section V of the revision is Section VII of the old chapter changed by the addition of the words in italics and by the omission of the words in brackets in Section VII.]

CHAPTER IV. OF CREATION.

(Revision.) I. It pleased God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost for the manifestation of the glory of His eternal power, wisdom and goodness, in the beginning, to create of nothing the universe, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, and all very good. The heavens and the earth, with all that they contain, were made by Him in six creative days.

(Old.) I. It pleased God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of His eternal power, wisdom and goodness, in the beginning, to create, or make of no hung (the world) and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good.

CHAPTER VI. OF THE FALL OF MAN, OF SIN, AND OF THE PUNISHMENT THEREOF.

(Revision.) IV. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to evil, do proceed all actual transgressions. Nevertheless, the Providence of God, and the common operations of His Spirit, restrain unregenerate men from much that is evil, and lead them to exercise many social and civil virtues.

(Old.) IV. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.

CHAPTER VII. OF GOD'S COVENANT WITH MAN.

III. Man by his fall, having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace; wherein He freely offereth by His word and Spirit unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in Him, that they may be saved, and promising to give, unto all those that are ordained unto life, His Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe.

[The only change in the foregoing section is the addition of the words in italic. The only change in the following section is the omission of the words in brackets.]

Section IV was stricken out, Section V becomes Section IV. The words in the last line, "and is called the Old Testament," were stricken out.

IV. This covenant was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the Gospel; under the law it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all fore-signifying Christ to come, which were, for that time, sufficient and efficacious, through the operation of the Spirit, to instruct and build up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah, by whom they had full remission of sins, and eternal salvation [and is called the Old Testament.]

[Section IV, which was stricken out, is as follows:]

IV. This covenant of grace is frequently set forth in the Scripture by the name of a testament, in reference to the death of Jesus Christ, the testator, and to the everlasting inheritance, with all things belonging to it, therein bequeathed.

Section VI becomes Section V. In line nine, the words "and is called the New Testament" were stricken out.

V. Under the Gospel, when Christ, the substance, was exhibited, the ordinances, in which this covenant is dispensed, are the preaching of the word, and the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; which, though the fewer in number, and administered with more simplicity, and less outward glory, yet in them it is held forth in more fullness, evidence and spiritual efficacy, to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles; [and is called the New Testament.] There are not, therefore, two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same under various dispensations.

CHAPTER VIII. OF CHRIST THE MEDIATOR.

V. The Lord Jesus, by His perfect obedience and sacrifice of Himself, which He through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied Divine Justice, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the Kingdom of Heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto Him.

[The only change in the foregoing section is the substitution of the word divine for the phrase "of His Father."]

The chapter "Of the work of the Holy Spirit," becomes Chapter IX.

CHAPTER IX. OF THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

I. The Holy Spirit, the third Person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, the same in substance with the Father and the Son, and equal in power and glory, is together with the Father and the Son to be believed in, loved, obeyed and worshipped throughout all ages. I Mart. iii, 16, 17; xxviii, 19; John xiv, 16, 17; I Cor. ii, 11; II Cor. xiii, 14; Gal. v, 22, 25; Eph. iv, 4-6; Heb. ix, 14.

II. The Holy Spirit who of old revealed to men in various ways the mind and will of God, hath fully and authoritatively made known this mind and will in all things pertaining to life and salvation in the sacred Scriptures, the Holy men of God speaking therein as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and these Scriptures being so inspired, are the infallible Word of God, the supreme rule of faith and duty. I I Cor. ii, 10-13; Heb. i, 1, 2; John xvi, 13; Acts i, 16; II Tim. iii, 15, 16; II Peter i, 21; I Thess. ii, 13; John v, 39; Col. iii, 16.

III. The Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, is everywhere present among men, confirming the teachings of nature and the law of God written on the heart, restraining from evil and inciting to good; and is the source of all the wisdom, virtue and reverence for God found in men, and of all the peace and good order in society; thus preparing the way for the Gospel wherever it is preached. I He everywhere accompanies the Gospel with His persuasive energy, and urges its message upon the unregenerate, enlightening their minds concerning divine things, quickening their consciences, and drawing them by His grace, so that they who reject the merciful offer of the Gospel are not only without excuse, but are also guilty of resisting the Holy Spirit. I Joel ii, 28; John i, 9; Rev. xxii, 17; Rom. x, 18; Rom. i, 19, 20; I, 14, 15; I John xvi, 8; Isa. lxiii, 10; Acts ii, 16-18; Acts vii, 51; xxv, 25; Heb. x, 29.

IV. The Holy Spirit is the only efficient agent in applying and communicating redemption. He effectually calls sinners to new life in Christ Jesus, regenerating them by His almighty grace, freeing them from the bondage of sin and death, and persuading and enabling them to embrace Jesus Christ by faith. I He dwells in all believers as their Comforter and Sanctifier, and as the Spirit of adoption and of supplication, leading them into all the truth, making the means of grace efficacious in their edification, strengthening them for all duty, sustaining them in all affliction, and performing all other gracious offices by which they are sanctified, sealed, and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. I John iii, 5; II Cor. v, 5, 17; Rom. viii, 9; I Cor. xii, 3; II Cor. vii, 10; I John i, 19; xiv, 17; Rom. viii, 16, 26, 27; 3 Gal. v, 5, 22; Jude, v, 20, 21; Eph. iii, 16; iv, 30; II Thess. ii, 13; Col. i, 12.

V. By the indwelling of the Holy Spirit all believers are vitally united to Christ, who is the Head, and are thus united to one another in the Church, which is His body. I He calls and anoints ministers for their holy office. He also calls and qualifies all other officers in the Church for their special work, and imparts various gifts and graces to its members. I He gives efficacy to the word and to the ordinances of the Gospel; keeps the Church from apostasy, revives it in times of declension, and enables it to bear effectual testimony to the truth. I By Him the Church has been and will be preserved, increased, and purified, until it shall cover the earth, and at last be presented to Christ a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing. I I Tim. iii, 15; Eph. i, 22, 23; iii, 10; iv, 16. I Acts xiii, 2; I Cor. ii, 4. I Eph. iv, 8, 4; I Tim. iv, 1; Joel ii, 28; Acts ii, 17; Matt. xxviii, 18-20. I Eph. v, 27; Rev. v, 11-13; xi, 15.

[The foregoing chapter is entirely new.]

CHAPTER (IX) X. OF FREE WILL.

(Revision.) III. Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether indisposed to that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto. Yet is his responsibility as a free moral agent not thereby impaired.

(Old.) III. Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether [averse from] that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.

[The changes in the foregoing section are indicated by the italics. The last sentence is entirely new.]

The chapter "OF THE UNIVERSAL OFFER OF THE GOSPEL" becomes Chapter XI, and the number of all succeeding chapters is increased by two.

CHAPTER XI. OF THE UNIVERSAL OFFER OF THE GOSPEL.

I. God so loved the world that He provided in the covenant of grace, through the mediation and sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, a way of life and salvation sufficient for and adapted to the whole lost race of man: and He doth freely offer this salvation to all men in the Gospel. I Rom. i, 16; II Cor. v, 19; Eph. i, 10; Col. i, 20; Heb. ix, 26; x, 14; I John i, 7; ii, 2; Luke 9, 47; Acts ii, 39; xiii, 47; Col. i, 23. II. The Gospel declares the love of God for the world, and His desire for the salvation of all men. I It sets forth fully and clearly the only way of salvation, which is through Christ alone; promises that all who truly repent and believe in Him shall be saved; commands, exhorts and invites all to embrace the offered mercy; and urges every motive to induce men to accept its gracious invitations. I This free and universal offer of the Gospel is accompanied by the Holy Spirit, striving with and entreating men to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. I John iii, 16; I John iv, 14; Ezek. xxxiii, 11; Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xix, 41, 42; I Tim. ii, 4; I Isa. lxi, 5; Matt. i, 21; Luke ii, 30-32; I Cor. i, 20; iii, 11; I Tim. ii, 5, 6; iii, 16; I John v, 24; vi, 47; xx, 31; Acts ii, 39; iii, 19; x, 43; xvi, 31; Rom. x, 9-11; I Isa. lv, 1-3; Matt. xi, 28-30; Mark i, 15; viii, 36; Luke, iv, 18; John vii, 37; Acts xvii, 30; II Cor. v, 20; I John xvi, 8-11; Acts ii, 17; x, 44, 45; xvi, 14; I Cor. ii, 4; Titus iii, 5, 6; Heb. ii, 4; Rev. xxii, 17.

III. It is the duty and privilege of every one who hears the Gospel immediately to accept its merciful provisions. I Great guilt and danger are incurred by delay or neglect. I And they who continue to disobey the Gospel perish by their own fault and are wholly without excuse, because they have resisted the Holy Spirit and rejected God's gracious offer of eternal life. I Matt. iii, 9; Luke ix, 41, 42; xx, 24, 25; II Cor. vi, 2; Heb. iii, 12, 15; I Matt. vii, 24-27; xxv, 10; Luke xii, 20; xiv, 18; Acts xxiv, 25; Heb. ii, 1-3; xii, 25; I Prov. i, 24-26; John iii, 18, 19, 26; Acts vii, 51; Rom. ii, 4, 5; II Cor. ii, 15, 16; iv, 3, 4; I I Thess. i, 8, 9.

IV. As there is no other way of salvation than that revealed in the Gospel, and as in the divinely established and ordinary method of grace, faith cometh by hearing the Word of God, Christ hath given to His Church the written Word the Sacraments, and the Ministry; endowed her with the Holy Spirit, and commissioned her to go with His Gospel into all the world and to make disciples of all nations. I It is, therefore, the duty and privilege of all believers to sustain the means of grace where they are already established, and to contribute by their prayers, gifts, and personal efforts to the extension of the Kingdom of Christ throughout the whole earth. I John viii, 24; x, 9; xiv, 6; Acts iv, 12; I Matt. xxviii, 19, 20; Mark xvi, 15; Acts i, 8; viii, 4; xxvi, 16-18; Rom. i, 14, 15; x, 14, 15, 17; xvi, 25, 26.

[The foregoing chapter is entirely new.]

CHAPTER (X) XII. OF EFFECTUAL CALLING.

(Revision.) II. This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive in the act of regeneration wherein, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is enabled to answer God's call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.

(Old.) II. This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive [therein, until] being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer [this] call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.

[The italics in the revised section indicate the changes made in the words in brackets in the old section.]

III. All infants dying in infancy, and all other persons, who, from birth to death, are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word, are redeemed by Christ, and regenerated by the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth.

[Section III has been recast. The substitution of all infants for "elect infants."]

IV. Others, not elected, altho they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet inasmuch as they never truly come to Christ, they cannot be saved; neither is there salvation in any other way than by Christ through the Spirit, however diligent men may be in framing their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess.

[The foregoing section has been recast. The changes are indicated by italics in the revised and brackets in the old section.]

CHAPTER (XI) XIII. OF JUSTIFICATION.

I. Those whom God effectually calleth, He also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins; and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, their receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith; which faith (they have, not of themselves, it) is the gift of God.

The words in parenthesis were stricken out, so as to read which faith is the gift of God.

III. Christ, by His obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to Divine justice in their behalf. Yet inasmuch as He was given by the Father for them, and His obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for anything in them, their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners. In line three Divine is substituted for "His Father's" justice.

CHAPTER (XIV) XVI. OF SAVING FAITH.

I. The grace of faith, whereby sinners are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls, is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts; and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word; by which also, and by the administration of the sacraments, and prayer, it is increased and strengthened.

[The only change in the foregoing section is the substitution of sinners for "the elect."]

CHAPTER (XVI) XVIII. OF GOOD WORKS.

(Revision.) VII. Works done by unregenerate men, altho they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; and while their neglect of such things is sinful and displeasing unto God, yet because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore not free from sin, and cannot be accepted of God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God.

(Old.) VII. Works done by unregenerate men, altho for the matter of them they may be things which God commands, and of good use both to themselves and others; yet because they proceed not from a heart purified by faith; nor are done in a right manner, according to the word; nor to a right end, the glory of God; they are therefore [sinful], and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God. And yet their neglect of them is more sinful, and displeasing unto God.

[The phrase not free from sin is substituted for "sinful" the other italicized words are new matter.]

CHAPTER (XXI) XXIII. OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP AND THE SABBATH DAY.

(Revision.) IV. Prayer is to be made for things lawful; for the forgiveness of all sins except the sin unto death; and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter; but not for the dead.

(Old.) IV. Prayer is to be made for things lawful, and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter; but not for the dead, nor for those of whom it may be known that they have sinned the sin unto death.

[The changes are indicated by the italics.]

CHAPTER (XXII) XXIV. OF LAWFUL OATHS AND VOWS.

VII. No man may vow to do anything forbidden in the word of God, or what would hinder any duty therein commanded, or which is not in his own power, and for the performance whereof he hath no promise or ability from God. In which respect, [popish] monastical vows of perpetual single life, professed poverty, and regular obedience are so far from being degrees of higher perfection that they are superstitious and sinful snares, in which no Christian may entangle himself.

The word "popish," in line five, was stricken out so as to read "monastical vows," etc.

CHAPTER (XXIII) XXV. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.

III. Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the Word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; or in the least interfere in matters of faith. Yet, as [ruling fathers] it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the Church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger. And as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in His Church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let or hinder the due exercise thereof among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people in such an effectual manner as that no person be suffered, either upon pretenses of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence,

abuse or injury to any other person whatsoever; and to take order that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance.

The words "as nursing fathers," line 4, were stricken out.

CHAPTER (XXIV) XXVI.
OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

III. It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent, yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. And therefore such as profess the true religion should not marry with infidels, nor with the adherents of false religions, neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life.

[The phrase in italics is substituted for "papists or other idolaters."]

CHAPTER (XXV) XXVII.
OF THE CHURCH.

VI. There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ, and the claim of the Pope of Rome to be the vicar of Christ, and the head of the Church universal, is without warrant in Scripture or in fact; and is a usurpation dishonoring to the Lord Jesus Christ.

[The following is the old section:]

VI. There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself, in the Church, against Christ, and all that is called God.

CHAPTER (XXIX) XXXI.
OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

II. In this sacrament, Christ is not offered up to His Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all, for remission of sins of the quick or dead; but only a commemoration of that one offering up of Himself by Himself, upon the cross, once for all and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same; so that the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice for sin.

[The words in italic take the place of "popish," and of "for all the sins of the elect."]

VIII. Altho ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament, yet they receive not the thing signified thereby; but, by their unworthy coming thereunto, are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, to their own damnation. Wherefore all ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with Him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table, and cannot, without great sin against Christ, while they remain such, partake of these holy mysteries, or be admitted thereunto.

For damnation, line 4, "condemnation" was substituted.

CHAPTER XXX (XXXII).
OF CHURCH CENSURES.

II. To these officers the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have ministerial and declarative power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the Word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require.

[The words in italic are new.]

Dr. Joseph T. Smith: *Mr. Moderator:* I move that the recommendation of the Committee be adopted and the report sent down to the presbyteries as the Committee request.

George P. Hays, D. D.: I venture to suggest to Dr. Smith a little different phraseology for the same thing, and covering one or two points that his motion does not cover, and I ask his attention and that of the house and suggest this motion: That the report presented by the Committee be now accepted as a report of progress, and the Stated Clerk (in order that the expenses may be properly paid) is hereby directed to print the same under the supervision of the Committee, and send it down to the presbyteries in accordance with its recommendations, and the Committee is continued to make final report to the next General Assembly.

Elder James T. Graham, of Nebraska City: Is that open for discussion now, Mr. Moderator?

The Moderator: Yes, sir.

Dr. Hays: If the brother will pardon me—I only desire to say one or two words in explanation of this, and I say this at the request of one or two brothers who know somewhat of my earlier position on this subject. I have already in print said what I now repeat that I do not believe the prospect of revision will ever come from a committee more competent and a committee more satisfactory to make it; nor, so far as I have yet seen, am I disposed in any particular to complain of the work or differ from them in judgment. But they notified the Church at large of their request that this should be sent down to the presbyteries, and for myself, therefore, I say I do not feel that on this question I have a right to represent my presbytery and so send it down; they did not send me, and I don't believe many of them sent the rest of you here, either, to send that down, otherwise than for their information. It is a report of progress. Then during the next year in our presbyteries everybody will have an opportunity to send to this Committee, and will also have a right to cross examine this Committee to their hearts' content about what they want, and then send to the Committee their opinion. I therefore am in favor of doing just what the Committee and what the presbyteries expect to be done, namely, to have it printed under the direction of the Committee. I do not mean, of course, any reflection upon the Clerk, but the Committee ought to be responsible for that, and more especially for the reason that they ought to determine how they will print it, whether in parallel columns with the old, or not; but the method of printing it shall be under their supervision, and then they shall send it down to the presbyteries. Then we shall be able to express our opinions together, and next year there shall be sent up to the General Assembly delegates specially authorized to act upon this subject. I do not know that I need say more than that as to the drift of the motion and the intention and effect of it, in case it should be passed in these words, and these are the reasons—and I beg Dr. Smith's pardon for seeming to suggest to his motion—for suggesting that it covers two or three things that seem to be important, the method of printing, etc.

Dr. Smith: I think Dr. Hays has met what was in my mind, and, I am sure, in the mind of this Assembly. I just want to say one thing, however, and that is, that I think we all, with overflowing hearts of gratitude to the great Head of the Church, listened to the report of this Committee. We recollect the anxiety of a year and of two years ago. We all love the system of doctrine that we have held, and that we have maintained before the world, and that we have consecrated with the blood of so many martyrs; and when the proposition was made—not to change its integrity, but to change its phraseology—very many of us trembled lest there should be a failure in the changes that were made to maintain its integrity. Now, I am sure as we listened to this report that we have felt that there is the old Calvinism that we have all loved and loved so ardently—it is there in its integrity. [Applause.] I do not say that every particular proposition of the Committee you and I may assent to. It would be a marvelous thing if we did. But I do say that we can accept the report of this Committee as it is, and yet feel that we have been faithful to God's truth and faithful to that inheritance that has been transmitted to us. [Applause.]

Elder James M. Graham, of Nebraska City: *Mr. Moderator and*

Gentlemen: I oppose this report, because it has dictated to the presbyteries what they shall do. If we receive this, why, it is a dictation to us. I have understood that it was to be handed down without comment or vote of any kind, to the presbyteries to act upon it in the future. Therefore, I would put an amendment to this—namely, that it go the presbyteries uncommented upon by this General Assembly. I, perhaps, am the oldest man in this General Assembly; I think so. If I live until July, I shall be eighty. Now, I went through this old and new school controversy before, and I, for one, would not cross a t or dot an i in that old Confession of Faith. [Laughter and applause.] I tell you, brethren, this old Confession of Faith is an anvil that has worn out every hammer that has ever tried to disgrace it, and up to this day everybody was at peace and everybody respected it—except a few men. I tell you, Arminianism has got into Presbyterianism.

DR. PATTON ON REVISION.

Francis L. Patton, D. D., LL. D., was greeted with great applause as he took the platform. He spoke as follows:

I rise, Mr. Moderator, to support the resolution offered by Dr. Hays. I confess that on strictly technical grounds I would have preferred, in order to avoid any possible mistake, that this report having been accepted by the Assembly be recommended to the committee with instructions to the committee that they send it to the presbyteries and that the presbyteries be requested to send their criticisms to the committee, and that the committee be further instructed to make their final report to the next General Assembly.

I say, I would have preferred that on technical grounds, and to avoid the seeming appearance of this Assembly's giving its approval to the report—I mean to say, to the report on its merits.

Now, sir, I do not intend to enter into the merits of this discussion. I intend to speak to the resolution as offered by Dr. Hays, and I wish to say in advance that I am in sympathy with that resolution, but it is very important that this Assembly—beg the pardon of the Assembly for calling attention to a matter like this, for it is a very obvious matter—should understand that the acceptance of a report is a purely formal thing, and in no sense and by no implication, direct or remote, carries with it the approval of the sentiments in the report, I am heartily in favor of accepting this report, and I am heartily in favor also of acting upon the recommendations of the committee as they are substantially reproduced in the resolution of Dr. Hays; and I am the more so because of the circumstances attending all debates and deliberations in this committee. I am not speaking after conference with any of my colleagues in this committee; I am not pretending to represent anybody but myself. But I have a duty to discharge to my own conscience, and I wish to do so in the few words that I intend to speak.

As I have already said, I shall not speak on the merits of the question. Pardon me if I introduce what I have to say by referring to the report and as a loyal member of the committee saying again that I can bear my most cheerful and willing testimony to the harmony that pervaded the committee in all its sessions. Now, I do not mean by harmony that we came there with the good-natured sentimental idea uppermost that we must not say anything by way of expressing differences and that we must agree under any circumstances. I mean that the harmony that characterized this committee was the harmony of gentlemen who whatever their differences were determined to do their best to carry out the instructions of the Assembly and to act in the spirit of the Assembly that appointed them. And I wish to say again that whatever differences of opinion may have obtained in that committee and whatever differences may be expressed in the Church by and by, with reference to the report of this committee, or so much of it as we have already listened to, I wish to bear my testimony to this truth, that, notwithstanding the many alterations proposed in this report, so far as my knowledge of the Calvinistic system goes, and so far as I feel confident to express an opinion respecting what is the essence of Calvinism, that not a solitary doctrine of the Calvinistic system has been touched in the report of this committee. [Applause.] If men in the Church, and, what is more likely, if men outside of the Church, who seem to be greatly interested in our proceedings, have been under the impression that this committee intended to de-Calvinize the Confession of Faith, and that they were appointed for the purpose of giving expression to a widespread dissatisfaction with the Calvinistic system in the Church, they will be most woefully disappointed. [Applause.] For, altho every paragraph of this Confession has been subject to scrutiny, and the most careful scrutiny, day after day, there has been no disposition in that committee—and if there had been such a disposition it would have met with very little support—to alter substantially or to impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system contained in that Confession. And I do not hesitate to emphasize the word Calvinistic, for I am not ashamed of it. That is what it is, and that is what the Presbyterian Church means to keep it. [Applause.]

Now, your committee have made their report. They have made a report of progress. It is a very serious thing to revise the formulas of the Church, and, altho this committee was appointed with instructions to report finally to this Assembly, I hardly think that they will be charged with indelicacy in asking to be continued in order that a work of such importance may proceed slowly, that we may do it as liberally, so that the Church will be willing to stand by the results of our action. Therefore, I hope the Assembly will be willing to continue this committee, and will be ready to accept the suggestions of the committee that the report go down to the presbyteries for criticisms, and that this committee get the benefit of those criticisms before they make their final report; because even the wisest of us may change our minds a little bit between now and next December, or between now and next May; and I think it will be the better for the Church if this committee have a little more time to consider some of these changes—the more so when you remember that, altho, as I have said, there was a great deal of harmony in the committee, there was some difference of opinion. That has been recognized very properly in the report. There was a very considerable difference of opinion. There was a difference of opinion covering a very wide area, so far as these Confessional changes are concerned. There was a difference of opinion that concentrated itself with emphasis upon certain spots in the Confession. Now the committee have made their report and those who differ from the judgment of the committee do not feel called upon to enter their dissent or to make a minority report. They wished to have the report of the committee go down to the presbyteries for the criticism of the presbyteries. But we do not want the presbyteries, we do not want this Assembly to get the impression that we were unanimous when we were not unanimous. This Assembly is an honest Assembly, and this Church is an honest Church, and we want the exact facts in the case, as they have been given you very candidly by our chairman in his report.

Now, let me say a few things—not to enter into the merits of the question. I think that this committee, composed, as it was, of those who prior to the Assembly that appointed them were opposed to revision and of those who were in favor of revision, entered upon their work, as I have said, in the spirit of the Assembly, and some of us who, before the presbyteries were heard, wanted no revision at all, after the presbyteries had been heard were thoroughly committed to revision of a greater or less degree. [Applause.] Now I am speaking for myself; I am not speaking for anybody else. I am very free to say that before the presbyteries spoke I opposed revision. Since the presbyteries have spoken—I maintain the attitude I took last December—I have believed that some revision is demanded by the Church, and it must be given her. Therefore, it is simply a question now as to extent. With regard to some of the changes proposed by the committee I say,

speaking simply for myself, that I assent to them, *con amore*, heartily, and believe, seeing revision is demanded by the Church, that the changes we propose are the changes that ought to be made. I say that with respect to some; and then with respect to some other changes I say that I do not regard them as called for, as needed by the theological exigency of our day. But, at the same time, they are not so objectionable as to call forth, from me at least, any comment or criticism or objection; and altho they are not what I would have proposed they are not what I object to. And then with respect to another class of corrections or changes. There are those which ought to be made, but which ought not to be made in the way that this committee proposes to make them. I believe there are certain changes in the Confession of Faith demanded by the Church, and that the Church intends to make them; but I do not believe that the way the committee proposes to make them is the right way to make them. And then I believe, with regard to still another class of changes, that the proposed changes are not needed, and that change of any kind is unnecessary. Now when I have said that I think I have discharged faithfully my duty to this Assembly, and I say this in order that the 216 presbyteries that are represented on the floor of this Assembly may not enter upon the work of criticizing our report under the impression that the committee is unanimous, and therefore they are absolved from any great responsibility of criticizing it. I know they intend to do their own thinking. I know they are not going to take our word for it. I don't desire them to. We want them to criticize this report and do with it just as they please. We believe a great deal will stand, and I, for one, hope that some of it will not stand. [Laughter and applause.] Now, sir, with these remarks I beg to say that I am in hearty sympathy with the resolution just offered. I believe it is the wisest thing for this committee to ask for further light and to seek the benefit of further criticism at the hands of the presbyteries, but I want the presbyteries to enter upon this work in full possession of all the facts in the case. [Applause.]

The report was accepted, and the motion of Dr. Hays, that it be sent down to the presbyteries for their action and come up to the next General Assembly, prevailed.

Dr. Herrick Johnson read the report of the Committee on Unemployed Ministers, which was accepted and made the second order of the day for Saturday morning.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.

Dr. Francis, of Cincinnati: I wish to present a matter before the Assembly for its consideration for the especial purpose of fixing an order of the day, and at the same time for adjusting a matter which not only must come before this Assembly, but other Assemblies from year to year, so as to avoid the present chaotic state of the Assembly's action in regard to such things:

Be it enacted, That the General Assembly hereafter, in the exercise of its power to disapprove and veto the appointments of Professors in the theological seminaries, shall proceed in the following manner:

First, The time of such action shall be the second regular order of the day for the first Tuesday afternoon of the Assembly's session.

Secondly, When the time for such action shall have arrived the clerk shall read the name of each of the Professors elected and the chair to which he has been elected, and the question shall then be put by the Moderator without amendment and as follows: Will the Assembly disapprove the appointment of — to — chair in — Seminary?

Thirdly, Such question of disapproval shall be debatable as all other motions.

Fourthly, The names of the Professors elected shall be presented in the order of the time of their respective election.

Fifthly, After the submission of the name of each Professor elected and before debate the Committee on Theological Seminaries shall, if they deem best, report anything which in their judgment will direct the Assembly in reaching a wise and intelligent decision.

On motion it was referred to the Standing Committee on Theological Seminaries, to report at their earliest convenience.

The Committee on the Constitution, consisting of the Stated and Permanent Clerk, appointed to supervise the additions to the constitution of the Church, made their report, which was accepted and its recommendations adopted.

E. R. Craven, D. D., of Philadelphia, then read the report of the Committee on German Theological Seminaries, which was accepted as a report of progress, and the recommendations adopted.

Judge Hand, of Scranton, Penn., presented the report of the Committee of Seven appointed by the last Assembly, to whom were referred the report of the special committee on the publishing outfit of the Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work, appointed by the Assembly of 1889, and the report of the Business Committee of the Board.

The report closed with the following recommendation:

First, That for the present it is not expedient to purchase a complete outfit for manufacturing purposes. The Board of Publication is invited, if at any time it may appear to them proper, to consider fully the matter and prepare a complete report with reference to the extent and expenses of the outfit, the cost, its proper place of location, and if in the present building.

Second, The Board of Publication is requested and empowered to make a subdivision of the business management, to put in a manufacturing branch to be placed under the charge of a competent person who shall be held responsible for its proper management, and also to make a publication and distributing branch also in charge of a competent person by whom the book and periodical business of the Board shall be extended.

Third, That the Assembly approves and commends the plan adopted by the Board in July last of competitive bidding and contract letting.

Fourth, That such stock of books, bound or unbound, the sales of which have been superseded by more recent issues, be made into cheap libraries and donated to Sunday-schools or Home Mission stations, with a view to reducing largely the quantity of their material on hand.

Fifth, That the Board be authorized to make a re-inventory of the merchandise and such other property as is included in the capital stock account, with a view to a reduction of the same to a cash basis.

Sixth, That in reporting to the Assembly each year a separate balance sheet be presented of the Missionary Department and the Business Department.

On motion the report was accepted and made the second order for Tuesday afternoon next.

SECOND DAY—AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Committee on a seal for the General Assembly submitted its report, and, on motion, it was made the special order for to-morrow morning at half-past nine o'clock.

The Stated Clerk: The Special Committee on the Publishing Outfit of the Board of Publication which was continued to this present Assembly, desires to be heard.

Elder Simmons, of New Jersey: *Mr. Moderator and Brethren:* The Special Committee on the Publishing Outfit of the Board of Publication, consisting of five business men, all but one practical printers and publishers, was appointed by the Assembly of 1889, to report upon certain matters regarding the Board of Publication to the Assembly of 1890. This Committee made the investigation and submitted its report to the General Assembly last year, as ordered. This report, consisting of two parts, the first giving a statement of facts showing that the Board of Publication was expending annually many thousands of dollars more than was necessary, and the second part of recom-

mentations which, if adopted, it was believed would remedy the evils proven to exist, was received and referred to a committee of seven, who were directed to hear the answer of the business committee to the several matters alleged against their management of the business of the board by the special committee, and consider the whole question and report their finding of facts to the General Assembly of 1891. The Assembly then voted that the special committee on the publishing outfit be continued another year in order to appear before the committee of seven to be appointed by this Assembly. Under these votes the question of the truth of our report having been raised, acting in accordance with the order of the last Assembly, this committee appeared before the committee of seven in November last and submitted to them verbal and documentary evidence to prove the truth of the several statements and matters contained in the first part of our report alleged against the management of the business board by the business committee. After going over the entire charges as made in our report we specially requested the Chairman of the Committee of Seven to call upon us for further proof if there was any item in our report which was not wholly proven to their entire satisfaction, or if any should be denied by the business committee, offering further additional evidence to prove the absolute truth of every statement made by us. As we were not called upon to appear before the new committee again or to furnish any additional evidence, we must conclude that they were entirely satisfied of the truth of the statements made in our report. We offered to the Committee of Seven the evidence in our possession regarding the first of our recommendations concerning the advisability of the purchase of a plant by the Board, but our offer was declined on the ground that there was no difference of opinion upon that point. We did not present to the Committee of Seven any reasons for making the recommendation that we do in the part of our report as upon our proposing to do this they informed us that it was not the time for such reasons and argument. But we understood the chairman of the Committee of Seven to assure us positively that we should be heard upon them fully before they would make up their report or take any action. Altho we have requested this hearing repeatedly, up to the present time we have not been called upon or given any opportunity whatever to present the reasons which led us to make the recommendations we did to the last Assembly, as found in our reports.

All of which is respectfully submitted by the Special Committee on the Publishing Outfit of the Board of Publication.
(Signed) H. E. SIMMONS, Chairman.

On motion the report was accepted, and it was resolved to consider it together with the report of Judge Hand's committee Tuesday afternoon.

Joseph W. Torrance, D.D., of Ripley, O.: *Mr. Moderator:* I desire to present the following resolutions:

- "WHEREAS, Previous General Assemblies have made deliverances against certain forms of worldly amusements, among which are theater going, profane dancing, and card playing, and
 - "WHEREAS, The practice of these amusements, especially the last named, is increasing, and under the popular style of "progressive enquire" prevails to such an extent as to interfere with the spiritual light and progress of the Church and to imperil multitudes of souls, and
 - "WHEREAS, Former Assemblies have passed no law nor is there any deliverance specially applicable to the present situation; therefore
- Resolved,* That a special committee of three, consisting of two ministers and one elder, be appointed to report a paper for adoption by this General Assembly, which shall reaffirm the deliverances of former Assemblies, adding what is needed for our times, and call upon the Church by means of thoughtful and godly living in its members through the pulpit and through its Church associations, to do all that can be scripturally done to free the Church from these practices and their injurious effects."

The resolutions were referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures.

CHURCH UNITY.

The Committee on Church Unity then reported through Dr. Smith. The report closed with the recommendation that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject of Interdenominational Comity, and that the committee be continued to carry on the negotiations with other Churches and report to the next General Assembly.

A motion was made to receive the report and adopt the recommendation, whereupon the following discussion ensued.

George P. Hays, D.D., of Kansas City: I would like to have them taken separately first, the motion to accept the report, and then the motion for adoption.

The Moderator: Dr. Hays asks that the question be divided. Those in favor of accepting the report will vote Aye.

The motion was carried, and the report was accepted.

The Moderator: The question is now on the adoption of the recommendation.

Dr. Hays: I very much doubt whether anybody is less anxious about carrying his motions than I am myself; but there is an amendment to that report which I would like to move and then say a word or two. The first part of the report is to discharge all discussion of the question of Interdenominational Comity. I would like to add: And that the committee be also discharged from the further consideration of the subject of Union with the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. [Applause.]

Elder George Junkin, of Philadelphia: I second that amendment.

Dr. Hays: I do not believe this company of elders are here to discuss the question of the re-ordination or so-called historic episcopate of the pastors whom they meet at the side of the sick and the dying, and from whom they hear the Gospel. I was in the Assembly when that first letter came. I was sorry that when it was lost it was found. It was about the only thing that ever was lost that I was not glad when it was found; but that letter was for a time missing and finally turned up. I wish to speak with all due respect to my brethren of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Some of them are my intimate friends. All of them that I know I have all possible respect for their piety. But let us deal frankly. Personally I do not believe that either denomination is in a position to hope, at this age of the world and at this time, to come into any union. We respect each other highly. They call us laymen. We have not any name for them precisely. [Laughter.] We don't find them in the Bible, and we don't care to look for them anywhere else. [Renewed laughter.] I, with my brother who spoke a year ago on the floor of the General Assembly, am not satisfied with all of their propositions other than the historic episcopate. I am not satisfied with him that the Nicene Creed is a sufficient basis of doctrine. [Applause.] Certain questions were up then and were rightfully settled, pre-eminently the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ. But since that Nicene Creed was adopted other questions have been rightfully settled; and for one I am very much disposed to stay by the Scriptural settlement of them, under the providence of God, to which he has led, mainly, the Presbyterian Church. Now, with saying that I think it is time at least to raise the question; and that is all I do. I have no motive about it that is not open and above-board, and no argument except such as is submitted to your judgment; but for myself, I am in favor of discharging the committee from further consideration of that subject. With reference to the question of federation I have not yet sufficient experience to determine whether there is much in it or not. I want to say one thing, however, with ref-

erence to federation. I say it after having for several years spent some effort in the work of our home mission field in the West, after having been refused by the Foreign Board. I have sent several of my relatives into the foreign field, and now have the sorrow of having had a child refused to be sent to the foreign field. I do not believe that any federation will improve the question of the division of the foreign field and the living of denominations that are not working in the same field. They are not now trenching on each other. In Egypt last year I met nobody but United Presbyterians; in Syria I met nobody but our own denomination; in Constantinople, nobody but the Congregationalists. They have agreed now to a Committee, and therefore, I think we have the perfection in that for the foreign field. And in the home field precisely the same thing is being done. Here and there in the home field—perhaps our own missionaries wouldn't have the impudence to say it, but I have, and not lacking in that, at least—every now and then somebody will write a letter to a paper about a little town with four or five churches in it. It reminds me of a traveler from India telling about how many tigers he had seen and how many Christian converts. He was asked: "What are you out there for?" He replied: "Hunting tigers." Well, converts are not out in the bush where the tigers are to be found. If he had been hunting Christians he could have found them. The trouble is with the churches; and yet, after all, synod after synod never allows a Presbyterian church to go into a town that is of a certain size. In Colorado when I was there, we only put one church into a town of a thousand people, and that was by conference between the Methodist presiding elders, the missionary of the Congregationalists, the missionary of the Baptist church, and our own synodical missionary. Therefore, I have not great hope, but I am willing that the Church shall now hereafter for a season pay considerable to make the experiment. But I think privately, between you and me, that we have expended a great deal more money in trying to get united with the Episcopal Church than the thing is worth. Therefore, my motion simply is this, leaving this Committee—I am not sure that I shall not in the future, I reserve that right, when I have the opportunity to advocate the consolidation of the two on Church comity—I leave to this Committee the question of interdenominational federation—I am not sure that that is the word; but it is the subject—and that they be discharged from consideration of the subject. I want to leave the Church federation in their hands, and to discharge them from all other subjects, and then to continue the Committee under the last resolution to report. Now, Mr. Moderator, I make that motion as an amendment to the report, that at the end of the first resolution where they ask to be discharged from the subject of comity, to add: And be discharged from the further consideration of the subject of Church unity, otherwise than as the subject of Church federation.

The Stated Clerk: And also from the further consideration of the subject of Church unity with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and also from all other subjects except the question of federation with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

Dr. Rice, of San Francisco: *Mr. Moderator and Gentlemen:* I admire the zeal of Dr. Hays for the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. I think I have quite as much zeal for our Church. I have always been a Presbyterian. I am one, and I expect to be one until I die. I always sympathize considerably with his feeling in regard to the high churchism of the Episcopal Church. I think they are altogether too high church, I think they are altogether too high church—let me emphasize that. I think they deserve severe criticism for their course. And yet, sir, I am not prepared to vote to make any distinction in the work of this Committee. I prefer, sir, to let this Committee go forth and do what they can for Church unity and Church federation, and leave the results with God. I believe, sir, that if we are to distinguish it might be necessary to distinguish still further. There are Christians that do not believe, not only do not believe that we are ordained ministers of the Gospel, but that we are not members of the Church. I remember an Episcopal minister that was visiting his Baptist friend; they were college mates, and he was invited to preach on the Sabbath, and he did so, and preached the Gospel beautifully, and his Baptist brother said: "I should be very much delighted to have you further in our service, but it is the Communion to-day, and inasmuch as you have never been immersed I cannot invite you." "Oh, my brother," said the Episcopalian, "don't let that disturb you at all; you have never been ordained, and you have no right to administer the sacrament; we agree perfectly on that matter." So we may find that we will not only have to have the Apostolic succession hands laid on our heads if we are ministers, but we shall have to go under the water if we belong to the Church. So I say, leave all that matter with God. When I was pastor in Norwalk, Ohio, I remember seeing the rector of the Episcopal church come into our Presbyterian church three months every Sunday night, with the minister of the Congregational church and the minister of the Baptist church and the minister of the Methodist church! Five churches united there every Sunday evening in a union service for three months, and the Episcopal minister preached without a gown and prayed without a prayer book. Bishop Bedell heard of it and he wrote the rector a letter. He commended the blessed work that was going on, and commended the rector for joining so heartily in it, and said if he required it he would come and make a special visitation in December, when his time to come was not until the spring. And he did come on and made a special visitation in December, and then we all united in the Episcopal church and listened to the good Bishop's sermon. You remember in 1858, when the Evangelical Alliance met in Berlin, how the good Dean Alford was there, and sat down at the communion table, and a high church bishop heard of it and complained to the good Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote a letter acknowledging the receipt of one of Dean Alford's books, thanking him for it, and referring to this complaint; and he said that he was aware that ecclesiastical gunnery had been very much improved by many inventions, but that he had not learned that a cannon had been invented that could carry a shot across the channel. Now, who knows to what God may lead us? Let us go forward in full faith in the providence of the living God. Now, in regard to the main matter of this report, it seems to me it is a beautiful onward look, and to those of us who have been out in the outskirts of our country, as I have been in California for sixteen years, we would hail with the greatest delight anything that would bind together the Church of God nearer and nearer. I venture to say that in any large city of this nation the saloons can command their forces for a campaign in the city far better than the Church of Christ can command its membership. The world, the flesh and the Devil are united in strong compact. Let us do all that we can to unite the body of Christ, and the Lord God Almighty will lead us on to a glorious victory. [Applause.]

Dr. Proudft: *Mr. Moderator:* This is far too important a subject to let go with nothing further said upon it. I feel that we are in danger of making a grave error here. We allow ourselves to get stumped about little things that happen, and to say and do rash things. Now, sir, none of us are pleased by the attitude of certain persons in the city of New York of late where the hand was held out and the brethren of our Church and some other Churches responded, and then when others called the attention of the Bishop to it they explained that they had only been invited as laymen. I honored the candor of one of the New York ministers who immediately came out and said that he had been invited as a minister, and had accepted as a minister. I think it is high time, sir, that we as Presbyterians let it be understood by the whole world, and especially by the Protestant Episcopal Church that we esteem our ordination as valid as that of any one of them. [Applause.] I believe that we ought to take such a stand here in this Assembly, since this question has been raised, as shall convince th

House of Bishops and the committee appointed by the Protestant Episcopal Church and the whole denomination, and all the churches of that denomination, that we are not weakening at all in the matter of claiming validity for our vows, that we consider our vows just as good as theirs, and a little better. [Applause.] Now, all that being so, what are we going to do about this matter? If it be a settled thing that the Protestant Episcopal Church will not recognize our vows, if it be a settled thing that there is no possibility of coming to an understanding upon that point, if we shall unite with a perfect recognition of our ordination, then it is time to stop. But there are some things, on the other side, Mr. Moderator. Some time ago the Rev. Dr. Hoge, of Richmond—and I will be specific in mentioning names because it will carry greater weight with it, and there was no injunction of secrecy laid upon it—mentioned these facts to me in a personal conversation. He said that the Synod of Virginia met in Staunton, Virginia, some years ago, and he was invited by the rector of the Episcopal Church to conduct his services of the Lord's Day morning. Dr. Hoge paused a moment and he said: "I will preach the sermon and you conduct the service." The minister reflected a moment and then said, "No, I have invited you to conduct the service in my church to-morrow morning in recognition of your position as a minister of the Presbyterian and the Christian Church and you shall conduct the whole service." Now, sir, that is the state of things in certain other places. Which are we to choose, New York or Virginia? If we hold back our hands, if we withdraw, if we say because some men talk this way about our vows, about our ordination, "if we say: "Because some men try to put us in the position of laymen therefore we will have nothing more to do with Church unity," we block the whole thing. What I want to see this Assembly do is to distinctly declare that we are anxious to have a union with the whole Church of Jesus Christ and that we are ready to go forward in the consideration of this subject, but only with this distinct understanding, that we claim to be and we claim recognition for our claim that we are ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ regularly ordained and on a par with any other minister in the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. [Applause.]

Dr. Joseph T. Smith: *Mr. Moderator:* There is not a word about ordination or about re-ordination. If that question were put it would meet the response that it met so heartily here. We are not here to be re-ordained. We don't entertain that question at all, and that question has not been raised in any shape, and if it was that would be at this moment an end at once of all negotiation. Now, what are the facts here? They tell us distinctly that they have no dogmatic article of faith with reference to the three orders of the Christian ministry. They tell us that with them it is simply a question of historic fact. They say that it is a matter of ecclesiastical polity, as the Protestant Episcopal Church has inherited the same. That is what they come and say to us, and as Christian gentlemen and Christian brethren we are obliged to take them at their word. Their Standards do not commit them to any position that would lead on to the consequences that have been suggested here. Their practice is not uniform in any direction. As Dr. Proudft has so well said, there are sections of the Episcopal Church arrayed against other sections. They have no uniform practice among themselves. We all know that a great many offensive things are said, and we all know how irritating they are. Brethren, it is the hardest thing in the world when anything comes that touches our denominational life and our inherited traditions, for us to preserve our Christian comity. Now, the Apostle tells us that we must be courteous. That is a Christian virtue. These brethren came to us three years ago with a certain proposition. That proposition we agreed to entertain. In response to it we have appointed this committee. It does seem to me that what we ought to do is to throw the responsibility of these negotiations falling upon them. We don't want to throw them off and say to them: "We will have nothing more to do with you." We will exercise the greatest possible forbearance, and if the thing comes to an end, let the responsibility rest with them and not with us. [Applause.] And I do hope that the matter will be allowed to rest just as it is, and then if anything in their position compels them to put an end to this thing or to continue a silence with reference to it then we throw the responsibility on them. But I would be very sorry if this Assembly here would take the responsibility in the present state of the case of putting a stop to negotiation. There are reasons—I will not mention them here—that are known to some why there has been the delay and the seeming discourtesy that appears upon the face of it, but whatever this may be, as I say, I would be glad to bear this and let the responsibility when it comes rest upon the other side. Now, let me say one word as to this federation. I do think the great thing that the Church of Christ wants in this land and in this age is to present a united front to the enemies of God. [Applause.] Look out all over the land at our reformatory institutions, look at our benevolent institutions, look at our charitable institutions, look at our Army and Navy. They tell you at once how gladly they would have Christian influences; but they say: "While we have Methodists and Presbyterians and Baptists, we know not whom to choose." Just give us some common basis on which we may all stand and all agree in the representative of that, and then in every hospital, in every almshouse, in every army post throughout the country you can carry a distinctive Christian influence. These Evangelical Alliances do not answer the purpose. They have been tried. They want efficiency. We want something that when one goes into any of these institutions he can go with the Church of God. He can go with the influence of that behind him. You can interest men only when they have that, and they are efficient only when they do have it, and I do think that a federation like this that would make the Church of God appear one in the great things that pertain to the Kingdom would do more to advance the interests of our common Christianity and the welfare of humanity than any single thing that we can do. [Applause.]

Dr. Hays: It will be remembered that I did not antagonize the question of Church federation. It will be remembered also that this Committee has, in the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church, if I understood the Stated Clerk correctly.

I wanted to change the form of that. The question of unity with one denomination I wanted to change to the broader question which Dr. Smith has referred to—the federation with all denominations that can unite in federation. That is all my motion contemplated, that it shall be changed from a response to a particular denomination to the subject of Church federation with all denominations, the Episcopal Church or any other Church, provided after conference with them they find such federation possible. I do not wish to speak further, because every Commissioner knows as well as I do what we are at.

Elder George Junkin, of Philadelphia: *Mr. Moderator and Brethren of this Assembly:* I want to say a word on this subject. I am perfectly willing for one to unite with every Christian Church in the land in presenting but one army of the living God against the common enemy; but when I go forth to meet that common enemy I want each regiment that composes that grand army to be recognized as a distinct regiment in the one army of God's elect. [Applause.] Brethren, I would prefer that you would not clap or cheer. If I can influence your judgment I don't care much about your hands or your feet. I think all this applause is not becoming in the House of God—but that is by the way. If the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States will come to this General Assembly and say to us: "We recognize you as one of the regiments of this great army, we recognize your ministry, and that you have a right to celebrate the Lord's Supper and to administer the rite of baptism," then I will give them the right hand of fellowship, and will join with them in any efforts to present this undivided front. But I have yet to learn that the Prot-

stant Episcopal Church stands upon that platform. They have assumed that they are the Church of the United States of America, and they have, with an authority that they think they have the right to exercise, sent out this invitation and asked all Churches to come into their fold. And it means that, brethren, and it means in my judgment nothing more. It is true that there are differences of practice in the United States. There was a time in the Southern part of our country when they did interchange pulpits; and I have known of Presbyterian Synods being invited to take part and to preach in Episcopal pulpits; and I rejoice in the fact. But, as I am informed, that practice has fallen into desuetude. The instance that has been given here was one. I have an instance that comes nearer home to me than that. I know of a young girl in one of our churches, in my own city that wanted to unite with the Presbyterian Church, and she went to the rector of the Episcopal Church and asked for a letter of dismissal, and he reasoned with her and tried to persuade her by one argument after another, until he finally told her, "I cannot give you the recommendation, because the Presbyterian Church is not a Church of Christ authorized to administer these rites, and you are taking the first step in the downward ecclesiastical career." Now, you may say that is exceptional. Brethren, I think it is the rule and not the exception. My brother that was upon the platform a moment ago from California, and who spoke of having the love feast out in Newark, O., why, were the brethren that took part in that love feast invited to go into the pulpits of the Episcopal Church and preach? Or was it the coming out of the Episcopal rector into the wilderness of Presbyterianism and there doing missionary work? [Laughter and applause.] Is not that the ground upon which they put it? Is it right enough for them to come and preach in our pulpits and help us to that sort of work; but I want to know the instance where, as a rule, the Episcopal rector has come into the Presbyterian Church, and said: "Come preach the Gospel here to my people." They have listened to me for a long time, and sometimes it is a good thing for to have a change of voice and of person." Do they do that? Do they recognize that the ministers of our Church have a right to administer the rite of baptism, that they have the right to celebrate the Lord's Supper, and the right to ordain men and send them forth to preach the everlasting Gospel? My dear brother Dr. Smith, if they will come to you and tell you, "We will recognize your Church as a Church of the living God, standing upon the same platform that we stand upon"; not putting it off and postponing it month after month on a variety of circumstances, and saying, "We are historical episcopates," and all that sort of thing; but let them come right square out and say, "Yes, we recognize the Presbyterian Church as a Church of Christ"; then I will say, Let us unite with them shoulder to shoulder, and keep step with them as we march against the common enemy. Now, don't let us be carried away by the thought that oh, we must not do anything that is unbrotherly or unkind. I agree to that. But are we not to have some degree of self-respect for ourselves? If they will recognize us as brethren in Christ—not (as they will) as private individuals, as laymen—but if they will recognize us as having the same authority that Jesus Christ gave to them, to go forth and convert the world, then I say, Yes, let us unite. But, brethren, it does seem to me that we are merely dallying with this question. They never mean, in my judgment, to recognize you as being a Church of Christ; and what they mean by union is for this great Presbyterian Church to try to squeeze itself into the little historical Church called the Episcopal Church in the United States. [Laughter.] We are only representatives of one branch of Christ's Church. There is the Methodist Church, there is the Baptist Church, there is the Congregational Church. The Episcopal Church does not recognize one of them as being its equal. It treats them all the same way, and I recognize the force of that old story that my brother from California told us so well in regard to the difference between these two classes of churches, and it has a great deal of power. But the difference in favor of a Baptist is that he does recognize us to some extent as a Christian Church, and he will invite our ministers there to preach the Gospel, altho he may not go quite so far as we think he ought to. Now, brethren, I think as the Presbyterian Church in these United States who has done more good and glorious work in carrying on the Gospel of Christ in this land than any other Church—I won't lower my standard even to the Methodist Church, we have been the great educators in this land of ours, we have been the great promoters of religious thought and of religious freedom, and for one hundred years we have maintained that banner high as it ought to be held up—and I do not propose for one, and there is no exercise of pride in this, that we shall lower that banner and let any Church say to us "You have no right to administer the ordinances of God." The Almighty himself has set his seal upon this Church in the past one hundred years, and we have a right to say to this Episcopal Church: "Treat us as Christians and then we will meet you. As long as you treat us you treat us as inferiors we must wrap around us the garments of our Saviour's righteousness and say you have not the right to treat us thus." These are the principles that I maintain, and these are the thoughts that actuated me when I seconded Dr. Hays's motion that we finally give up this dallying with this question. But if this committee is to be continued, let them put the question right fair and square to this Church: "Do you mean to treat us as a Church of Christ?" And if they cannot in one month—in one week—answer that question, then very well, say to them: "The world is wide enough, the field is the world, there is plenty of work for us both to do; you are a Christian Church, the historic episcopate Church; we recognize you as such; we know that with your for as you will reach a class of people that the Presbyterian Church cannot reach; go forward in your lines and God bless you." We will say that from the very bottom of our hearts. "But our work lies in a different direction, and we will do our work there, and when the time comes that your Church shall be called up to the General Assembly of the first born, and our Church shall be called up, may we both hear from the lips of that Master in whom we both believe those glorious words: 'Well done, good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joys of your Lord.'" I shall support Dr. Hays's amendment.

Dr. S. C. Logan: It does seem to me that there is danger of exaggerating this recognition. The brethren evidently mean the same thing, but they do not speak the same thing. The point in my mind is this: That the Protestant Episcopal Church has recognized the Presbyterian Church in every proposition upon which this Committee has been appointed. They do not want to unite with a people that are not Christians. They are not seeking for an organic union with those that are outside of the covenants of promise. They do recognize the Church. And, whilst there are these very things which grate so harshly upon us all, it does seem to me that it would be a very clear ending of the thing that we should have one or two years of investigation discover that actually we have no right to treat with them on the subject of Church union. For they have no right to invite a treaty on Church union with a people they do not recognize as a part of the Church of Christ. We have no right to consider for a moment the question of union with a people that deny that we are of the Church of Christ. Let us not press this question, then, too far. The habit of church life is one thing. The actual character of the Church is a very different thing. They are Protestant Christians organized for a particular kind of work in the Church, in the whole Protestant Church, and they may have particular shibboleths that they may find necessary for their efficiency and they may press those until they become offensive symbols and to other Churches just as good as they are; but, nevertheless, let us not fight against that grand idea that is set forth in the prayer of the Lord Jesus Christ that his Church

shall be one. Why, we are looking for the fulfillment of God's promise before we shall find where there is but the one fold and the one shepherd, when all the people of God shall be so instructed and so enter into communion with God that they shall see eye to eye, and shall together sing the praises of the one Lord and Saviour. Now, there is a great deal in this progress toward a Church union which will be found uncomfortable. Whenever we undertake to put on the armor of any other person, we will find places where it will rub us, sometimes make us sore if we attempt to make it fit us; and this is just one such case. I am ready to make all patient efforts to teach these brethren then, if they really think we need to be ordained again. I am perfectly willing to wait until they shall have thought themselves true on that subject. I do know that they unite with us in some kinds of service, and they have a peculiar way of uniting. [Laughter.] I have been united with them in funeral services. I don't know how. It was a streak of lean and a streak of fat; there was no mingling particularly between the two lines. Nevertheless, the great body of the Christian people in the community recognized both the rector and myself as being preachers, and doing the thing well [laughter]; and after the funeral was over, we had a good time. [Renewed laughter.] Now, if they enjoy that sort of thing, I say we can go along with it patiently, and we will have in the end of the days—I hope it will be before the end of my brother's days—we will not have to shake hands through a crack in order to get hold of the real heart of God's children in the episcopacy but shall be able to put our arms about them in the broad daylight and everybody understand it. The same is true with the Baptist brethren. They are softening down. That is perfectly plain. All we want is patience in this matter, and I am perfectly sure that a great body of them see the absurdity of claiming that the ministers of the Presbyterian Church or of the Baptist Church have not an ordination from God. I am sure of that. Let us, therefore, go forward if we can make this a Church unity movement in the way of federation. Don't let us do or say anything that will put the Episcopal brethren further away or shall interfere with them. Our dignity does not need any protection. We can stand historically. We are not ashamed of it. While we would be perfectly willing that all Episcopal rectors and bishops and deacons in the United States shall stand upon the capitol and proclaim with their trumpets that we are not ordained, who will they convince? The Lord won't curse us if we say nothing. And let them stick to it to the end. If this committee can do anything toward bringing these hosts of God's servants more shoulder to shoulder in the work of redeeming the world unto Jesus Christ, I say let us keep them at it and stand by them to the end. [Applause.]

The Rev. William A. Bartlett, D.D., Washington, D. C.: I just rise to call attention to what seems to me rather an important fact that Dr. Hays suggested. I would not mar the suggestions of Dr. Smith, the chairman of this committee; but I broaden instead of having it associated simply with the Episcopal Church; I would put in all the Churches, and have it meet fairly the Episcopal letter. They tell us that they have written this same kind of a letter to all Churches; and I would prepare a letter of Christian comity that should match that letter, and let it go forth to all Churches. And it seems to me that would adopt the better part of both these suggestions. I think there is a very large matter under this that ought not to be turned off flippantly. It is an interpretation of the spirit of the age. The denominations are vastly nearer together than everybody admits, and this is a reach of the Episcopal Church through its bars and fetters for communion and union with us. We do not see exactly how we are to get together; but we can keep reaching and preaching, and some bright morning we will wake up and we will be out of jail, all of us. I do not suppose that anybody imagines that the Episcopal wolf, because it has opened its mouth at the Presbyterian lamb, will walk in and lie down; and I don't imagine that anybody will want to make any other man's prayer if he is intelligent enough to make one of his own; and I don't imagine, either, that anybody will want an ordination that has come from the Apostle Paul when he can get one from the Holy Ghost which is better. And these two suggestions seem to me to settle the whole Episcopal difficulty. The trouble is with them. They are struggling to get free from what to-day are absurdities. They want to find out somehow to let themselves free from the fact that they claim to be better ordained for God's work than the Holy Ghost can ordain a man to-day. Unless God has adjourned, unless he has ceased to live, there must be the same quality of ordination to-day that there was in the Apostolic days. I think God is alive, and I think he ordains now. So that question is not debatable. The question of the liturgy is a question of intelligence. That will settle itself. It is a kind of baby jumper that is used in certain stages of the Church's progress, when it is young and has the measles and cannot stand alone. [Laughter.] But those questions out of the way, I wish to give my strongest adherence to the general purport and tendency of this thing. I think our good Chairman of this Committee is the very impersonation of the kind of a spirit that we ferocious Presbyterians want to put in front. We want to put our gloved hand out, our mild and softened St. John, who has all the sweet qualities of grace, put out in such kindly attitude that he would fascinate these Episcopals to lay aside their peculiarities, if anybody would. [Laughter and applause.] And the great question to me—it is in the spirit of the age—I had once in the city of Brooklyn, a great many years ago when I was a pastor there on a Sabbath afternoon I joined with all of the Protestant brethren of the city at union communion in an Episcopal Church, and every one in the city united in that. I administered at the Episcopal Altar, excepting our Baptist brethren, and they were busy that afternoon and couldn't come. [Laughter.] Within two years I was invited out from the city of Washington into Virginia to assist at a wedding, where I performed the larger part of the marriage service according to the Episcopal form, and, as the Episcopal brother had been so courteous as to invite me into his church and give me this opportunity, he assisting at the service, he did not urge it, but he suggested that I should put on his white robe. I told him I was not in the habit of wearing those robes at that time of day. [Prolonged laughter.] But, still, anything for Christian comity. [Renewed laughter.] And, seriously, brethren, it is a reach in the right direction. The truth about it is that the Christian heart at this day has run far in advance of the Christian head. We have got to revise and reform our aged and infirm and tottering statutes and bring them down to the youth of the Holy Ghost, who is always young, and the spirit of the day, which is Christ's Spirit, which is conquering the world. The great army is going together, and cannot much longer be kept apart. It is a step in the right direction, and let us send it off with a rush. Send these brethren and say that the Presbyterian Church is warm for anything that does not compromise its history, is for anything that will advance the Kingdom of Jesus Christ whatever becomes of any Church. [Applause.]

The Moderator: The Stated Clerk will read the amendments.

The amendment offered by Dr. Hays was then read as follows:

That the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subjects of inter-denominational comity and Church unity, and that the name of the Committee shall hereafter be the Committee on the Federation of the Protestant Denominations of the United States.

The discussion being ended, the question was taken on the motion as amended, that the Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subjects of inter-denominational comity and Church unity, and that the name of the Committee shall hereafter be the Committee

on the Federation of the Protestant Denominations of the United States, and by a rising vote this was adopted, yeas 240, nays 186. The Committee consists of the Rev. Drs. Joseph T. Smith, Geo. P. Hays and H. H. Rice, and Elders S. M. Breckenridge and John C. Tucker.

On Friday evening a popular meeting was held in the interest of the Board of Publication and Sabbath-school Work.

Saturday morning was taken up with the Board of Relief, the seal of the Assembly, and a few minor matters. So great was the interest in the afternoon excursion to Ann Arbor that many of the Commissioners left the Assembly before the hour of adjournment. Overtures relating to the teaching of Dr. Briggs in Union Seminary, had been received from seventy-nine of the 216 Presbyteries, and they were referred to the Standing Committee on Theological Seminaries without being read and without any discussion. President Patton, of Princeton University, is chairman of that committee. His associates are: Wm. McKibbin, D.D.; Jas. T. Lapsley, D.D.; Samuel Bowden, D.D.; John D. Hewett, D.D.; J. K. Wright; Thomas R. Beeber; Marcus A. Brownson; Elders Hon. S. M. Breckenridge, Samuel F. McDwitt, E. W. C. Humphrey, D.D.; Robert C. Totten, Philip Doremus, Maxwell Frick, and Robert McConaughy, M.D.

On Sunday commissioners to the General Assembly filled the prominent pulpits of the city. The feature of the day was a meeting under the auspices of the Assembly Sabbath Committee at which Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, spoke at length on the question of the opening of the gates of the Exposition on Sunday. He said that the American Sunday has been our glory and our joy, and American citizenship ought to blush if it is not willing to exhibit its own goods. He stated that he had just received a petition from China against the opening of the gates. China itself out of respect for the Western nations had adopted an order closing its offices on Sunday. A resolution embodying the points made by Dr. Johnson was adopted by a rising vote.

MONDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

[By Telegraph to THE INDEPENDENT.]

DETROIT, MICH., May 25th, 1891.

President Patton summoned his Committee on Theological Seminaries this morning to take up the reports of the several institutions together with the overtures relating to the Union Theological Seminary. The paper presented by Dr. Francis, of Cincinnati, last week, was considered first. Dr. Patton asked that the report of his committee be made the special order of the day for Thursday morning.

In the meantime the regular work of the Assembly will go on.

Prof. Herrick Johnson labored faithfully this morning to have the Assembly adopt his report on vacant churches and unemployed ministers; but the recommendations are to be referred to a special committee to report on their constitutionality.

Dr. Erskine presented a report commending the Freedmen's Board, but this goes over as unfinished business along with Dr. McCook's serpent on the seal.

THE BAPTIST ANNIVERSARIES.

THE Baptist churches of the Northern States, having met in Chicago last year, are gathering this year in Cincinnati, to renew and strengthen their fellowship, hear the reports of their various organizations, and make plans for another year of aggressive work.

Their program is a full one, the youngest of the societies, the Educational Society, has already held its annual meeting with the Southern brethren at Birmingham, Ala. First comes the home work, as the basis of all, then the Publication Society, and last, the foreign work—the crown of the churches. It is, perhaps, significant of the change that is coming over Church work in this land that the first meeting is that of the Woman's Home Missionary Society, while the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society occupies with its anniversary the last day of the meetings. There are no doctrinal questions to overshadow the gatherings, and the whole strength will be given to the discussion of the practical management of the great interests committed to their care.

Sunday, May 17th, was a gathering day. The Baptist churches were filled to hear earnest preachers draw inspiration from the great themes of the Gospel, and to gain a foretaste of the good things of the week from many of the ladies who were to take part in the Home Missionary Meetings. A Sunday school mass meeting was held in the Mount Auburn Church, and ladies' missionary mass meetings in a number of the churches.

WOMAN'S BAPTIST HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

This Society met for its fourteenth annual meeting in the Ninth Street Baptist Church on Monday morning. Mrs. J. N. Crouse, who has been president for the whole fourteen years, was in the chair and conducted the exercises most efficiently. After the devotional services a conference of mission workers was held, Mrs. J. P. Morse giving an interesting account of her work in Louisiana. Miss Jennie Peck told of the work in Texas, where women who could not read but could pray had gone into the work, and at least 1,800 young people had been brought into the Sunday-schools. The afternoon session was taken up with the annual report, according to which the total number of auxiliaries is 2,363, an increase of 338 over last year. Receipts from all sources were \$57,085.43, the expenditures, \$48,360.11, leaving a balance on hand of \$8,725.32. Branches and bands numbering 2,363 members have been established in thirty States and Territories, with 312 District Associations, 231 Associational Directors, 1,927 adult branch societies, 536 mission bands, and besides there have been established 57 mission stations with 78 missionaries. In the conditional trust fund there has been received from donations \$7,097.50, of which \$7,500 has been invested in securities, and they now have as holdings real estate and personal property valued at \$31,835.34.

The Independent.

Entered at the Post-office at New York, as Second-class Mail Matter.

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN, BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XLIII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1891.

NUMBER 2218.

The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 10.

BEFORE THE BLOSSOM.

BY ROBERT UNDERWOOD JOHNSON.

In the tassel time of spring
Love's the only song to sing;
Ere the ranks of solid shade
Hide the bluebird's flitting wing,
While in open forest glade
No mysterious sound or thing
Haunt of green has found or made,
Love's the only song to sing.

Tho in May each bush be dressed
Like a bride, and every nest
Learn Love's joyous repetend,
Yet the half-told tale is best
At the budding,—with its end
Much too secret to be guessed,
And its fancies that attend
April's passion unexpressed.

Love and Nature communing
Gave us Arcady. Still ring—
Vales across and groves among—
Wistful memories, echoing
Pan's far-off and fluty song.
Poet! nothing harsher sing;
Be, like Love and Nature, young
In the tassel-time of spring.

NEW YORK CITY.

APPLE BLOOM.

BY DANSKE DANDRIDGE.

Ah, yes! How lovely youth and beauty are!
She lay along the low, recumbent limb
Of the old apple tree; her light guitar
She fingered when she sang, in girlish whim,
Green-ribboned, on her bosom rose and fell.
Her gown was palest green, and that was well.
The light, with half a glory, half a gloom,
Flickered and filtered through the apple bloom.
Her cheek was like the apple-bloom in tint
And softly rounded contour; just a hint
Of rosy flush. Her wealth of waving hair
Fell to the ground and made a radiance there.
Fresh fancies, light and gay as butterflies,
Fluttered and frolicked in her sunny eyes.
Against the trunk she braced her dainty feet,
And she was sweet as the young spring is sweet.

ROSE BRAKE, W. VA.

THE WITCH.

BY EPIPHANIUS WILSON.

THERE is a witch in yonder wood.
She waved a fiery wand one day,
And lo! upon the withered spray
Red bud and golden tassel flashed;
With patches green the sod was splashed;
The wild bird sang his sunniest lay;
Smooth over stones the brown brook dashed.
There is a witch in yonder wood.

I longed to see her, where she stood;
I wis she must be wondrous fair;
I thought I saw her threaded hair
At dawn beneath the birches shine,
For, with their silver, limbs divine
Were blending, and a forehead rare
With mist and twinkling leaves was twined;
But, ah! I lost her in the wood.

I wonder in the summer wood
Whether upon the morning mist
She float, in veil of amethyst,
Or better love the setting sun
Gray mantled like a holy nun.
With hand untouched, with cheek un-kissed
A lovely huntress does she run
The wildering circuits of the wood?

And now I hear her in the wood;
I hear her, and my heart is rent
By the wild note of her lament;
It comes on autumn's wind so clear
To me the world's own end is near;
Life leaves my cheek, my hope is spent;
It stabs my very soul to hear
The weeping witch in yonder wood.

Why dost thou weep in yonder wood?
Is it because thy love is dead,
And thou art seated at his head,
With white face straining to the sky?
Is it for grief that those must die?
Or, that the summer flowers are fled?
Tell me the secret of thy cry,
Wild witch that weepest in the wood!

Silence is sweet, and death is good;
For dying is more sad than death,
And she no longer draws her breath,
No longer shines on leaf and lea;
Gray is the turf and stript the tree—
She lies the whimpled snows beneath,
She's gone without a word to me,
The witch that lived in yonder wood.

NEW YORK CITY.

WHY SHOULD NOT THE INDIANS ENLIST?

BY ELAINE GOODALE.

I AM told that an effort is now being made to enlist the young Sioux in our regular army. I am ignorant of the inducements which may be offered them, nor do I know what success is to be looked for in obtaining Indian recruits; but I am moved to present certain reasons why such success is not desirable.

The arguments in favor of this significant step in our Indian policy are sufficiently obvious, and have been publicly stated with an air of great plausibility. It is said that Indians are born fighters, that the profession of war is the only one to which they have been already trained and for which they are peculiarly fitted. To this I reply that "man is a fighting animal." The savage passion is deeper than mere *Indian* nature, and has its roots far down in our common *human* nature. The question is not whether it is natural to hate and destroy our fellow-creatures, but whether such acts are in accordance with an enlightened Christian civilization. Is it for the highest good of the Indian that his primitive, fierce instincts be systematically developed and rewarded? or should those nobler qualities which are doubtless called into exercise by war—courage, endurance, keenness of observation and skill in maneuvering—be devoted to a more worthy and inspiring end?

It is praise of a certain kind, to declare that the Indian would make a magnificent soldier. It is almost the same thing to say that he possesses all the qualities necessary to an accomplished murderer. His daring is splendid, his coolness unrivaled, his sagacity equal to either. But is it not equally true, and a less equivocal compliment, to affirm that these admirable traits would be as effectively and much more wisely exercised in a profession whose object it is "to save life instead of destroying it?" The finest characteristics of the native American are fine enough to win recognition in a higher calling than that of arms.

The other argument, acceptably advanced in support of this new undertaking is the rather weak one that it will presumably attract the more restless and turbulent young men, and by withdrawing this element from the Indian Agencies reduce the chances of another "outbreak." This is the same excuse that was produced in view of the spectacle of our prisoners of war being placed on exhibition in Europe by "Buffalo Bill." My reply is twofold. In the first place, the existence of a body of young Sioux burning to distinguish themselves upon the warpath was not, in my opinion, the cause of the recent trouble, nor does it hold the menace of future difficulty. A sufficient degree of hunger, accompanied by acts of patent injustice, will create discontent, disturbance and perhaps rioting among any class of our population. The events of last winter, so far from indicating that the Sioux are anxious to fight, proved their determination not to do so except as a last desperate resort. Secondly, this expedient is not one of which we can be very proud, even if any expedient were needed, beyond such action as is dictated by common justice and common sense. In the opinion of many of the Indians themselves, it is a cowardly and dishonorable thing to cripple an enemy already hopelessly at a disadvantage by hiring or attempting to hire the flower of its youth to desert its ranks. "If we were as strong as you, and you as weak as we are," said an old Indian to me, "we would not hire away your young men and bribe them to betray their people!" It would

do us no harm if we could occasionally hear ourselves discussed by those whom we affect to despise.

I believe, in a word, that we need not be afraid of the Sioux if we will treat them fairly, and, further, that the army is not the only nor the highest calling to which they may aspire. Why should not the Indians enlist? Because they can do a great deal better. Their youths will be better employed as stock-raisers, in the trades, in school and college, than as privates in our regular army. What is the character of the ordinary private soldier? A fair-minded and thoughtful man said to me recently, "He is the scum of our cities!" Did I not myself shrink from the brute and the sensualist in the faces of many at Pine Ridge last winter? Do I not know something of the moral degradation which inevitably results from the presence of troops at or near an Indian Agency, and which was observable even in the short time during which they were quartered upon us last winter? If our Indian young men are constantly exposed to these associations and influences, the result will be—not a Christian manhood, but one that is vicious and low.

The occupation of the soldiers in time of war is—legalized murder. In time of peace, it is largely enforced idleness. Idleness begets gambling, drinking, and kindred evils. The absence of women lowers the morals of the man. If Indians who have wives enlist and are ordered to a distant post, the women at home as well are subjected to danger and temptation—and nearly all adult Indians are married. There is another objection which may be regarded as serious. If a regiment of Sioux were formed, and stationed, as it very probably would be, in Texas, or the Indian Territory, or some wild, enervating climate, the change would doubtless be fatal to a large number. There are few things these Indians dread more than a change of climate—and with good reason.

A few days since I had occasion to speak of the Spartan training of Indian youth in the old days of aboriginal purity, and of its admirable results in developing self-reliance, self-possession, endurance, habits of accurate observation and laconic speech. "What!" exclaimed a friend, "would you call it fine to educate the young to a life of crime?" "And what," I replied, "would you call the training of a cadet at West Point?" We must learn to judge ourselves by the same standards as those by which we measure others. It is quite possible to admire the manly traits of the brave soldier, in a uniform of blue cloth or one of paint, and still to regret that mankind has not yet found a better way of settling its quarrels than by brute passion and brute force.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.

ENGLISH NOTES.

BY JAMES PAYN.

It is curious that the contention between Professor Momerie and the Bishop of London respecting "Seriousness and Smiles," should not have received more generous notice. Perhaps those divines who use the gift of humor do not wish to call attention to it; but they are certainly not a few, including the late Archbishop of York and Mr. Spurgeon. The Bishop of London told the Professor quite gravely that "when a man commissioned by God to preach to his fellow-sinners, tells good stories, disgrace is brought upon religion and the Church." And again: "You are undoubtedly one of the ablest men we've got; but if you persist in telling good stories you will ruin your career." The Bishop, no doubt, meant telling them in sermons, since it seems hard indeed that a man should be precluded from agreeable conversation because he is a clergyman. A greater man, and almost as serious a one, as his lordship, has put the case even more strongly:

"Tis pitiful
To court a grin when you should woo a soul;
To break a jest when pity should inspire
Pathetic exhortations; and to address
The skittish fancy with facetious tales,
When sent with God's commission to the heart.
So did not Paul."

Still the man who wrote those noble lines was a life-long victim to melancholy, and died melancholy mad; and it is certain that the early fathers of the English Church thought it no sin to sprinkle their most serious discourses with the salt of humor. The great Domini-

Religious Intelligence.

THE PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SECOND WEEK.

REPORT ON THE BRIGGS CASE.

A GREAT DISCUSSION.

THE ASSEMBLY VOTES TO DISAPPROVE.

ACTION ON VARIOUS REPORTS.

STORY OF THE ASSEMBLY.

BY GEORGE P. HAYS, D.D.

The telegraph and the daily papers will have brought to your readers the account of the vote in the famous Briggs case. It is matter for congratulation that the final vote was so overwhelmingly on one side, for this disposes of all talk about a division in the Church. Whatever may be true of the Church, after two days of discussion in the Assembly, the Assembly finally came to be of one mind. Several efforts have been made to determine, if possible, the number of the real Briggs men who are in the Assembly. The final vote was not a test of that question, for many voted in the negative to make up the fifty-nine who were not in favor of Briggs, but were unwilling to take immediate action. The best information available is that those who would have been ready to approve of his entering upon the duties of his professorship would not number more than twenty, or at the most twenty-five men. He may be inoculating the Church with his notions, but the infection has not yet sufficiently reached the members to indicate itself in the election of Commissioners to the General Assembly.

It was not a question whether the General Assembly should approve of Dr. Briggs's election to this professorship. The only question was, in what mode should they disapprove of it. At one time it looked almost certain that the method of disapproval would be that indicated by the proposition of Dr. Worcester, of Chicago. This was that the Assembly should ask that he be relieved from the work of his professorship until the Assembly should finally decide the matter, and that in the meantime a committee should be appointed to confer with the directors of Union Theological Seminary, and represent the views of the Assembly in that conference, and that the Assembly reserve the right of final action until this committee of conference should report to the next Assembly. So likely did it appear that this resolution would pass if the Assembly were allowed to vote upon it, that even members of the committee, making the original report, were disposed to ask that the whole subject should be referred to them again in order that some mode of incorporating Dr. Worcester's proposition into their report should be found and reported to the Assembly. If this had been adopted it would have been utterly unfair to the Assembly to do as some of the daily papers here have done—represent that action as an action taken under the leadership of Dr. Briggs's friends, and meaning a partial sympathy of the Assembly for him and his theories. The only question ever up before the General Assembly, was the single one of how to do the thing in the kindest way to the Church first, and then to the directors of Union Theological Seminary.

One thing played a specially conspicuous part in leading up to the final decision. The insinuation that ministers and intelligent elders of the Presbyterian Church have not read Dr. Briggs was shown to be wholly without foundation. His book, "Whither?" was accepted by the whole Church as a somewhat audacious bid for the leadership in a new departure in a biblical and theological movement. It was understood to be specifically aimed at Princeton Theological Seminary, and to be an effort to have whatever revision movement was abroad in the Church taken in charge of and managed by those who differed from Princeton Seminary. Numerous articles in the same line followed in the various religious reviews of the country. When the revision Assembly convened last year it was discovered that there were three parties in that Assembly—anti-revisionists, conservative revisionists and radical revisionists. The second of these two parties was probably in a majority of the whole Assembly, even if the two extremes had combined themselves into one house. Dr. Briggs had not been elected to that General Assembly. When that General Assembly by a committee representing every Synod elected this revision committee Dr. Briggs's name was not found in the list, nor the name of any other man known to be specially in sympathy with his views. As time wore on, by various little leakages the fact reached the Church that the committee would report a revision which would just about fairly represent the wishes of the conservative revisionists. Dr. Briggs's in-

augural seemed like the defiant challenge of an impatient knight demanding attention. Then the anvil chorus began and was characterized by a great deal of not unnatural impatience throughout the presbyteries. The delegates elected to this General Assembly read up on this subject. They read the syllabus and the inaugural, with all the prefixes and suffixes. Many of them specially read up the book on Biblical Study. They also read the articles of Dr. Morris, of Lane Seminary; Dr. Shedd, of Union Seminary; Dr. Green, of Princeton Seminary; and various newspaper articles and anonymous criticisms. They came to the Assembly, therefore, with their minds made up with remarkable definiteness; and when a Presbyterian General Assembly comes together representing the mind of the Church, made up through patient study and careful survey of the whole field, it is a very difficult matter to change that opinion. It was not an opinion, as was frequently said in the Assembly, manufactured by the newspapers, or made up in haste, or limited to the syllabus, or formulated by emotion, or shaped by passion. It was a painstaking but deliberate opinion of the members and the presbyteries. Nearly one-third of the presbyteries of the Church had sent up papers, and probably as many more who had not taken formal action had elected delegates because that in the presbyteries or elsewhere they had indicated their very definite opinion.

Undoubtedly there was much disappointment felt at the absence of Dr. Briggs from the Assembly. When their Presbytery elected Dr. Green and Dr. Patton and it was understood that they would come, and when the New York Presbytery elected Dr. Briggs, Dr. Parkhurst and Mr. Day, it was taken for granted that all this simply meant a pitched battle. Both sides had picked their champions and everybody expected to see a struggle of the giants. When the members came together and found that neither Dr. Briggs nor Mr. Day would be present, and that Dr. Parkhurst would not reach the Assembly till late in the session, the unanimous feeling was that this was a confession of failure and an unconditional surrender before the struggle came on. It was Waterloo wrong end foremost, flight before fight. There never was the faintest chance in the world of any other result than an explicit condemnation of Dr. Briggs from this time onward. The only possible hope he had of even having a respectable following to go out of the Church was to come to the Assembly and, sick or well, stand up for his principles.

The whole of the Church and the world ought distinctly to understand that there was no angry feeling in the Assembly. There was not only an entire absence of a manifestation of bitterness, but there was the best possible evidence that there was no bitterness in the minds, whatever might be the fixedness of purpose in the will, of the members. Men were earnest in their utterances, but there were no personalities, and no unkind allusions or insinuations. There was really but one speech made which looked toward a desire to have the Assembly approve of Dr. Briggs's election. This was made by Prof. H. P. Smith, of Lane Seminary, Cincinnati. The wide-spread expression was that this speech, instead of helping Dr. Briggs's case, really did his cause great harm. If the Assembly could have had brought before it in a legitimate way the question of approving or disapproving of Professor Smith as a teacher in a Theological Seminary, it is absolutely certain that on the basis of that speech, and especially on that part of it touching the Middle State, the Assembly would have advised his withdrawal from the teaching force of any of our theological institutions. The papers read before the Cincinnati Ministers' Association, by Professor Smith and Professor Evans, of Lane, and published by them as a joint pamphlet, has awakened throughout the Church widespread concern regarding their teaching in that institution. Both of these brethren are in the highest sense elegant, devout and reverent Christian gentlemen. The Church at large, however, does not hold the views they express in their pamphlet, and many of their friends, while loving them as men, energetically object to their doctrines. The fact that Professor Smith made the opening speech against the report of the Committee disapproving of Dr. Briggs, had a good deal to do with the energy and determination with which Dr. Briggs was disapproved of at this time. It may have been somewhat unfair to Dr. Briggs, but this was the only method open to the Assembly to disapprove of Dr. Smith. The speech of Dr. Dickey, of Philadelphia, made a profound impression on the Assembly by its ability and most admirable spirit, and elicited for the members of the Board of Directors of Union Seminary the kindest feeling in the embarrassing position in which they were placed. It must be remembered that he was elected to this chair of Biblical Theology before the inaugural was delivered, or any of the other later irritating, offensive, unwise and excessively dogmatic utterances were issued to the public. They did not know and could not suppose that he would make such a fool of himself as this later record. On the other side of the discussion no speech deserves wider circulation than that made by Dr. Bartlett, of Washington City. His resentment is felt by the whole Church against the insinuation of Dr. Briggs and his apologists, that nobody knows anything but the higher critics. Dr. Bartlett's illustration of the theory about Moses and the

Pentateuch and the similar conclusions supposed to be reached about Homer should get into the public proverbial philosophy. He says: They have now incontrovertibly demonstrated that the Iliad was not written by Homer, but by another man of the name of Homer." He uttered simple, ordinary history when he said that the Church had not been hunting Dr. Briggs, but Dr. Briggs had been pursuing and dogging the Church; and that surely the Church sometimes should have the right to defend itself. Dr. Patton's argument in behalf of his report was clear and incisive. Elder Junkin, of Philadelphia, suggested that the question was not whether they should deprive Dr. Briggs of a Professorship, but whether being Professor-elect the General Assembly should complete his elevation to the Professorship by approving of the election. This was really adopted by the Assembly, and should be used in the interpretation of the vote. Dr. McKibbin, of Cincinnati, probably turned the tide, which was setting strongly in favor of the Worcester method, when he called attention to the fact that other interests besides those of Dr. Briggs and Union Seminary were at stake. The Assembly was called on to regard those other interests quite as much as the interests of the Seminary. These interests were the views of the presbyteries, the feelings of the eldership, and the friends of the Bible. What is wanted by them is a concrete utterance from the Church just now, in order to peace at home and a proper understanding of her position by those outside. If Dr. Briggs has liberty to utter his views without asking permission of the Church at large, the Church at large ought to have liberty to utter its views without longer delay to confer with him and his friends.

The tragic event of the whole discussion was, of course, the sudden death of the Hon. S. M. Breckinridge, LL.D., of St. Louis. He was a member of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, and had studied the whole case from the legal side of the question. He spoke immediately after the noon recess on Thursday, and while speaking only for fifteen or twenty minutes, it was such a speech as only a master of clear statement, incisive logic and the rules of law could possibly make. He had finished his speech, as his hearers could obviously see, and with a courtly bow ended by saying: "And now I believe I have done my duty," and turned to take from a table beside which he was standing some papers that he had been using for reference during the debate, when he staggered for a moment and then fell prostrate upon the floor. The physicians supposed that he died instantly, as they found neither pulse nor respiration when they reached him, altho they were in the house at the time. It is possible that the determination of the blood to the head caused by the effort to make a speech on such a momentous question immediately after lunch may have promoted the fatality; but whatever may have been the physical causes, it was a wonderful translation from the General Assembly of the Church he loved on earth to the General Assembly of the first-born in Heaven. It would be hard to say how much impression that last speech in favor of the legal necessity for immediate action may have made when the final vote came. The event made every heart solemn and every member anxious so to do his duty to God's Word and God's people as that if suddenly called away, they would at least be able to say they had done their duty according to the best of their knowledge and understanding.

But whatever may have been the co-operating causes that brought about that last final vote by roll call, the result was such as ought to give the Church peace for a time. The vote was so unanimous that there can be no good ground for speaking of it as an undecided vote or opening the door for division. Of course the opinion of the Church may be wrong, but it is perfectly evident now what that opinion is, Professor Smith rather intimated a conviction that this widespread opinion had been manufactured by the newspapers, and that therefore it ought to be distrusted. But the newspapers are generally a very fair reflection of public opinion, as the pages occupied by correspondents would show. Moreover, editors are so constantly occupied by studies in styles of language and expression that they ought to be the men of all men who would best appreciate an argument based on varieties of style in the Bible. If an editor is not an expert on the subject of style, it is hopeless to undertake to educate him into an expert in anything. Without expertness in judging of style, he cannot even judiciously fill his waste basket.

Little else but the Briggs case has been thought of by the Assembly, and the routine matters of business would not be entertaining to your readers. This Saturday afternoon the Assembly is out on an excursion given by these hospitable Detroit people. Their elegant banquet for Thursday night was omitted in view of Judge Breckinridge's death that day. The courtesy of Gen. Russell A. Alger in putting his private car and a special train at the service of the Assembly and of the Assembly's committee of escort to return with Judge Breckinridge's remains to the home of his friends in St. Louis is just a good specimen of the royal treatment he and other Detroit friends are giving to the Assembly.

DETROIT, MICH., MAY 30th, 1891.

FRAGMENTS.

HAD the vote been taken after Dr. Worcester's address, the result would probably have been different.

... There is a peculiar power in a roll-call, as was evidenced in the dwindling of Dr. Briggs's support on the final vote.

... Dr. Ramsey's plea for a *modus vivendi*, after the manner of civil governments, did not command itself to the great majority of the Assembly.

... Dr. Parkhurst's mortification at the handling he has received, was perhaps an element in the influence that made his word some of the most sober that were uttered.

... There was very little open enthusiasm in the meetings. All felt that there was a crisis upon the Church, and what would be the result of the action no one could tell.

... It was an utterly unexpected move that of the Committee on Dr. Briggs's case reporting a day before they had expected to, and it evidently took more than one person off his feet.

... There were probably few arguments that weighed more with the Assembly than those presented so forcibly by Drs. Patton and Baker, that a man who is constantly compelled to defend himself against misunderstanding is not the best teacher for young men.

... Dr. Dickey voiced the thought of more than one man when he said, speaking of Dr. Briggs's choice of a subject for the Inaugural, "Oh, would to God he had made it geography; for I do not believe he would have taken such risks in geography as he has in theology."

... Dr. Patton showed his realization of the true gravity of the situation, when, at the close of his address, as a commissioner rushed up to him warmly, and reaching out his hand, congratulated him, he withdrew his hand, saying: "Don't say that. I feel too sad to have this matter referred to in that way."

... "I feel that I have discharged my duty faithfully," will stand before the Church like "I have fought the good fight, I have kept the faith." The request, "I ask you to excuse me from further work," like an appeal to the court above, had an answer as solemn as unexpected from the Judge of all.

... No one who listened to the quiet, calm logic of Dr. Patton, the intense earnestness of Dr. Dickey, Dr. Worcester, and Dr. McKibbin, the straightforward simplicity of Judge Breckinridge, could feel that the Presbyterian Church has lost any of its hold upon vigorous thought or conscientious devotion to duty.

... It was not a bad point that made by Dr. Logan's correspondent after seeing a telegraphic report of the Moderator's sermon, which made him out a Universalist, that after the 1st of June every minister and every theological teacher should be required for one year to speak exactly what he means, and to submit it to the girl in the kitchen before he preaches it.

REGULAR REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS.

BY THE REV. JOHN B. DEVINS.

FOURTH DAY—MORNING SESSION.

"The Serpent on the Cross," was the subject of an animated debate at both the morning and afternoon sessions on Monday, May 25th. Dr. McNiece, of Utah, moved to amend that part of the Committee's report which retains the device to which exception is taken. Dr. H. H. Rice, of San Francisco, asked Dr. McNiece if he would accept the following as an amendment:

Resolved, That the report be amended by the omission of the symbol of the serpent on the cross from the seal, and substituting therefor the symbol of the open Bible, as found in the seal of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.

THE SERPENT ON THE CROSS.

Dr. McNiece: I have no objection to that. I only want to get the serpent off first. I accept the amendment. Now, Mr. Moderator, I wish to take only about five minutes to give some definite and practical reasons here why those whom I represent wish to have the serpent removed from this seal, and the first reason is that the serpent there makes offensive and repulsive to people generally what would be otherwise a most beautiful and attractive symbol. I am sure that no one but an eminent scientific man like Dr. McCook would have discovered any spiral beauty or any other beauty in the miserable, crawling, treacherous snake. [Applause.] And I am sure that its beauty is not enhanced when it leaves the grass and the dust of the earth, where it belongs, and climbs up on the cross. I suppose if there is anybody that can persuade Presbyterians in general that a snake is a sweet, lovely and beautiful thing, it is Dr. McCook; but the fact is that neither he nor Agassiz nor Darwin, nor all of them combined, can ever eradicate from our hearts that antipathy to the whole snake tribe which I believe God himself put there. If that serpent were put in an obscure corner of the symbol it would not be so bad, but it occupies the most conspicuous position, so that we cannot look upon that otherwise beautiful symbol without having that horrid thing glaring in our faces. The second reason is, that we believe that the serpent there in that position is unbiblical, if not anti-biblical; for whatever may be said to the contrary, the fact is that all through the Scriptures the serpent is used as a representative of Satan; even in the very last book of the Bible, and almost in the last chapter, he is referred to as that old serpent. Now I appeal to the judgment of the Assembly if it is not exceedingly inappropriate to have even Satan himself or any representative of Satan placed upon the top of the cross. [Applause.] If there is any proper position in that symbol for the serpent or Satan it is down under the cross, with the foot of the cross grinding it in the dust. The third reason I want to give is that that symbol is obscure and meaningless to 999 out of every 1,000 Presbyterians, except through a long and learned explanation; and I do not wish to take the time in my section of country to explain to the Presbyterians there what that horrid thing means. And finally, we want that serpent taken down because it is an unpopular thing throughout our Church. I have never met but one Presbyterian man or woman who favored it. About the first thing that a Presbyterian woman asks is, "What did you put that horrid snake there on the cross for?" You remember the clamor that went out of the whole Church when that symbol was on the cover of the *Presbyterian Magazine*. The cry went out through all the religious papers, "take down that snake," and the Committee took it down, and now we appeal

to Dr. McCook to let it be there in the grass where it belongs. We all appreciate what is said about the importance of the truth illustrated by the serpent lifted up on the pole in the wilderness; but it certainly was one thing to put the serpent on a pole 3,000 years ago, and another thing to put the serpent on the cross in this Christian age, when the serpent is being bruised under the heels of the Lord and His disciples. [Applause.] So that many of us, and I hope the majority of this Assembly, believe that the proper thing is not to put the serpent on a pole, but put the pole on the serpent; and we ask to have that taken down, because the symbol is beautiful and complete without it; we ask to have it taken down, because it makes it repulsive, because it is unbiblical, because it is obscure, and because it is exceedingly unpopular. [Applause.]

Dr. Geo. D. Baker, of Philadelphia: I have been very much surprised and I have been more pained at some of the utterances that have been made upon the floor of this Assembly with reference to the time-honored seal of our Church. I have been surprised when I have heard men say upon the floor of this Assembly that the people did not understand the meaning of the uplifted serpent, when if there is a familiar story in the Old Testament, a story which perhaps more than any other is burned into the heart of childhood, it is this same story of the uplifted serpent. I have no extended speech to make upon this subject, but I simply want to remind the Assembly again of that of which they have already been reminded, that when our Lord himself would give the world the heart of his Gospel, when he would compress into as few words as possible the redemptive scheme, he, in his infinite wisdom, with all illustrations at his command, was pleased to choose this illustration out of them all, and say: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him may not perish but have everlasting life." Fathers and brethren, are we wiser than our Lord? Do we propose striking out from our preaching that symbol which he was pleased to use? Will you who minister to your people hereafter, not preach to them concerning that uplifted serpent? Will you not use that uplifted serpent as the illustration of the Old Testament of the uplifted Christ? Really, brethren, it does seem to me that we are impugning the wisdom of our blessed Lord himself when we speak as has been spoken here in this Assembly with reference to this symbol. This is my chief reason. I rest the case upon this. I beg you to remember that our Lord himself uses this as the illustration of all illustrations, when he would present to the world the great redemptive scheme. Shall we be wiser than he?

After a short address by Judge Shipman, the order of the day was announced, and the debate was interrupted to be resumed in the afternoon.

FOURTH DAY—AFTERNOON SESSION.

The report of the Committee upon the Seal, being up for consideration in the afternoon, the Rev. Samuel M. Johnson, of Denver, offered the following amendment to the resolution of the Committee:

"That we omit the cross and the rising sun and substitute instead the open Bible, in form substantially as upon the seal of the Westminster Assembly of Divines."

The Moderator stated that the Stated Clerk would read for the information of the Assembly the original resolutions and the first and second amendments proposed.

The Stated Clerk then read as follows:

Resolved, That the General Assembly hereby adopts as its official seal the following, namely, the device of a serpent suspended upon a cross, uplifted within a wilderness, in form as represented upon the official seal of the trustees of the General Assembly, and displayed upon a circular field of the same proportion. In addition thereto, the figure of a rising sun appearing above the margin of the wilderness, whose outshooting beams shall occupy the center of the field. Further, the decoration of a demi-wreath of two palm branches (in the form of the wreath upon the seal of the Westminster Assembly of Divines), placed around the margin of the upper hemisphere of the field, and on the lower hemisphere of the field a demi-wreath composed of a branch of oak united with an olive branch. Further, that the words of the motto, "Christus Esentatus Salvator," shall be displayed in a semicircle upon the upper part of the field, on either side of the standard of the cross, and encompassing the whole in a border, the following words, in full or in proper abbreviation thereof, "The Seal of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

Also, the first proposed amendment, as follows:

Resolved, That the report be amended by the omission of the symbol of the serpent on the cross from the seal, and substituting the symbol of the open Bible, as found in the seal of the Westminster Assembly of Divines."

Also, the second proposed amendment, as follows:

"That we omit the cross and rising sun and substitute instead the open Bible, in form substantially as upon the seal of the Westminster Assembly of Divines."

The Rev. M. W. Jacobus, of Oxford, Penn., said he was sure the entire Assembly felt thankful to Dr. McCook and the other members of the Committee for the painstaking report which they had presented in such a beautiful way. He thought the majority of the Assembly would say there rests against this seal the same objection which in last year's debate was raised against our unrevised Confession, namely, that it is liable to be misinterpreted and misunderstood. By a vote of the majority of the presbyteries we as a Church have been launched out on the venture of making things plain. Let us be consistent and do with the seal what we are trying to do with our Confession. It might be said that under present conditions, if we were to substitute the Word of God, our meaning might be misunderstood; but he was in favor of running the risk of that, and making the substitution and saying, "We understand by that the infallible Word of God." [Applause.]

SPEECH OF DR. MCCOOK.

The Rev. H. C. McCook, D.D.: Mr. Moderator and Brethren: I think I was never more sober in my life than I am at this moment, yet I have seen enough snakes to-day to give me the reputation of a most veritable *bon vivant* in the world, and I trust I may ever be delivered from any similar experience. Now, if I had thirty minutes I would carry this Assembly [laughter], because I believe that sitting here as a court, with your judgment at the fore, pledged to give your verdict according to the testimony alone and not according to prejudice, you could not vote any other way. But I know how hard it is to vote down a prejudice, and yet I will try in the few moments allotted to me to do what I can to save this Church from what it seems to me will be a serious mistake. [Applause.]

I start out, then, with an answer to Dr. Logan's question. It seems trivial, and yet the triviality has been in all your minds: Is that a living snake? Why, it is not a snake at all, living or dead. It is an emblem of a snake.

Now, then, what did this Committee show you? They started out first with the history of this symbol. We had no interest in it except to try it by facts and report to you in accordance with the facts. We found historically that this is and has been the symbolism of the Presbyterian Church for nigh one hundred years; that it remains the symbol of the Church until some action is taken by the Assembly, or, rather, by the trustees to wipe out that symbolism.

Now, another thing. Men have said on this floor, and the motion is to that effect, that we place that honored symbol, the seal of the Westminster Assembly, to substitute it as our own. Mr. Moderator, are we prepared to take such a false step as that? That is an honored symbol of one of the greatest bodies that ever sat on earth, as they sit now in Heaven. They are entitled to that symbol. It is theirs, and

you have no right, sirs, to rob them of all the honor that belongs to that symbol as there established by them in history.

The open Bible is one of the most common symbols in heraldry. Our Board of Publication has it—the open Bible. The Methodist Church has it on the parchment commission which their bishops give to their preachers—the seal of the open Bible, the Word of God. They have it in their missionary society and in one other society, I think the Publication Society of the Methodist Church.

Now, it does seem to me that under these circumstances, speaking from this mere technical standpoint, it would be a mistake for us to do this thing. The Assembly can do it if it is pleased to do it, and I do not mean to say that there is not a way by which the Word of God might be diffused on, with little devices to make a proper one; but I say that under all circumstances you are in great danger, if you pass that resolution as it is, of making a serious mistake.

Now, let me pass to another and even yet more important point. It has been stated here continually upon this floor that the serpent is the emblem of the Devil, that it is unworthy of a place on such a seal as ours. Now, I ask you to consider this point—I ask you, brethren, I want your best judgment and your spiritual thoughts in this moment, for I ask you to remember just what you propose to do. You wish to honor the Word of God. I honor the Word of God, I believe in the Word of God—from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation.

Now, what will you do when you get to your homes and want to expound that passage in which God Almighty himself bids Moses take his serpent rod and make it an emblem of his own divine supremacy over all serpents? Did God Almighty make a mistake when he gave that serpent rod as an emblem as to supremacy? When Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, that blazon emblem of the divine supremacy and work of the divine healing power, did he make a mistake? When Jesus gave a serpent as a device of that Kingdom divine, by which his Apostles could carry the Church, did he make a mistake in the emblem? When he made that serpent an emblem of himself, did he make a mistake? Brethren, you must meet those facts seriously. [Applause.]

At the conclusion of Dr. McCook's remarks, the previous question was ordered and much suppressed excitement and no little confusion. A number of members inquired as to the effect of the amendments offered, and, finally, after several motions to recommit, etc., had been voted down, the amendment directing the erasure of the symbol of the serpent was adopted by a rising vote, ayes, 285; noes, 137. Mr. Johnson's amendments were also put and declared lost. A motion was then made to recommit the whole subject to the Committee having charge of the question, and this was carried.

Dr. Herrick Johnson's report on vacant churches and unemployed ministers was taken up again, and on motion of President Patton referred to a special Committee to report especially upon the constitutional questions raised. The following were the recommendations of the Committee:

1. Each Presbytery shall appoint a Committee, either an existing standing Committee or a new one, to have supervision of all vacant churches within its bounds, except as otherwise arranged for by the Presbytery. And for purposes of greater efficiency it is recommended that the term of service of this Committee be not less than three years.
 2. It shall be the duty of this Committee to prepare and keep a list of the Presbytery's vacant churches and of such of its unemployed ministers as are competent for service and not relieved from the active work of the ministry; and also to arrange for the supply of these churches from its list of available ministers, and from such other sources as may be suggested by correspondence with the secretary or with committees of other presbyteries; all details of adjustment, such as the amount to be paid supplies, the sum to be contributed by the churches and the duration of assignment to any particular church being left to each presbytery, to be determined by its own conditions and needs.
 3. It shall be the persistent aim of the Presbytery and its Committee to bring the vacant churches to the full support of this arrangement for temporary supply. But if, in the judgment of the Presbytery, pecuniary aid is wanted beyond the amount contributed by the vacant churches themselves, the Presbytery shall provide by a distinct offering from its entire list of churches, or in some other way, for a fund that shall be used exclusively for this work, and which may be known as "the vacancy and supply fund" and placed in the hands of the treasurer of the Presbytery.
 4. All unemployed ministers, able for service, who refuse to be placed on the list, and to work under the direction of the Presbytery; and all vacant churches that refuse to assist in any presbyterial arrangement to supply them with the preaching of the Word, shall, if not excused, be so recorded by the Presbytery and reported to the Assembly.
 5. The chairman of the several presbyterial committees on supply and vacancy within the bounds of any given synod, together with the synodical missionary, if there be such an officer, shall constitute a synodical committee of a similar character, whose duty it shall be to report annually to the Synod of this work of adjustment, to unify the work within the Synod's bounds, to bring about better relations of supply and demand, and to furnish such information to the presbyterial committees as might contribute to their knowledge and efficiency.
 6. There shall be a permanent advisory committee of seven appointed by the Assembly, and of which the secretary, hereinafter to be named, shall be a member ex-officio, whose business it shall be to consider and plan for the better adjustment of this delicate and difficult problem of our Church, to issue such appeals and tabulated statements as may be deemed serviceable, to order all such matters pertaining to the work as shall not be in conflict with the episcopal powers of the Presbytery, and to make an annual report through the secretary to the Assembly.
 7. There shall be a correspondence secretary, located at —, with a salary of —, to be provided for by —, who shall act as a constant and helpful medium of communication with different parts of the Church through or by the authorization of the respective presbyterial committees on vacancies and supplies. He is to stimulate to organized and concerted action, so that at the earliest moment the scheme, in its essential features, tho with varying details, may be in operation in every presbytery. His office carries with it no power of authority. His business shall be wholly to give information, to be a depository and distributor of facts both as to unemployed ministers and vacant churches, to whom a minister without charge may unhesitatingly apply, and by whom he may be put at once in correspondence with a presbyterial committee or, through that committee, with a vacant church likely to furnish the very field for which he has both adaptation and desire. He shall be appointed by the Assembly, or by a committee of the Assembly named for the purpose, and shall be subject to the Assembly's general direction.
- All previous action of the Assembly in conflict with the foregoing action is hereby repealed.
- The report of the Standing Committee on the Board of Freedmen was submitted by its chairman, Dr. Ebenezer Erskine, of Newville, Penn. It closed with these definite recommendations:
1. That the restriction placed upon the Board by the last Assembly be removed, and that the Board be recommended to exercise a wise

discretion in seeing that its affairs are administered in as economical a manner as the business of the same will admit.

2. That the attention of the standing committees of the presbyteries be called to the urgent need of larger and more general contributions to this cause from all the churches, and that they use their best endeavors to bring this cause before the churches that have hitherto been non-contributing to the same.

The 26th Annual Report of the Board, which was heartily commended by the Committee, represents the past year to have been a most successful one. The colored people themselves have given toward the support of the Church for the past year \$45,581. There are connected with the Board 14 white and 120 colored missionaries, and 52 white and 168 colored teachers. During the year seven new churches have been organized, making the whole number now under the care of the Board 253 with 17 missions in addition; 1,396 communicants have been added on confession of their faith; while there is now a total of 15,486 communicants and 18,212 scholars in 259 Sunday-schools. There are 84 schools for instruction in all elementary branches with 197 teachers and 11,029 scholars, and these could be indefinitely increased if there were funds. The women's department has increased its gifts during the year by \$8,458.

After several speeches in favor of the work of the Board, final action was deferred, as some of the commissioners intimated that there was another side to the problem. The popular meeting in the evening was in the interest of the Freedmen's Board.

REPORT ON THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Gen. John M. Eaton, United States ex-Commissioner of Education, presented the report of the General Assembly's Committee on the Board of Education. The Committee expressed their gratification that an advance had been made during the past year on the number of candidates under the care of the Board, this increase being thirty-six. The total receipts of the Board were \$106,600, an increase of \$21,686. But there were, on the other hand, discouraging facts.

1. There is a lack of promptness among the churches. The Board must meet its bills at a given date; the churches send their collections—when they are taken at all—as suits their convenience.

2. The Board is still in debt, notwithstanding it had cut down the number of candidates accepted until it supposed it was safely within the limit of its income.

3. But if the Board's calculations at the beginning of the year had been fully realized the result would have been totally inadequate. It would not have aided all who were offered by the presbyteries, for eighty-six were declined. Nor can the demand for money be measured merely by the number of candidates. We ought to take into account the vacant churches as well and supply them, 1,168 in number, as reported by the minutes, with a still further net increase of 167 new churches. We should not be led to conclude that we have ministers enough because every attractive vacancy is beset by an army of applicants.

4. Study the statistics. They are significant. The wealthy Synod of Baltimore received \$983 more than it gave for its nineteen candidates, forty-seven churches giving nothing. The Synod in Illinois received \$1,290 more than it gave; Indiana, \$3,761 more; Ohio, \$4,951. The Committee are gratified to note that in several synods these facts are attracting attention.

5. Further emphasis is given to these facts by a slight computation showing the rate of contribution per member. All churches are not alike in their ability it is true; but looking at five churches in one of our prosperous cities we notice that the average rate of giving per member is in one year eight cents per member, in another six, in two others four, and in one one-half cent. The total number of churches contributing was 2,970, and those giving nothing 3,760. Must we not suppose that pastors are derelict in presenting this cause? A similar disregard of duty on the part of the Board would be visited with the severest condemnation. What, then, shall be said of the churches?

6. If presbyteries and sessions were as careful on their part as the Board is on its part, many hindrances could be removed. Candidates well known to possess means sufficient to educate themselves should not be recommended by presbyteries, and the same is true where they are known to be wasteful in the use of funds, or are unfit, either in ability, conduct or character. All candidates should be carefully examined by their presbyteries.

7. If such studies and requirements as those by Dr. Morris, and such activities as those of Christian Endeavor societies, and such movements as that among students toward missions have added to the number offering for the ministry, why may we not expect that other studies and a more profound sympathy with the work of the Holy Spirit for the salvation of souls may hasten the day when there shall be men to preach the Gospel to every perishing soul and consecrated means forthcoming for their ample support.

8. There should be special caution in devoting young men to school and to books, that they be not separated from the work of God among his people. The ministry must possess more than voice or learning or the mastery of its theory; it must live Christ, and go about doing good. Not a few are embarrassed in their work or are unemployed on account of some defect which might have been removed by proper attention on the part of advisers or teachers. Let every elder and minister inquire what God would have him do with reference to this Board. A large share of our ministry must come under its care. They must supply our pulpits at home, the teachers and directors in the affairs of the Church, and answer the cry from distant parts of the world. Every Board of the Church will be paralyzed if there are not men to do its work. In the entire circle of our Church activities, what is more central than the supply of men?

The Committee recommended:

1. The approval of the minutes of the Board.
2. That Elder Samuel B. Huey be elected to fill the vacancy of Samuel Field, deceased, in the class of 1892; that Elder N. S. Walton be chosen in the place of William F. Smith, resigned, also in the class of 1892; and that Elder William Wood take the place of James S. McGee, who declined to serve in the class of 1893. Also that the following outgoing members of this year be re-elected: Ministers, Samuel Mutchmore, D.D., J. H. Monroe, D.D., and Edward B. Hodge; elders, James F. Gagley, M.D., Charles H. Matthews and George Peirce.
3. The Committee note with satisfaction that there have been added during the past year three Indians, 108 Negroes, six Mexicans, thirty-eight Germans, one Japanese, and representatives of other nationalities.
4. In view of the fact that young men able to support themselves either when entering or afterward, have mistakenly received the benefactions of the Board, it is recommended that the Board have larger discretion in such cases.
5. It is recommended that all presbyteries call for a report once a year from every church, both as to candidates and donations for this cause.
6. We repeat the urgency of our predecessors, that parents, pastors and teachers be watchful to find young men for this special service.
7. The care taken by the Board in the acceptance and oversight of

candidates is commended, and sessions and presbyteries are urged to renew fidelity in bringing them into the ministry.

8. Let the whole question be prayerfully restudied and restated, that there may continue to be an increase of men, and that there may be a corresponding increase of means consecrated to this purpose.

9. But neither the amount of funds nor the number of candidates offered should be the measure of our efforts. We urge that the churches do not measure themselves by themselves, or their future by the inadequate past, both that we seek to know and do what the Master expects of us, both as to men and means for the conversion of the world in our own day and generation.

After speeches by Dr. Poor, the secretary; Dr. Baker, of Philadelphia, and Dr. Hewitt, of Kansas, and others, the report was accepted, and its recommendations were adopted.

FIFTH DAY—MORNING SESSION.

A. V. V. Raymond, D.D., of Albany, N. Y., presented the report of the Committee on Home Missions, and the same was accepted by the Assembly.

The Moderator announced the receipt of a telegram concerning the death of Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke, of Brooklyn, upon which the Assembly took appropriate action, and prayer was offered by the Moderator.

HOME MISSIONS.

The consideration of the subject of Home Missions was then taken up. Dr. A. V. V. Raymond, of Albany, chairman of the Standing Committee of the Assembly, read the report of that Committee on the work of the past year. It went over the facts as fully presented, commenting upon the impressive lessons which they teach the wise citizen of the urgent need of Christianizing the great American Republic if we would save it. The report closed with these recommendations:

1. That the overtures from the Presbyteries of Albany and Niagara, asking the Assembly to provide for a General Missionary Conference, to be held in the fall of the present year, to which delegates shall be chosen as commissioners to the Assembly, be answered by the appointment of a committee of five to arrange for said conference, in the interests of both home and foreign missions, and that every presbytery be urged to send delegates, on the basis of its representation in the Assembly, and that an appeal be issued to the whole Church, through this Committee, to unite in earnest prayer for the blessing of God upon this Conference.

2. That the delegates attending this Conference shall be all thereafter appointed the special missionary agents of the presbyteries, charged with the development of the cause of the missions within their bounds.

3. That the Assembly re-affirm its grateful recognition of the great service rendered by the Woman's Executive Committee and recommend to all the pastors and sessions the duty of fostering this work in their churches.

4. That the Sunday-schools be urged to take a collection for home missions during the year, and, so far as possible, the Sunday before Thanksgiving be observed for their united offerings.

5. That this Assembly instruct the Board of Home Missions to organize and push the work among the foreign population with all possible energy, even to the extent, if necessary, of employing an officer, who shall have it in special charge.

6. That the following members of the Board whose term of office expires with this Assembly be appointed: the Rev. John Hall, D.D., the Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, the Rev. Lyman W. Allen, and Elders George H. Lockwood, Titus B. Meigs and John Crosby Brown, in the class of 1892, in place of Joseph F. Joy, deceased.

7. That the Board be urged and enjoined to increase its membership as soon as possible, according to the request preferred by it to the Assembly in 1889, and granted by that Assembly; and the Assembly authorize the Board to secure whatever change in its charter may be necessary for this increased membership.

8. That the Assembly express its grateful appreciation of the work of the Board during the year, and commend its administration of the great trust committed to it to the confidence of the Church, and we recommend the sum of \$1,000,000 as the amount which should be contributed during the year, in order both to carry on the work and liquidate the debt.

9. Because of the present embarrassed condition of the Board, we recommend immediate remittances, whether as regular or special offerings on the part of individuals or churches.

Dr. McMillan, the Secretary of the Board, made the principal address in behalf of the report. The recommendations of the Committee's report were then taken up. The first two, relative to the proposed missionary conference, were referred to a special committee, consisting of the Rev. Drs. Geo. P. Hays and H. H. Rice and Elder Van Rensselaer. The remaining resolutions were all adopted.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Mr. Elliott F. Shepard, of New York, submitted the report of the Committee on Sabbath Observance, and presented the following recommendations, which were adopted:

First. That this General Assembly expresses profound gratitude to God for the fulfillment of his declaration in the fourth Commandment about his blessing the country and those who have kept his day holy.

Second. That we most heartily recommend to the National and State commissioners and municipal directors of the Columbian Exposition, to be held in Chicago in 1893, immediately to decide that its doors shall not be opened to the public on Sunday, and to announce that decision so that the public conscience shall be at rest on the subject, and that Christians of all denominations may consistently unite in rendering that exhibition a great success by attending it with their families, sending their exhibits there, and praying to God to bless the exhibition and make it a means of incalculable good to the nations of the earth; and that a certified copy of this resolution, properly authenticated by the signatures of the officers and by the seal of the General Assembly, shall be intrusted to the Sabbath Observance Committee for presentation to the said authorities.

Third. That the work of the American Sabbath Union, in behalf of the Sabbath Day, is heartily recommended to pastors and elders for their co-operation and support.

Fourth. That the first week of April, 1893, be observed by our churches as a period for special prayer for the blessing of our Father which is in Heaven upon all the people that they may be led to a better observance of his Holy Sabbath Day—the Lord's Day.

Dr. Moore, the permanent clerk, moved that the resolutions be adopted and that a committee consisting of Elliott F. Shepard, of New York; James A. Beaver, of Harrisburg, Penn.; Byron Sunderland, D.D., of Washington, D. C.; Herriek Johnson, D.D., S. J. McPherson, D.D., John L. Withrow, D.D., Henry J. Willing, of Chicago; Samuel J. Nicolls, D.D., of St. Louis; F. C. Montfort, of Cincinnati, O.; Robert J. Trumbull, of San Francisco; W. R. Worrall, of New York; William S. Wright, D.D., of Pear-

sall, Texas; John Cameron, of Detroit, and C. H. Glover, of Milwaukee, be appointed as the Committee of the General Assembly on Sabbath Observance, to serve without expense to the Assembly.

The report was then accepted, and its resolutions adopted.

The Rev. Dr. George P. Hays, of Kansas City, reported on the Board of Aid for Colleges, recommending the following resolutions, which were adopted:

1. This Assembly gratefully recognizes the goodness of God in leading our Church to establish this Board and in blessing and guiding the Board in its work to abandon methods which proved failures and to adopt its present business methods of administering beneficence.

2. With calls urgent and important and resources too small we appreciate the painful perplexities and embarrassing duties of this Board in striving, when all claims cannot be met, to select the most important, all bespeak for the Board the wisdom of God and the confidence of his people.

3. The work of principals and teachers in newly founded communities in conducting Christian education is as truly religious work as any to which Christians can give themselves; and we insist on sessions regularly and urgently presenting the claims of these workers as represented by this Board. If people do not give when the case is presented, that is their responsibility. When sessions do not give the opportunity to give, a double responsibility is incurred, to wit: both that of the sessions and that of the people.

4. In many cases it will seem hard to insist on the rule that "no debt shall be incurred"; but the future is so uncertain, and givers are so unwilling to pay debts, that we advise the Board to be very slow to abandon in any case its rule of requiring each year's expense to be kept within that year's income. The deficiency should be made up somehow.

5. This Assembly strongly commends to those whom God has blessed with means the endowment of these living fontains in new lands. The local friends generally do their utmost in providing ground and buildings for colleges and academies. Whoever, then, endows the institution serves God and his fellow-men for all time to come. Tombstones may perish, but endowments give harvest every year. The children of the poor seem to make the best students; and the rich givers may only know of colleges rich in money, this Board can direct them to schools rich in physical endurance, intellectual ability and consecrated spirit in the classes. They give doubly who give to the needy, when the needy are the coming great and influential.

6. That the following persons be elected to serve three years—viz.: Ministers—M. W. Stryker, D.D., G. G. K. McClure, D.D., M. L. Haines, D.D., the Rev. Thos. C. Hall; and Elders Dan P. Eels, Cyrus H. McCormick, James McMillan and Thos. Lord.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION.

Judge Hand: *Mr. Moderator, Fathers and Brethren:* I understand perfectly that, not being a member of this House and having presented the report of the Committee appointed at the last Assembly, whatever I have to say is only by the courtesy of the House. The examination and the conclusions of the Committee of which I am chairman have been fairly presented in the report which I read and which has been circulated. Since that report was read I have understood, altho I was not present, that a statement was made by the Chairman of the Special Committee to the following effect:

"We did not present to the Committee of Seven any reasons for making the recommendation that we do in the second part of our report, as upon our proposing to do this they informed us that it was not the time for such reasons and arguments; but we understood the Chairman of the Committee of Seven to assure us positively that we should be heard upon them fully before they would make up their report or take any action."

I have tried to avoid in this examination any issue of fact or veracity between myself and the chairman of this Committee; but it seems forced upon me at this point. I do not know what the Special Committee understood. I do know what I said. I stated that after we had all the facts in, if we needed any explanation of them, or any further light to enable us to judge of them, we would send for their Committee, and I understand that he complains that we have not allowed him to introduce testimony upon the recommendation. This is the first time that I ever heard of any such thing or any proposal, except in one or two letters, and the first time that I ever heard that when the facts were all in and the parties were to make up their conclusions, they needed other evidence to make up their conclusions. I supposed the recommendations grew out of the facts, and when we met—and I am borne out by this entirely by the memories of the Committee, who state that it is the exact truth—when we met and went over the facts presented by the Special Committee and by the Board, we found nothing that required any further testimony, and, of course, we did not send for that Committee. If they have, however, any evidence which they did not produce before us which would change your action in this matter, we have not the slightest objection to their producing it. We supposed that we had received all the evidence in the case and that the Special Committee desired to present to us at the end of the day that was given to them for that purpose. We heard their statements, and the letter subsequently received from the chairman of the Committee certainly gave me to understand that he had produced all the evidence on the facts that he had, and, after hearing their statements and taking their proofs, which were exhibits, numbered as they were presented, we then presented to the Business Committee of the Board all these exhibits except one and required them to make specific answers to the testimony that was adduced before us by the Special Committee, which they have done. In this statement of the chairman of the Special Committee he says he repeatedly asked the privilege of introducing other testimony. That is not true so far as the facts are concerned. All he asked for was that he might make an argument before us upon their recommendations, and that he would produce before us any evidence of any kind that we wanted. His first letter after the meeting in Philadelphia was in answer to a letter which I wrote to him asking that he would withdraw the pledge of honor upon which one item of testimony was given to us, or have it withdrawn, so that we could present it to the Committee, which he declined to do. In declining it he said that if we desired he would produce such evidence as we did desire—showing that he understood exactly the statement that had been made in the presence of the Committee that if we desired any further testimony we would let him know. That was the first letter. Consequently, it was a surprise to me to find when he made the statement the other day here in the house that he had other testimony to adduce; but I think the fair inference of his paper is it is only testimony that he wanted to introduce in support of their recommendations and on the facts which he says in that statement occupied the first part of his report.

I simply make this statement to place myself right before this Assembly. I do not know how far this House desires to go into the immense number of details that are contained in the voluminous papers that I have before me. I can only say that if they do it will be a day or two before you get through with this matter. I do not shrink from going into it if you desire it. My own judgment is that it is not necessary, and that it would not result in any particular amount of good, or make the matter any clearer than the reports do that are already before you; but if the House is of a different opinion at any time during the progress of this discussion, and they want to go into each detail of matter, I am prepared to go into it. All that I shall say at present will be somewhat general.

The first fact that I wish this Assembly to understand is that you are not called upon to criticize the management of a business which has not been successful, but one which has been successful. The net profits of the year, for 1889-1890, of the business part of the Board of Publication, were \$14,943.14. That is the year that the Special Committee examined their affairs in order to ascertain whether a plant was desirable. And that success has been a growing success from year to year. Two-thirds of this amount, or \$11,295.44, was passed over to the missionary department of the Board. I, therefore, wish that in all this discussion you would bear in mind that you are not criticizing a Board that has run behind, a Board that is liable to insolvency, or a Board that has not had in all its existence from the beginning—I mean for the last twenty years, for that is since the union of the two churches—a gradual and a growing success up to the present date.

There is another fact that I want you to understand. That you have a large, intelligent, honest, fervent Board of Managers, both clerical and lay, and there are no better men either clerical or lay to be found in the Presbyterian Church on any of your Boards than are found on this Board.

There is another fact that I want you to bear in mind, and that is that the best men will make mistakes. I do not say they are liable to. I say they will.

The next thing is when they do make mistakes, what is to be done? Now, there is the whole question of this case in a nutshell. The principle underlying the report which I had the honor to present to you (it was a unanimous report of my Committee) is that whatever the mistakes are that are made, whatever the blunders are that are made, you had better reach them through your Board. That is the principle that underlies it. I think it is Presbyterian.

I will go a step further, and say that when you have a Board that makes mistakes and when they find that they have made a mistake and are ready at once to attempt the remedy, you had better keep that Board in rather than fill their places with somebody else, because the chances are that the next Board would have to go through the same process. It reminds me of the story of the conductor and the railroad president, who called him up and said that he would have to discharge him, and he asked why. The president said: "You have been keeping too large a part of the money." "Well," said the conductor, "I think it is very unwise for you to discharge me, because I am satisfied now and the next man you will put in my place will be a great deal hungrier than I am." Now, that is in a bad cause, from which we can draw an inference. If you have a Board that has made mistakes and has learned of their mistakes and if they are prepared to correct them and they do correct them, keep them in.

Doctor Hays (Interposing): Are they satisfied, do you think? [Laughter.]

Judge Hand: The way some of them are resigning, I don't think they are exactly satisfied. Now, why should we keep them in? In the first place, the report of the Special Committee, I want to say, substantially agrees with the report that is now before you, except in one particular; and if you want to cut this Gordon knot as quick as you can, I think the quickest and best way is to strike right at the difference in the first instance, at the recommendation, because it don't make any difference after this Assembly adjourns what the Committee has reported, we shall be relieved tremendously whatever you do, there will not be any more responsibility upon us, and you can take these reports and recommendations and do with them what you please, we will sleep quietly and peacefully, and perhaps you won't, because then the responsibility will be on you, and perhaps you will make a mistake. I always felt that way when I was on the bench and a case went up to the higher court; I felt I was through with it and the responsibility was somewhere else. Now, as I have said, we have agreed in the main as to our recommendations, except as to one point and that point is the second recommendation in the Special Committee's report—the second and third recommendation in the Special Committee's report—and the second recommendation in the report which I presented to you.

The recommendation of the Special Committee is that "the General Assembly"—not the Board of Publication—"shall appoint three additional members of the Board of Publication to serve for three years, who shall be Elders residing in different synods, and each shall be practically acquainted with publishing and printing, and these three shall constitute the manufacturing committee; and this committee and their successors in office, who shall be appointed by the General Assembly, shall by order of the Assembly have oversight and control of the making of all contracts for paper, printing, binding, manufacturing materials and advertising, as well as of fixing of the basis for prices, and also the exchanging of sheets with other publishers; and the business superintendent shall in these matters act under the direction of said Committee; said Committee to serve without compensation. Third, we recommend that in future contracts for paper, printing, binding, and manufacture, the manufacturing committee shall avail themselves of competition; but the price, quality and contract shall be subject to the approval and under the direction of this Committee.

That is, you shall step over your Board of Publication and put this whole business matter in the hands of a committee of three appointed by them—still a committee of the Board of Publication—you still holding the Board of Publication responsible for the whole work, and the committee not obliged to answer to the Board, but excepted out of the Board in that respect, as expressly stated in their report, so that the Board could not interfere with them in their contract.

Now, our recommendation is as follows:

"The Board of Publication is requested and hereby empowered to make a subdivision of the Business Department with a manufacturing branch, to be placed under the charge of a competent person, who shall be held responsible for its proper management; and also to make a publishing and distributing branch, also in charge of a competent person, by whom the book and periodical business of the Board may be extended, and its publications brought more fully to the attention of the churches and the people."

Now, with reference to the report of the Special Committee, I take occasion to commend it in one particular, and for that it is to be commended. They did ascertain that the Board could have certain work done by competitive bidding and contracts at a lower price than they were having it done for. That was a fact that they found out. Their report was made to the last Assembly; and on the 10th of June after that Assembly adjourned, altho their report was not adopted by that Assembly, the Board did at once inaugurate the plan for inviting bids from fourteen different firms, in New York, Philadelphia and Boston, the result of which was that they had saved and are saving at the rate of \$18,000 a year. [Applause.] Now, all honor to that committee for this.

Now, let us come back to these recommendations. Admit, if you please, that the Business Committee, or somebody, made a mistake in not finding that out before. I believe—and I think every business man in this house who has had anything to do with corporations, understands that the corporation should hold their board of directors primarily responsible for everything. Responsible, I say. The board of directors in this case hold their business committee responsible, and the business committee holds their employes responsible—or, in one sense, the board holds the employes responsible.

Now, there is a difference between holding a person responsible for a thing and his being to blame, or to be chastised, or to be held up for contempt, or to be called to account in any way, except to do his duty under the circumstances and meet his responsibility. You don't expect your Board to manage your business. They meet once a week, or once a month—I don't know how often; generally, once a month. You don't expect your business committee to manage the business.

You expect your employes to manage the business. Now, this matter of prices, this matter of expenses—I don't care where you place the responsibility. It certainly was not, in the first instance, upon the Board. As soon as they found that a mistake had been made, the responsibility then was, and the blame would have been on them not to have corrected it. Just so with the business committee; just so with the employes. Now, in regard to the employes, I don't propose to put this responsibility upon him. I don't know where it should be placed.

There is another thing. Your board of directors, your business committee and your employes, if your business is successful and largely successful, are very apt to have their eyes shut to the fact that they might make more money if they would be more careful. Now there is the exact state of things. There is another side to this, so far as the employes are concerned. When this business was commenced, as the facts all show, it was a much smaller business than it is now. It has gradually grown, and this Board necessarily has gradually put more and more upon its business superintendent and upon its employes, and have not increased them in proportion to the increase of business; and where a business is successful and full of an immense volume of detail, as both reports here say this kind of business is, there may be some excuse for their not finding out that they could have made more money, until somebody comes in and examines the things and examines the prices and sees that they could.

Now, the Special Committee came in and found this fact, and the moment it was called to the attention of the Board they took steps to remedy it, and they have remedied it and the result is an increase of \$18,000 profit. Now so far, so good.

Elder Charles Lyman, of Washington, D. C.: Let me make one inquiry at that point. Has this increased revenue or increased profit been to any extent at the expense of quality of work and material?

Judge Hand: You will find in the report in some respects it has, but the Board states that they hope not to such an extent but that it can be remedied. That is in the answer of the Board themselves. Now, it seems to me, gentlemen, that right here is the whole of this case. There are a great many details. There are a good many expressions in the report of the Special Committee and some adjectives which do hold up this Board, I think, to unnecessary criticism—especially when they say in their report that this Board was willing to receive the Committee and welcome them and give them all the information they desired, and have been willing, as their conduct shows, to receive any suggestions from the Assembly if they thought it was wise. I won't state those adjectives contained in that report, neither will I state some of the details which would be uncomfortable here to state unless this House desires it. If an examination in detail is to be gone into I should hope, for the defense of this Board, that an opportunity will be given to answer the statement which will be made exactly as they are. We have laboriously undertaken to fathom this thing to the bottom and to give all credit in every statement that was made by the Special Committee and then examined to see if it was exactly true, and I am compelled to state that where they have got some truth in their statements they have been extravagant in it and have gone beyond what the facts would bear them out in, and there are one or two things in it that should have been corrected by them before this time, but they have not been.

But, as I say, if you desire to go into that we are here prepared to meet it, and when the question comes up upon the passing of the resolutions I should, if it is necessary, like to be heard upon any matter of that kind that casts any reflections upon the Board. If they cannot meet the reflections they must stand it. If they can meet it, it is proper that this House should hear them.

And with these remarks—simply stating that the idea we have is that you can reach every remedy, you can carry out every remedy and reach every evil, even admitting that everything stated in the report of the Special Committee is true, you can reach it by the present Board that you have appointed, and you cannot find any better in the United States and in the Presbyterian Church.

Elder Charles S. Converse, of New Jersey: Are there any practical publishers, men accustomed to the printing business, in the Board as it is constituted at present?

Judge Hand: I will answer that by stating that we say in our report that the Board would be glad to welcome any practical men acquainted either with book printing or with publishing business on the Board. There are two now on the Board; one was appointed by the last Assembly, and the Board have filled the vacancy since then by appointing another. And we suggest for the Assembly that you appoint more practical men upon the Board from time to time as vacancies occur.

Elder H. E. Simmons, of New Jersey: Mr. Moderator, Fathers and Brethren: The Committee that I have the honor to represent here to-day was appointed under very peculiar circumstances. Matters of discontent with the Board had been growing for years, until it came so that the great Synod of Ohio took action upon it, and two years ago the General Assembly passed a resolution, or a minute, under which a special committee on the publishing outfit of the Board of Publication was appointed; and when my name came to be mentioned in connection with it the moderator, whom we all honored so much, came to me and said: "I propose to put you upon the Committee." I said, "I beg you will not do it; I don't wish to go upon that Committee; there is too much hard work, and too little of something else in it." When the moderator came to me and told me he was going to make me the chairman of the Committee I again remonstrated against it. And then he gave me my charge. He said: "I shall make you the chairman of the Committee, and I want you to go to the bottom of this thing." I have obeyed the charge fully, and I stand here to-day prepared to defend the report of the Special Committee in every particular. We have been put upon trial. At the last General Assembly when our report was received, not being a commissioner as I am now, I was only entitled to the floor by courtesy, and, without ever hearing one word in regard to the recommendation of the Special Committee, our report upon the motion of a gentleman who was formerly a member of the Board of Publication, and, as it is stated by one of the members of the Board, by action of the Board itself (as is stated in the *Presbyterian Quarterly* of the South) this matter was referred to a Special Committee of seven. In order to show you that we are not wrong in supposing that we are upon trial, allow me to read from the stenographic report which was furnished so admirably by the New York INDEPENDENT; the mover of the resolution said:

"There are contained in that special report, the merits of which I do not propose now to enter upon, very serious and very grave accusations, which, if true, ought to require the dissolution of the Board of Publication. I want it distinctly understood, that so far as I am concerned, or my vote, or influence as a Commissioner here might be exercised, if my truest, dearest and best friend should be in the Business Committee of the Board of Publication and these facts were true, I would work, sir, for his removal from that place. There are facts contained, or alleged facts, I should say, in that Special Committee report which I, for one, am ready and competent to combat to-day as being erroneously stated and untrue."

We have not noticed him combatting them yet, tho; he was not so anxious to get the floor as to be willing to take anybody else's time.

"The minute appointing this Committee was also a very peculiar one. They were directed to hear the answer of the Business Committee and of the Board of Publication and the charges of the Special Committee, and consider the whole question and report their finding of facts to the General Assembly of 1891."

In other words, to put it plainly, they were to try the Special Committee and see whether they lied or not. That is all. And we took the matter in just exactly that very spirit. And I want to state that that report of the Special Committee can only be looked at in one of two ways. The statements contained in the first of that report are either true or they are false; and, if they are true, then I say that

there ought to be a change in the methods and management of the Board; and, if they are false, this General Assembly ought to reprimand us and send us back to our sessions for trial and for punishment. You cannot go between those two things, and we propose to fight it out on that line if it takes all summer. [Applause.]

Now, the question as to how we were heard. I only regret that the chairman of the Committee refused our request to have a stenographer, for it is always such an easy thing to forget, and I have thought many times that a stenographic report is very invaluable. I have one here that I would not take a great many dollars for [holding up the before referred to extract from THE INDEPENDENT], and it did not cost me a cent. We went before that Committee, and for six hours we laid before them our proofs of certain precise charges that we alleged against the management of the Board. We said nothing to them upon the question of the plant. When I attempted to speak upon that I was informed that there was no occasion to speak upon that, as the parties were already agreed to speak upon it. I shall have occasion before I get through to show that it would have been better for me to have spoken upon it in order to avoid some misunderstandings in the report. There is not a word in regard to our recommendations. Those recommendations were, by an act of the last Assembly, which, if I had been a member of it, I would have protested against as unconstitutional and illegal, committed to this Committee of Seven, and the power was attempted to be given to them to enact those recommendations and then to enjoin and direct the Board of Publication never to obey them. But on those recommendations, not one word was asked of us about them. While I most certainly would not wish to suggest that our friend, the Judge, could be mistaken, it is a very singular fact that every member of our Committee understood the Judge to say to us: "You shall be heard before we make up our report; and we expect to meet in New York, and it will be convenient for you to meet us there." Now, one of us is mistaken; that is all. We thought we were going to have that opportunity; and we think so now. But, of course, I would not pretend to say that I am accurate and the Judge is mistaken.

Now, the question comes up: Have they in all this examination, or has any one, yet answered the facts that we laid before the Church in this report of ours? It has been tried. The Board put upon the platform of the last Assembly a gentleman that stood there for an hour and twenty-five minutes. He had a bigger fund of misinformation than any man I ever saw in my life, and he never answered a solitary one of the facts, altho you would expect every moment that the very next he would do it, and he would prance up to it, but that was all. He could not even find the vreface to a book when he did not want to. [Laughter.] He could not find it because somebody wanted him to. There was another proof that they thought the best way for him to answer it was to slip off down to the *Presbyterian Quarterly*, and so he sailed in, and he told all the great things he could think of down at the Southern brethren—how he acted, and how bad it made him feel, and about this Committee of incompetents—[referring to a bundle of papers]. I will have to go a little easy on that and refer to the papers because it is so easy to make mistakes. [Laughter.] He said:

"Only one of the Committee had any knowledge of book printing or publishing, and he had failed of success and is now earning his bread in a different business"—that is me. [Laughter.] "Instead of obeying these positive instructions of the Assembly which appointed it, this Committee of obscure and incompetent persons assumed from the outset an insulting attitude toward the Business Committee of the Board, which is composed of gentlemen of the highest character and of conspicuous business capacity."

And again:

"The members of the Assembly were buttonholed and plied with malicious charges against the business management of the Board. Under the influence of these slanders the Assembly was prepared to accept the most damaging statements against one of its useful institutions. It was a strange spectacle; a large number of the leading ministers and elders of Philadelphia were by this infamous report arraigned before the Bar of the Assembly and denounced as incapable, if not dishonest."

Now, here is something you will be glad to know about. I knew I was pleased when I saw it:

"As soon as the Board could obtain a hearing, every charge was effectually disposed of, and the Board vindicated, while the authors of the libel were covered with confusion."

That is the way that is answered. Now then, our good Committee of Seven have found one thing that they say right out in cold print was unfounded. It is on the top of page 6:

"The strange discrepancies are fully explained by the necessary manner of keeping the accounts. This was admitted by a member of the Special Committee on the floor of the Assembly last year. In the judgment of your Committee they are unfounded, and the statement grew out of a misapprehension."

Now, I propose to settle that thing once for all. That discrepancy business is a hard one. [Laughter.] Those of you that may possibly have the report of the Special Committee, if you will look close upon page 7 you will find what that discrepancy consisted in:

"Some strange discrepancies came under our observation. A single example will be given. For the year ending March 31st, 1889, 4,154,364 copies of the Westminster Lesson Leaf were published. The Board pays seven-fifths cents per thousand for folding and stitching. At this rate 4,154,364 copies would have cost \$3,117.19; but the Board paid \$3,935.60—a discrepancy of \$708.41; or stated another way, the Board paid for folding and stitching 9,540 more copies than were published."

Now that has been answered in three ways. First, Dr. Agnew answers it. He says:

"I do not know what the law of New York State is, but I do know something of the laws of Pennsylvania, and I know that such a charge as that made on page 7 of this report would be an indictable offense, a criminal offense, and the persons who uttered it would place themselves in a very serious position indeed."

Then he quotes the very words I have read you, and then he proceeds:

"I say that under the law that is a slander. Let me give you the facts. The regular edition of the Westminster Lesson Leaf is 4,154,364 copies, which is read in that statement, and that it costs exactly, as represented here, \$3,117.19. But there is, in addition to these Three Thousand Six Hundred and Fifty-four copies, one-fifth Sunday insert, costing 195; and in addition, there are several thousand copies which are cut up (\$33.80), making what they say is a discrepancy of \$3,935.60."

You see that he adds together \$409, \$195 and \$33.80, making \$708.60, or within 61 cents of the entire discrepancy. But, determined not to leave anything undone, he then goes on and accounts for it in another way:

"In addition to this they say that they call it \$731.51, a mistake of \$31.71; whereas I show you that there is no mistake at all. The financial year of business men in Philadelphia closes with the last day of December. Our year closes with the 1st of April, when we make our report to the General Assembly. In that item where there is that apparent discrepancy in the account, it is simply this: that the account ran over a part of fourteen months instead of twelve months. We get our work done, and whenever the man who does it wants his money, whether it is three months or four months, we pay him; consequently we paid in one instance, in one year—and then that year would include thirteen months of work, and the actual cost was \$3,117—but we paid that other amount of \$3,936 on that particular account. Is there any discrepancy in that whatever?"

I should say there was. He explains the thing all out, but he forgets this little fact. You see, gentlemen, that he not only accounts for \$708.41, but he accounts for \$3,946. Assuming that he said what he meant to, it is a singular fact that while twelve months cost \$329.75 per month, yet when they have the thirteenth month that month costs \$708.80. Thirteen is an unfortunate number. [Laughter.]

You may take either of those that you please, and when you have taken the one you will wish you had taken the other. Now, the Committee of Seven say it was a misapprehension. The Special Committee say it was an apprehension. We understood the thing exactly. There is not a particle of slander or libel or criminal offense in it. And I will prove that. If you have the report of the Board for 18-9— for you will please understand that that was the year that we investi-

gated and not 1889-1890, as stated by the Chairman of the Committee—I regret he was not better posted on it—if you will turn to the annual report of 1889, the Board stated that they published in that year of this particular thing 4,156,264 copies. Now, then, Mr. Black, the business superintendent, gave me an official statement which I have right here in which he said that the cost of doing that work was seventy-five cents per thousand. That is official. Now, if you will take a pencil and figure that up you will see that it figures \$3,117. I called then upon the treasurer for an itemized statement of what the periodicals cost. Here it is: "Folding, stitching and cutting Westminster Lesson Leaf, \$3,825.60." That is the official report of the Board as to the number; second, the official statement of the business superintendent as to the amount paid; and, third, the statement of the treasurer as to how much he paid in that year. We said nothing whatever about it. We picked out that word "discrepancy" because it is a good word. It is not half as bad as it is called by some. Now, they actually had the cheek to stand on the platform of the General Assembly and dare to threaten the chairman and the Committee with a criminal offense and with arrest, etc., also Governor Beaver who sat there in the corner, close by my side, said to me: "It is not so, it is not true." But there must something be said in order to get around this thing.

Now, I want to say right here that I have in this whole matter—as those of you who have heard me before know—I wish to say that I have conscientiously refrained from anything that could appear like an attack upon the Business Committee or the Board of the Church.

Adjourned.

SIXTH DAY—MORNING SESSION.

The first business was a report of the Committee on a religious exhibit at the Columbian Exposition, which was presented by Rev. Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago. The report made the following recommendations:

First. That the General Assembly give its approval to the proposition to have an exhibit at the World's Columbian Exposition illustrative of the influence of religion on civilization, and that it invites the hearty co-operation of other Churches and religious organizations throughout the land in the work of preparing such an exhibit.

Second. That a Committee of nine be appointed by this Assembly empowered to confer with the Exposition authorities and the representatives of other religious bodies, and make specific plans and arrange for the preparation of the exhibits representing our own Church and its work, provided that all the funds needed shall be procured by contributions from individuals interested in the exhibit.

The report was accepted and its recommendations adopted.

The Standing Committee on the Increase of Ministers reported through Dr. Nicolls, who said that four of the resolutions in the report were adopted by the last General Assembly. In the third resolution was this:

"In order to secure uniformity of practice in the reception of such ministers [ministers from other denominations] the Assembly hereby directs the following to be overtured to the presbyteries, in accordance with Section 6, Chapter XII of the form of Government."

This report was ordered to be printed for the consideration of the presbyteries, so that this was not sent down directly in the form of an overture. Now, by amendment to the Form of Government that section is taken out so that it could not be overtured in that form, nor was it the wish of the Committee that this resolution should be sent down to be adopted as a part of the Form of Government, but only as a rule. The Special Committee recommend that this be amended as follows:

In order to secure uniformity of practice in the reception of such ministers, the Assembly hereby enacts the following rule for the direction of the presbyteries: To amend the original resolution by the insertion of that, instead of sending it down to be adopted as a part of the Form of Government.

The amendment proposed was adopted.

Dr. Moore, the Permanent Clerk, stated that the General Assembly from time to time has adopted rules and regulations, and that the action just taken came under those rules. He claimed that the Assembly must have legislative authority to enact rules and regulations for carrying out the principles which they have adopted, and he objected to sending this to the presbyteries for overtures, because then it would become a part of the Form of Government, and, if found impracticable, desiring alteration or repeal, the General Assembly must send down overtures to the presbyteries to that effect; otherwise the Assembly will have two Forms of Government, one under one set of rules reachful by the Assembly at any time; the other beyond the reach of the Assembly except through the consent of the presbyteries.

Dr. Nicolls remarked that this was not designed to be sent down as an overture to the presbyteries. It was simply a rule. He stated that over 1,500 ministers from other Churches had been received into the Church since the reunion, and this is designed simply to secure uniformity among the presbyteries on the subject.

Dr. Moore said that with that statement from the Chairman he would withdraw any objection to it.

Dr. William C. Roberts, the Stated Clerk, said he hoped that the Assembly would call a halt in this matter, and do what the last Assembly did in regard to it.

After some further discussion, the rule was referred to the Committee on Polity of the Church.

The time having arrived for the consideration of Foreign Missions, Dr. Hayden, of Cleveland, the Chairman of the Committee, submitted the report, together with the following recommendations:

First. That the Minutes of the Board be approved.

Second. That the following members of the Board, whose term of office has expired, be re-elected—

Third. That the Assembly adopt as it is the suggestions made in the body of this report as to missions and methods of stimulating interests and securing the necessary funds for this work.

Fourth. That a Christmas offering be planned for and taken in every Sunday-school in aid of making Christ known to the nations, that this blessed charity we will associate with one of the sweetest festivals of childhood.

Fifth. That our various Women's Boards be heartily commended for the work of the past year, and begged not to relax one jot or tittle of their splendid endeavors, but to go on to greater things.

Sixth. That the recommendation of last year as to expenditure be re-affirmed for this year, with instructions to the Board to obey the injunction of the Assembly, if the exigencies of the work demand so much, and the churches are urged to at once plan to meet the require-

tions by raising the sum of \$1,100,000, that the Board may incur no debt.

On motion, the report was accepted, and the Treasurer of the Board, Mr. William Dulles, Jr., addressed the Assembly on the subject of the finances.

Mr. Dulles was followed by Arthur Mitchell, D.D.

Dr. Chas. A. Dickey presented the report of the Committee to whom was referred the duty of drafting a suitable minute expressing the sense of the Assembly in respect to the death of Dr. Henry J. Van Dyke, which was unanimously adopted; and the Assembly adjourned.

SIXTH DAY—AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Moderator announced the Committee to represent the General Assembly at the World's Columbian Exposition as follows: Mr. George Morrow, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, the Rev. Drs. Herrick, Johnson, S. J. McPherson and J. H. Worcester, Cyrus McCormick, W. C. Gray, Henry Warden and John M. Converse.

FRATERNAL GREETINGS.

The report of the Standing Committee on Correspondence was read, and delegates from corresponding bodies were then heard.

The Rev. Joseph H. Dubbs, D.D., of Lancaster, Penn., of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of the United States, was first introduced and conveyed the cordial Christian greeting of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of the United States.

Mason Gallagher, D.D., of the General Council of the Reformed Episcopal Church, was next introduced to the Assembly, and spoke at length.

Dr. George W. Chamberlain, representing the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Brazil, was introduced, and spoke as follows:

Mr. Moderator, Fathers and Brethren: The commission which I hold from the Synod of Brazil empowers me to convey the salutations of that Synod to this General Assembly, and bids me also lay before the Assembly all the information in my power in regard to the present state, the future prospects and the great needs of Brazil. That is simply out of my power in the brief time allotted for a salutation. I shall avail myself of the courtesy of the stated clerk and reduce that to writing, so that it may reach you, and through you the churches which you represent. If I were, however, to attempt to depict the present state of Brazil as regards the Gospel of Jesus Christ, I would refer you to the state of Jericho when the walls had fallen down. We were accustomed to represent it as an open door hitherto. There are no walls now on which to hang the door. We are not surprised at the radical measures of the provisional Government, for the men of whom it was composed had already advanced during twenty-five years their ideas on this subject. But the Constituent Assembly, in face of the protest of the apostolate, as it called itself, that is, the united body of bishops, for there were twelve, and they protested, anticipating the gathering of the Constituent Assembly on the 15th of November of last year, the anniversary of the revolution, that unless the constitution as drafted and decreed by the provisional Government were modified in those features touching religious liberty, the Government would henceforth find itself confronted by the united apostolate and 12,000,000 of Catholics—that the Constituent Assembly, I say, in face of this process should have quietly proceeded to ratify all these radical measures and to make them fundamental laws for all generations in Brazil, has surprised even the most hopeful of us. If we enjoyed toleration when our Synod was organized we now enjoy ample liberty.

Now, as to future prospects. That depends upon two factors. First it depends upon you, upon the Church here, which is the mother Church of the Synod of Brazil. In the proclamation of reciprocity issued on the 5th of February last by President Harrison, there are specified those things which you may send into Brazil free of duty. There is one thing which is not mentioned, and that is the Gospel. That is free, as free as you have a mind to make it. And there is a call for reciprocity, not proceeding merely from the millions of Brazil, but from the great Head of the Church, who established this as a foundation principle of our retaining that which he gives us, "Freely ye have received, freely give." There is another factor, however, which, if the fountain of liberty should be stanchd here at home, indicates plainly to us the future prospects of the Presbyterian Church in Brazil. When our Synod was organized there were twelve native ministers. There never has been an increase since. The spirit of self-support has been growing immensely for the last five years. There has existed what we call a fund for national missions, to which every church and every church member has been urged to contribute. It was provided that out of this fund every church which raised four-fifths of the salary of its pastor might draw the remaining fifth. It looked unfair, as tho it favored the stronger churches. But no sooner has a church availed itself of this privilege but it has immediately reflected: "That has been contributed by the poorer members of the church," and they never have drawn a second. It has actually spurred them on in making up their own salary and in turn to contribute to this fund. This is an index finger to the future of this Church, when the young Church of Brazil is undertaking its own support. You will have some items showing this spirit of self-support laid before you in the Board of Foreign Missions. South America has been brought into view within the last eighteen months, not only by what has occurred in Brazil, but by what was contemporaneous with it, the gathering here of the representatives of South America. Judge Wilson told me that when those representatives of the South American States were in Philadelphia the committee were somewhat embarrassed as to what they could do with them on the Sabbath Day. They were invited to services at Girard College, and it fell to Judge Wilson to direct that service. Knowing that they were nominally Roman Catholics, he endeavored to avoid anything that would be likely to offend them. Some of them said to him subsequently: "You need not have feared to touch our sensibilities. We are nominally Roman Catholics, it is true; but there is not a man who does not know that the greatest foe of our civil liberties is the Church of Rome." Many of the greatest statesmen of this country have not yet learned this fact, but the thoughtful men in South America have learned it by 300 years of object lessons. These men, who are stretching their hands for help for the founding upon a permanent basis of civil government, realize that their foe is the religion that has called itself the mother Church. They need, therefore, your help. There is a cry coming to you from the thirteen or fourteen millions of Brazil to aid them in leading men out of the dark night which Rome has systematically and persistently given, and will forever give to Brazil, if those who have the Gospel free shall not give it freely. I beseech you, brethren and fathers, to remember that the needs of Brazil are all implored in the cry which, whether consciously or unconsciously, is uttered by these millions: "Ho, there, you who have the light, bring it." [Applause.]

Dr. Green, the Moderator, responded to the addresses as follows:

It is to us a very pleasant feature in our arrangement that we are able to set apart a brief time to receive the kind expressions of your

regard, and to express our own for the bodies which you respectively represent. We are very glad to receive these greetings from the Reformed Church in the United States and from the Reformed Episcopal Church and from the daughter of our own Church in Brazil, and we extend most heartily our congratulations and greetings to the bodies which you severally represent, and pray that when you return to your homes you will express the kind and fraternal feelings which are here entertained for them. I have no time at present to express at any length the interest that we have felt in the communications which you have made to us. We rejoice in the statements which you have brought to us of the work which you are doing and of the blessings that God has bestowed upon you in your enlargement and in your increase, and we bid you godspeed in your noble work, and pray that God may bless you more and more a thousandfold. We are firm believers in the unity of the Church of Christ. We believe that all God's people in all the earth and in every form of organization are one in Christ, and that nothing can separate them, that nothing can break the unity which really does belong to all those who are united to the Lord Jesus Christ, the one living Head, and bound to him. If they are one in him they have the same faith substantially, they have the same spirit of the living God abiding in all their hearts, the same light produced by the Holy Spirit, manifesting itself in lives of obedience and love and active service.

There is a unity among all the followers of our Lord which nothing can break. And yet this unity is not in all cases manifested to the world as it should be. There are various influences and various obstacles that stand in the way and obstruct it, and therefore we are especially gratified and pleased when our brethren state to us and set forth to us the actual unity which is manifested between ourselves and them. We are rejoiced to know that we have the same great substance of faith existing between us; that we believe in the same Lord; that we receive the same great principles; that we are walking by the same road; that we are seeking the same end. But we do not suppose that the unity of the Church of Christ consists essentially in an external organization which is to embrace all the followers of the Lord Jesus. With all the disadvantages that beset denominational distinctions, there are some advantages, nevertheless, that belong to them. We would not have an organization, if it were possible to bring it about, in which all those who receive the Lord Jesus Christ should be embraced in one body. In order to accomplish this, it is necessary to pare down our belief point by point until nothing shall be professed by the united body except that which is common to all Christians and is absolutely essential to all. We think that there is an advantage in each separate body of Christians holding firmly to that faith which they themselves believe to be taught in the Word of God. We may differ from our Christian friends in some particulars, we may differ in certain articles of faith, we may differ in our form of government, we may differ in our modes of worship; but we can agree to differ. We rejoice in the prosperity of all the true people of God of every name. We rejoice in their doing for God and for his influence; but at the same time we feel that there would be an advantage if there could be a more formal expression of the unity which really subsists among Christians, and therefore we rejoice in the movement which has been made by the Reformed Churches in the United States to enter into federal union with a sister Church; and we appreciate the principles and motives which have led you to take that step, and we hope that that may be an omen for good. We hope that the time may not be far distant when the people of God of different names, even if they do not change in any item their own peculiar creed, tho they have not changed in any particular their individual organization, nevertheless shall be so brought together in federal relations that, maintaining their own organization, maintaining their own special peculiarities which they believe to be best for themselves, maintaining all that is precious and dear to them, nevertheless shall come in close relations, close fellowship, intimate connection with their brethren of other names, so that they can co-operate, so that they can work together, so that they can present a united front against the enemy, so that they can stand shoulder to shoulder in the great battle which is waging between our blessed Lord and the powers of darkness. We hope that the time may not be far distant when there shall be some effective arrangement made between the different denominations of Christians in this country by which, tho they yield nothing of that which they treasure, which they prize, which they believe to be based upon the Word of God, which they believe to be best for themselves, nevertheless they can clasp hands with their Christian brethren, and can move forward as different regiments in the same great army, engaged in the same work, and accomplishing more effectively than they are able to do by their separate labors the great work that is before them. God bless you, brethren, in your various organizations—bless you in your work, and do exceedingly and abundantly for them and for us above all that we can ask for you. [Applause.]

Dr. Francis L. Patton interrupted the presentation of the cause of church erection to read the following report in order to have it printed in time for discussion to-morrow morning:

DR. PATTON'S REPORT ON THE BRIGGS CASE.

The Standing Committee on Theological Seminaries, to whom were referred certain overtures respecting the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., beg leave respectfully to report that they have examined the same and find that sixty-three presbyteries, to wit, the presbyteries of Allegheny, Baltimore, Butler, Cairo, Carlisle, Cherokee Nation, Chester, Cincinnati, Clarion, Columbus, Crawfordville, Dayton, Dubaque, Duluth, Ebenezer, Freeport, Grand Rapids, Hastings, Holston, Huron, Iowa, Iowa City, Los Angeles, Lackawanna, La Crosse, Marion, Maumee, Monmouth, Nebraska City, Neosho, New Brunswick, New Castle, North River, Northumberland, Osborne, Ozark, Philadelphia, Philadelphia Central, Philadelphia North, Redstone, Pittsburgh, Portsmouth, Pueblo, Puget Sound, St. Clairsville, St. Louis, Shenango, Solomon, South Florida, Springfield, Steubenville, Transylvania, Trinity, Union, Utah, Vincennes, Walla Walla, Washington City, West Jersey, White Water, Willamette, Winona and Wood River, have overtured the General Assembly in reference to the utterances of the Rev. Dr. Briggs, contained in the address which he delivered on the occasion of his induction into the chair of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Some of the presbyteries recommend specific action on the part of the Assembly, but the majority of them ask in general terms that the General Assembly take such action as, in its wisdom, it may deem best. Inasmuch as the theological training of our candidates for the ministry is a matter in which all the presbyteries have a deep and common interest, the presbyteries aforesaid are to be commended for their vigilant regard for the purity of the Church, and their overtures should have weight with the Assembly in taking action upon a matter which would in any event have come to the knowledge of the Assembly, through the report of the directors of Union Theological Seminary to the General Assembly. The present report of your Committee is also a report of so much of the report of the directors of the Union Theological Seminary as refers to the appointment of Dr. Briggs to the chair of Biblical Theology in said seminary. It appears from that report that "on the 11th of November 1890, the Edward Robinson Professorship of Biblical Theology was founded and endowed by Charles Butler, LL.D., by the gift of \$100,000," and that "at the same time Professor Charles A. Briggs, D.D., was transferred to the new chair from the Davenport Professorship of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages." On the 30th of January, 1891, Dr. Briggs delivered an inaugural address on "The Authority of the

Holy Scripture," which has been the subject of severe criticism, and which is the occasion of the recommendation which your Committee feel constrained to make to the Assembly.

In making these recommendations your Committee feel that they are acting in the discharge of a difficult and delicate duty. The matter with which they have been called to deal bears in a very important way upon the purity and peace of our Church. The interests of the Union Theological Seminary should be most carefully considered, and great regard should be had for the judgment of those who, as directors and as members of its faculty, are administering its affairs. The Committee feel, moreover, that while the Assembly has not been officially informed, the Presbytery of New York has taken steps that look toward a prosecution of Dr. Briggs, on the charge of heresy; that well-known facts should be so far recognized as to secure from the Assembly the protection of the good name of Dr. Briggs in the discussion of the question that will come before the Assembly through this report, and also to prevent any expression of opinion on the part of this Assembly that could be justly regarded as a prejudgment of the case that will soon, as it now appears, assume the form of a judicial process in the Presbytery of New York. It cannot be too carefully observed that the question before this Assembly is not whether Dr. Briggs as a Presbyterian minister has so far contravened the teaching of the Westminster Confession of Faith as to have made himself liable to judicial censure, but whether in view of the utterances contained in the inaugural address already referred to, and the disturbing effect which they have produced throughout the Church, the election of Dr. Briggs to the chair of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary should be disapproved. Your Committee have examined the law of the Church regarding the relation of the General Assembly to the theological seminaries under its care. The relation of the Assembly to the Union Theological Seminary, so far as the appointment of professors is concerned, is embodied in the following statement taken from page 390 of the New Digest.

"First. That the board of directors of each theological seminary shall be authorized to appoint all professors for the same.

"Second. That all such appointments shall be reported to the General Assembly and no such appointment of a professor shall be considered as a complete election if disapproved by a majority vote of the Assembly.

"And further be it resolved, That the Board of Directors of Union Theological Seminary in the city of New York, persuaded that the plan proposed in the memorial will meet the cordial approval of the patrons, donors and friends of all these seminaries and contribute to the peace and prosperity of the Church, do hereby agree, if the said plan shall be adopted by the General Assembly, that they will agree to conform to the same, the Union Theological Seminary in New York being in this respect on the same ground with other theological seminaries of the Presbyterian Church."—General Assembly's Minutes, 1870, pp. 143, 149.

"The Assembly complied with this request."—See General Assembly's Minutes, 1870, pp. 62-64.

On page 397 of the new Digest there is the following statement respecting the "limitations of time within which the Assembly may exercise its veto in the election of a professor":

"That the Assembly declare that the true meaning of the act subjecting the election of a professor to the veto of the Assembly is that such election be reported to the next General Assembly thereafter; and, if not vetoed by that Assembly, the election shall be regarded as complete according to the plan ratified by the Assembly of 1870."—General Assembly's Minutes, pp. 60-65, 1878; 1871, p. 861.

It appears, then, that, according to the terms of the contract quoted above, the Directors of the Union Theological Seminary have conceded to the Assembly the right to veto the appointment of professors, and that an election is complete unless vetoed by the next Assembly following the election. Your Committee would have been disposed to recommend that the report of the Directors of the Union Theological Seminary so far as it has reference to the transfer of Dr. Briggs to the Chair of Biblical Theology, be referred to the next Assembly, if such a disposition of the matter had been possible; but the Assembly has clearly no power to postpone action. The control of the Church over the election of Dr. Briggs ceases with the dissolution of the present Assembly. Your Committee are constrained, therefore, to say that, in their judgment, it is the duty of the Assembly to disapprove of the appointment of Dr. Briggs to the Edward A. Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary.

Your Committee desire to say, moreover, that while they are clear in their judgment that the Assembly has the right to veto the appointment of Dr. Briggs to the Chair of Biblical Theology, it is possible to impose a meaning upon the apparently unambiguous phraseology of the compact between the General Assembly and the directors of the Union Theological Seminary that would lead to a different conclusion. Fairness also requires us to remember that the Assembly is one of the parties to the contract that is called upon to construe. While your Committee are of the opinion that the compact in question did not contemplate the distinction between the election of a person to be a professor and the appointment of one already a professor to the work of a certain department of instruction, it cannot be denied that such a distinction exists—the one act conferring status, the other only assigning duties. The seemingly irregular course of the directors of the Union Theological Seminary whereby Dr. Briggs was inducted into office before the Assembly had been advised of his appointment, is doubtless to be attributed to their mode of construing their compact with the General Assembly. While your Committee are sure that the Assembly will not and should not admit that its right of disapproval is restricted to the original election of a person to a place in the Faculty of the Union Theological Seminary, and while they are of the opinion that, acting according to the light it now has, the Assembly cannot but disapprove of the appointment of Dr. Briggs to the Professorship of Biblical Theology in that seminary, they are, nevertheless of the opinion that, in the interests of the mutual relations of confidence and cordial respect subsisting between the Union Theological Seminary and the General Assembly it would be eminently proper for the Assembly to appoint a committee to confer with the directors of the Union Theological Seminary in regard to the relations of the said seminary to the General Assembly, and to report to the next General Assembly. Your Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

"First. Resolved, That in the exercise of its right to veto the appointment of professors in the Union Theological Seminary the General Assembly hereby disapproves of the appointment of the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., to the Edward Robinson Professorship of Biblical Theology in that seminary by transfer from another chair in said seminary.

"Second. Resolved, That a committee consisting of eight ministers and seven ruling elders be appointed by the Assembly to confer with the directors of the Union Theological Seminary in regard to the relations of the said Seminary to the General Assembly and to report to the next General Assembly."

Respectfully submitted, FRANCIS L. PATTON, Chairman.

The Assembly's Committee on Church Election through the Rev. Dr. W. A. Bartlett, made a report presenting the facts contained in the report of the Board, and urging the continued hearty support of the Board in its invaluable work, supplementing and making sure all the gains of the home mission department. He then introduced the Rev. Dr. Eskie N. White, who spoke on the subject.

Among other things, he said:

Since this Board was organized there have been more than 5,000 churches completed through its instrumentality. We have distributed more than \$2,500,000, and we hold mortgages to just about that extent and insurance to just about that extent, and we want to have that work continued and helped. We want special aid in this work. Many missionaries and ministers, with their wives and children, suffer severely in the West from the want of proper housing. The women

who have gone out from comfortable homes into these new settlements, would be made happy by having a little house which they could dress with their own hands and make comfortable, where they could bring up their children uncontaminated by the surroundings to which they are often exposed. Do not forget this manse fund when you talk to the ladies of your church. Now, brethren we want your sympathy and your prayers. We want that you should think a great deal more about this Board than you do. When you face your congregations do not forget the Board of Church Election. There are eight hundred churches without houses of worship. We want to catch up, and we want to build houses for all these congregations, so that there will not be a congregation large or small belonging to the Presbyterian Church that has not a church home in which to dwell. In this country cities grow up very quickly, and our ministers catch the active spirit of the times. One minister promised his congregation to have a church erected in twelve days in which he could preach, and the church had all to be constructed within that time. Remember that if you want to hold this land for our Lord Jesus Christ, it is not by the itinerant missionary preaching and passing on, or leaving a little church organized; it is by the establishment of a house of worship where there can be a permanence, and where a man can stand and preach for Christ under his own roof tree. General Grant in his book said in reference to his work: "It was the shovel and pick that did it. When they pushed forward they threw up embankments, and when they had thrown up these redoubts they were there to stay." Brethren let us throw up our intrenchments, let us intrench our army, and then we are there to stay, and God will bless our work in this great land. [Applause.]

SEVENTH DAY—MORNING SESSION.

The discussion of Dr. Patton's report, presented yesterday, was begun at an early hour and continued until 1 P. M. After a brief recess, Judge S. M. Breckinridge, of St. Louis, made an impressive speech and at its close, with the words, "I feel that I have discharged my duty faithfully," on his lips, he fell to the floor and died within five minutes. President Patton, of Princeton, Dr. Francis, of Cincinnati, and Dr. Bartlett, of Washington, favored the adoption of the report, vetoing Dr. Briggs's appointment and recommending a Committee of Conference. Dr. Logan, of Scranton, Prof. Henry P. Smith, of Lane Seminary, and Dr. Dickey, of Philadelphia, the latter a director of Union Seminary, opposed the report. All these spoke in the morning, and in the afternoon, Judge Breckinridge, a member of the committee drafting the report made the only speech, and this was in support of the resolutions recommended. The Assembly adjourned as soon as it was announced that Mr. Breckenridge was dead, and spent the evening in prayer.

DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT IN THE BRIGGS MATTER.

Dr. F. L. Patton: *Mr. Moderator, Fathers and Brethren:* I shall not detain you at this moment with a long speech. I rise simply to say a word by way of explanation. I am sure that whatever differences of opinion may exist in this Assembly there is no one here who is not ready to credit the Committee that has been charged with the responsibility of introducing this report with the desire to do simply what is best. I wish to say that in the fullest recognition on our part of the possibility of mistake and error we have discharged this duty under the impulse of this one desire, to do what is demanded by the exigencies of the occasion, and to do it in the spirit of kindness and in the fullest recognition of all the rights of all parties concerned. The report of this Committee is unanimous. Propositions were made in the Committee looking to a different action, and different action was not taken simply because after the fullest discussion the Committee were clear that this was best. It is the least, in our judgment, that the Assembly can do. It is the most, in our judgment, that the Assembly is called upon to do. We have tried to look at the past, to study the present, and to anticipate the future in the consideration of this question. It is possible that the debate may bring to light matters that we have not considered; but I think we have considered the matter in all its lights, and we are ready when the occasion comes to give a reason for every part of this report. We should be sorry if it is found necessary to deal with this report in protracted debate, but if protracted debate is necessary we trust that, so far as we are concerned, and we are sure that so far as others are concerned, the debate will be conducted in the spirit that has dictated the report of your committee.

SPEECH OF PROFESSOR SMITH.

Prof. Henry Preserved Smith, of Lane Seminary, then addressed the Assembly. He said:

Mr. Moderator: A proposition to terminate the usefulness, so far as his connection with our Church is concerned, of a minister in good standing in that Church, certainly deserves the most careful consideration. I desire that this report, which is such a proposition, should receive this careful and, if possible, unprejudiced consideration. The gravity of the situation is enhanced by the fact that whatever the Committee may say—and I wish to credit them with the fullest desire to do what is right and best in the case—I say, whatever the Committee or the Assembly may say, it will be inferred that the gentleman who is the subject of remark this morning, is guilty of some offense which, in the eyes of the Assembly, makes him unfit him for the position to which he has been elected. By taking the action proposed by the Committee we shall therefore not only terminate the usefulness of a minister in good standing, but we shall cast reproach upon his good name. It cannot be otherwise. The gravity of the situation is still further enhanced by the fact that a great institution of our Church, already stricken by the hand of God, will be crippled in its work for the immediate future, if this action is taken. These are reasons not against the action, but in favor of careful consideration of all that can be urged in favor of the action. Now, sir, as I hold that there is not sufficient reason for the action proposed, I am well aware that I take the unpopular side. I must, therefore, ask particularly that you will lay aside all prejudice, and give me your most dispassionate attention while I consider at some length the reasons which may be urged for this procedure, and endeavor to show, as I have no doubt the Committee would be glad to have me show, that those reasons are not sufficient for the action proposed.

In the first place it is doubtful whether an assembly of this kind is competent to judge (I do not call in question its right in the case) as to the qualifications of a professor elected to a chair in one of our theological seminaries, aside, I mean, from his soundness in doctrine. And here I suspect that the Moderator of this Assembly (Dr. Green) has set the standard of theological teaching so high that unconsciously you are led to compare other professors-elect with him. But, sir, if you set that standard, how many of the chairs in your seminaries will be filled? Suppose you say, "Every man who is elected to a chair in our theological seminaries must be as tall as Dr. Green." I am not as tall as Dr. Green. Professor Curtis, my friend of the McCormick Seminary, is not as tall as Dr. Green. There are not enough tall men who are Hebrew scholars to go around. There are not enough Dr. Greens to go around. I wish we had a Dr. Green for every chair of biblical theology. [Applause.] But we have to make use of what we have, the material at our disposal. Dr. Green is not six or seven or eight,

but one, and while we envy Princeton the possession of such a treasure, we think it invidious to insist that every professor in every theological seminary should reach the stature, physically or mentally or morally, of any one who is already in a chair of any one of our institutions. Beware, therefore, lest in your high estimate of the theological chair, you set so high a standard that no one will be found to reach it. Shall we keep our chairs vacant because we cannot reach the ideal set by this Assembly?

But, sir, we ought to distrust our judgment in this case for another reason. Dr. Briggs, who is before us for consideration, is not a new man in the position to which he is called. After careful and special preparation he was elected seventeen years ago, if I am correct in my figures, to the chair of Old Testament Exegesis in the Union Theological Seminary. For seventeen years he has filled that chair with acceptance. We have the testimony of the Board under which he has served for all that time, we have the testimony of his colleagues, we have the testimony of large numbers of his students in his favor. And what is the tendency, what is the trend and meaning of that testimony? That Dr. Briggs is first a man of large ability; secondly, that he is a man of distinguished scholarship; thirdly, that he has peculiar qualities as a teacher; fourthly, that religiously and spiritually he makes the impression of deep earnestness and large evangelical piety. [A voice: "Good," and light applause.]

That is the testimony, sir, of those with whom he has been most intimately associated, his colleagues in the seminary, the directors who have watched his career and the students who have been under him. Now, this Assembly, to which Dr. Briggs is a stranger, comes and says: "Dr. Briggs shall not teach, he shall not occupy that chair," when we have this testimony in his favor. Are you willing to take that stand? The presbyteries overture us to do what in our wisdom is best in the premises. Can anything be better in our wisdom than recognizing our ignorance, to ask the testimony of those who know, and on the ground of this testimony to continue Dr. Briggs in his career of usefulness upon which he entered seventeen years ago? Sir, I hold that this creates a presumption in favor of Dr. Briggs and against the action which is proposed here, of disapproving his election.

Now, the reasons urged for such action ought to be many and weighty. So far as they have been urged in my hearing they can be reduced to two. The first is: "Dr. Briggs has been misunderstood." The second is: "That Dr. Briggs is not sound in his doctrinal teaching." You will think, sir, before I am through that like Dogberry, I am willing "to bestow all my tediousness upon you." At the risk of that I desire by your courtesy and forbearance to consider carefully these two reasons, which are urged for the action proposed by your Committee.

The first is that Dr. Briggs has been misunderstood, the implication being that he has not expressed himself clearly, and, therefore, has been misunderstood. It is said that in a quarrel both parties are generally wrong. Well, in a misunderstanding it is possible that either party may be in the wrong. It is said that a man was going along Fulton Market, where there are fishmongers' stalls, and, stopping before a pile of live lobsters, he said to the keeper of the shop: "It is a curious thing that if you put anything hard, like a stick or a cane, in the claw of a lobster, he will take firm hold of it, but if you put anything soft, like your finger he will not." "Oh, said the dealer, 'won't he? You try it. You put your finger in and see.'" "Well," said the man, "I don't want to put my finger in, but here is my dog. We will put his tail in and see."

The result of the experiment was as you might expect. The dog was soon seen departing at a quick race down the street with the lobster attached to his tail. "Oh," said the dealer, seeing what was up: "Look here, you call that dog back. He has taken my lobster away." "No," said the man, "that dog is in bodily pain. I am afraid he would not mind me now. You call off your lobster." [Laughter.] Now, sir, they say to us, "Your dog is making a great deal of fuss." We say: "Call off the lobster." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Moderator, I very well recognize the gravity of the situation, and I certainly would be the last to make light of anything in this controversy. I have watched it from the beginning with a good deal of care. I have had more direct personal interest in it, I suppose, than the large majority of this assembly. Now, the fact which has most struck me in this connection is the fact, which we are prone to ignore, but which exists nevertheless and which is a larger factor in our church life—I mean the existence and the influence (I was going to say the omnipotence) of the religious press. We have among us, then a body of men who conduct newspapers which are identified, in name at least, with the Presbyterian Church. These papers go into almost every one of our homes. The editors themselves are fond of telling us how many readers they have who believe their particular paper to be the best paper that is published and who never read any other. They are constantly magnifying their office in regard to the influence which they exert, greater than that of any pastor. I am not disposed to deny any of their claims on this head. Now, this press of ours, has become omnipotent. It goes into almost all our homes. It is read with care and attention upon the only day in the week on which the large majority of our people have much time for reading. Its dicta are taken, I was going to say, as inerrant. They certainly have a tremendous influence upon those who read them.

Now, the factor in this case which we need to consider very carefully, is this influence of the religious press. I shall not be going too far, I suppose, when I say that a large majority of the commissioners here present have obtained their impressions of this case from this source. Now, I have always been treated kindly by the gentlemen who conduct these papers. I desire to say nothing against them. I have a high regard for those whom I know personally. But, sir, I ask you whether, in the nature of the case, they are competent as a jury to decide upon such a matter as is before us? We know what their decision is; but are they the right persons to make such a decision? Mr. Moderator, no man can be a specialist in all departments. Even the editor of a religious paper, however wide his reading, however large his knowledge, cannot be a specialist in all departments. These gentlemen, therefore, and with them the papers which they conduct, are liable to mistakes in judgment. That the Church has misunderstood what Dr. Briggs says, means to a large extent that these gentlemen have misunderstood what Dr. Briggs says. But, further, from what point of view do these gentlemen regard the utterances of any one whom they criticize? Is it from the high plane of theological learning? Is it not rather from the popular position? They are in sympathy, and desire to be in sympathy, with the people at large. Therefore, when anything new comes before them, they are apt to judge it rather from the popular plane than from the special plane of theological learning. This I give as a general rule, and I think that a large part of the misunderstanding complained of can be traced to this source.

Allow me to enter a little into the history of the case. The inaugural address of Dr. Briggs was delivered before a select audience, consisting of the students, faculty and trustees of the Union Theological Seminary and a few ladies and gentlemen in sympathy with theological education, who were present at that time. The following week a prominent religious newspaper published a syllabus of Dr. Briggs's address, accompanied with an editorial making a violent attack upon him. Now, is it fair to judge an address, is it fair to judge a man by a table of contents? No, sir. A syllabus is simply a table of contents of the address. Is it right, I say, is it fair, in any court in the land would you be allowed to judge a man upon such material? Why, sir, pardon me, if I weary you, in the institution with which I am connected one of the theological professors printed for the use of his classes a syllabus of his lecture. An examiner at the seminary took up that syllabus one day

with the view of ascertaining the orthodoxy of the professor in question who as having been connected with the former newschool—I beg your pardon, perhaps that would be transcending the limits of what would be proper in an occasion of this kind—the fact is the commissioner examined the syllabus with the intention of criticising, in a good sense, I presume (the sense of the higher criticism), the lecture of the professor in question. His eye first lit upon this phrase: “A new creed needed.” Could he believe his eyes? There was the evidence of heresy right before him. “A new creed needed.” Our Westminster Confession to be thrown away; inadequate to the demands of the times. This was before the days of revision. Why, he began to make a sensation at once. The misunderstanding spread. The whole board of examiners called that professor before them to ask an explanation of that term, “A new creed needed.” He turned back to the page and pointed out to them that the chapter in question was on the history of the Westminster Confession, recounting that the Westminster Assembly, on coming together, considered first the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; that, coming to the conclusion that they were inadequate, they decided that a new creed was needed, which resulted in the Westminster Confession. Now, if on the basis of that syllabus, that table of contents, some religious or secular newspaper had published against my honored colleague an article showing that he was away out of line with the Westminster Confession, that he was advocating the making of a new creed for our Church, that misunderstanding would have gone all through the Church, and we should have seen just such a sensation as we have seen now. We should have had presbyteries overturning the Assembly to investigate the teaching in Lane Theological Seminary. We should have had just what we see before us now; and whose fault would it have been? Why, the fault of those who misunderstood, and not the fault of the professor against whom these charges were brought. Now, it was upon the basis of a table of contents, a syllabus of an address, that these charges were first made and circulated. And I know that in some presbyteries at least action was proposed, and I think in some it was actually taken, upon that basis, and sent up to the Assembly. Now, this is the question in my mind: Is that sort of agitation, that sort of misunderstanding, a reason for depriving a man of his chosen career? I say no, Mr. Moderator, and so far I say that this misunderstanding is not a reason for judging a professor as we judge him here.

I will not enter into the general question as to how far it is fair to judge a man by a single address, when he has published four books of acknowledged ability, scholarship and usefulness. But, sir, that a man should be judged by a syllabus of an address, that seems to me to be going too far.

But the second charge is doubtless the graver one—the charge that the views of Professor Briggs are not in accordance with the Confession of Faith; that is to say, that he is not orthodox. And trespassing upon your indulgence a little longer, I hope you will allow me to consider the address of Professor Briggs, to which allusion has been made, and the allegations that are made, that it is not in harmony with our Confession of Faith.

In the first place, there are a number of affirmations in the address which, whatever we may think of their prudence or the discretion the professor manifested in uttering them, or of the form of the utterance, cannot be said to be contrary to our Confession of Faith. I think that among these there should be classed his position in regard to James Martineau. I know very little of Martineau's writings, but I do know that he has been one of the ablest opponents of atheistic materialism that our century has seen. Now, sir, if Dr. Briggs believes such a man is in spirit a Christian, whatever the defects of his creed statement, has he had not a right to take that position? It seems to me that he has. If you will take the theology of Dr. Charles Hodge for a long time, sir, your honored and revered colleague—the now sainted Dr. Charles Hodge—and look in the second volume of that work, you will find a note, I think at about the 900th page, concerning Schleiermacher. You may ask, “Who was Schleiermacher?” He was a great leader of modern German theology. He was, in the sense in which we use the word, a rationalist. He was accused of being a pantheist. He laid very slight stress upon the Old Testament, and his doctrine of inspiration would certainly be considered in this Assembly decidedly loose. Now, this German rationalist, this German mystic, higher critic and rationalist, is classed by Dr. Charles Hodge among the believers in our Lord Jesus Christ, and he says concerning him: “Is he not now enjoying the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ in Heaven?” Now, if Dr. Charles Hodge could put a rationalist of this kind into Heaven shall we condemn Dr. Briggs for saying that James Martineau also, tho his creed is lamentably defective, deserves a place among those who in spirit are Christians?

But it is said that Dr. Briggs makes the Reason and the Bible and Church co-ordinate sources of religious knowledge. Dr. Briggs has denied this, and I might let it go; but I think we need to look a little more closely at the charge. What are the sources of our religious knowledge? I ask you to look at them. Take Schleiermacher, for example, whom Dr. Hodge supposes to have found Christ. How did Schleiermacher find Christ? Certainly not through the Bible, by accepting it in any sense in which we accept it as the word of God. No, sir; he came to the knowledge of God and of Christ by the use of his reason. Dr. Patton told us on last Sabbath that he was not afraid of being a *priori*. Schleiermacher was a *priori*, and, as he supposed, he found God by a *priori* method. Now, shall we deny facts of this kind? Shall we assert that on the ground of the Confession, the Scripture is in such a sense the only source of religious light and knowledge, that should shut out the reason and the Church altogether? It seems to me that it is impossible to say that Dr. Briggs also must affirm it. This is within his right of private judgment, and we cannot trench upon it.

But other charges of this kind are brought, concerning which I should say the same thing. If Dr. Briggs can historically justify his position, he has a right to hold it. I do not know how he would do so. He did not have time to elaborate some of the points that he brought up. I have no doubt that he could bring before us points that would convince us, at any rate, that he has historic probability on his side in making the affirmations which he does.

Concerning bibliolatry, for example. I do not know of the prevalence of bibliolatry in this country, in our own day; but that such a thing has existed I should be sorry to say. Have I not heard—and here some Scotchman will be able to correct me—have I not heard that the Bible is sometimes put at the door in Scotland to keep out the spooks? [Cries of “No, no.”] Perhaps I am wrong. I had the impression.

The Rev. William Ormiston, D.D.: I am a Scotchman, born on the banks of the Clyde, and fifty-five years ago I knew that to be true. [Applause.]

Professor Smith (continuing): Now, what I am saying is this, that if Dr. Briggs has had instances come under his observation which would justify such a claim he has a right to make the claim. Whether he has such instances or not to justify it I do not know. Let me give you an example, however. In the German War a mother sent her son into the army, and on parting with him gave him a little Bible that she had got for him, and told him always to carry it with him and to read it. He carried it in his vest pocket, and as happened in a number of instances also in our war, during the first day's hard fighting of one great battle, a bullet penetrated partly through that book, and being stopped there, the book saved his life. Examining it he found that the bullet had left a distinct mark on this verse: “A thousand shall fall at thy side and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee.” Full of joy and gratitude, as tho a voice from heaven had spoken to him directly, he wrote that night to his mother telling her how that Bible had saved his life and how it had given

him a promise from God. Sir, if that mother had her faith strengthened and renewed that her prayers for the preservation of her son were heard, that that was an answer from Heaven, can we blame her? Is not that tender and affecting conviction just what we should expect? But, sir, the next day, in the second day's fighting that son was blown to pieces by a shell. Now, what was the feeling, I ask you in all solemnity, what was the feeling in that mother's heart? Had it not a slight tinge of confidence in that Book as a book as tho it were a sacred talisman to protect her son?

This is an extreme instance. In one way it is an extremely affecting instance to me; but if that feeling be enlarged, can you not see that there would be ground for the charge that bibliolatry was one of the great evils of the Church? Might not that feeling go so far as to interfere with the intellectual and religious apprehension of the truth of Scripture? I do not know but there are people in this country—you who are pastors can tell—who have a confidence, a sort of sneaking confidence, in their own salvation because they have a big Bible on the center table in their parlor, which they never read, nor any other; but it is there. They have got a Bible in the house, and they place some sort of confidence in that.

But these are trifles, sir. All I want to say is, if Dr. Briggs has instances under his eye which will justify the charge that bibliolatry has sometimes kept men from the Bible, he has a right to make the charge, and we ought to be very careful in condemning him on the ground of that.

There are a number of other points of this question to which I should be glad to speak, but your patience would give out and so would my voice. Let me come to the final point in regard to the more serious charges which have been made against the orthodoxy of Professor Briggs. And let me premise that my view of the situation is this: In the Presbyterian Church we subscribe to a system of doctrine. That man is a heretic whose position can be proved contrary to the system of doctrine. This proof must be brought before a Presbytery. The man must be convicted by regular trial. The case may then be appealed to the higher courts, and it is only when such a judgment has been given by the highest court of the Church that a man is actually convicted of heresy. But, sir, the general opinion seems to be that if a man is charged with heresy, he is guilty; if he is charged with even the slightest departure from the system of doctrine contained in the Confession, that he is guilty of heresy. I say it is not so, but we are obliged to interpret the Confession with some regard to the essentials of the system, and if you are going to insist upon a system of verbal subscription to the Confession of Faith, we shall all, or at least a very large majority of us, have to leave the Church. We are to have a just weight and a just balance, and if we convict Dr. Briggs of departure from the Confession on one point, must we not, to be consistent, convict somebody else on another point, and so on through the list, so that we shall eliminate a very large element of the Presbyterian Church?

The charges against Dr. Briggs, which have been brought against the soundness of his views, I think may be summed up in three heads. The first is inerrancy of the Scriptures, the second is a race redemption, and the third is progressive sanctification after death. Now, I do not say that either one of them, if proved, interferes with the system of doctrine contained in the Confession, but that is for the presbytery to decide. All that I shall assert now is that if these departures be judged, then other departures must be judged in the same spirit. Take an example.

I hold, as you very well know, that the inerrancy of the original autographs of Scripture is not a doctrine of the Confession; but if it be a doctrine of the Confession, inerrant transmission of the documents is equally a doctrine of the Confession. The Confession is more specific on this point than on the other. The distinction between the original autographs and our present Bible was unknown to the Westminster Confession. The Confession says: “The Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, being immediately inspired of God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, is authentical.” Now, that clearly affirms inerrant transmission, does it not? Does it not say that the inerrancy of the originals, whatever they be, has been transmitted to us without failure? So that the text of the Scriptures has not suffered, in the opinion of the Westminster divines, from those corruptions which have invaded profane documents. If any one desires to go into this question at large, let him take up John Owen's “Treatise on the Divine Origin of Scripture.” Notice the emphasis which he there puts upon inerrant transmissions, and notice this is the practical point, the Westminster divines were interested not in the inerrant autograph which has perished years ago, but in the Bible of now, in which they could have confidence. And, sir, on this ground they affirm the inerrant transmission, or at least the inerrant transmission of the Bible to our own times. But, sir, you will pardon me for alluding to one of your colleagues, whom I regard with the highest respect, both as to his scholarship, his theology and his orthodoxy, the present professor of systematic theology in Princeton Seminary, Dr. Warfield, who published an article some years ago which proved, as he supposed, to his satisfaction that the last twelve verses of the Gospel according to Mark are not a part of the Scripture; that is to say, that those verses which we find in our copies are therefore corruptions—that the transmission has not been inerrant, and that these verses should be taken out. He holds the same, I presume, in regard to the story in the Gospel of John, of the woman taken in adultery. He holds the same with regard to the doxology in the Lord's Prayer. He holds the same as to the famous text of the three witnesses in the Epistle of John. Now, Dr. Briggs does not believe in the inerrancy of the original autographs, which is not asserted in the Confession. Yet you will condemn him of heresy; at least you will keep him from his professorship, while Dr. Warfield affirms the corruption in transmission in the text of the New Testament in such important particulars as I have stated. Ought you not in consistency to pronounce also against the views of Dr. Warfield. [Applause.]

I repeat, sir, I have the highest idea of the orthodoxy, of the ability, of the scholarship, of the fairness of Professor Warfield. If he comes to that conclusion he has a right to come to it; and his diversion from the Confession is not such that we ought to accuse him or even suspect him of heresy; but if that be so, shall we not say the same of Professor Briggs?

The second point to which I wish to call your attention is the doctrine of a race redemption which Dr. Briggs has affirmed and which some find to be contrary to the Confession of Faith. The strict Calvinism—I need not remind you, perhaps, and yet some of you may not study your Confession of Faith very closely—allow me to remind you that the strict Calvinism proceeds on these grounds: The whole race of men sinned in Adam. This sin is not simply corruption of nature, but it is real guilt, involving condemnation, so that God would be just were he to condemn on the ground of their original sin the whole human race to Hell forever. Now, through this mass of corruption God, of his mere good pleasure, chose a definite number, which can neither be increased nor diminished—the Confession has not yet been revised I remind you—God chose a definite number which can neither be increased or diminished, and entered into covenant with his son in due time to redeem, call, justify and sanctify them.

That, sir, on the strictest construction, is the doctrine of the Confession of Faith. It involves what is known as a definite instead of a general atonement. Now, this Assembly has viewed with favor—I think I am not mistaken in this—the change of the language of the Confession so as to read: “All infants dying in infancy, and other persons incapable of being outwardly called by the ministrations of the Word, are redeemed by Christ.” I would like to ask upon what

theological ground will you justify that change? All mankind a mass of corruption, deserving the wrath of God and the pains of Hell forever, God in his good pleasure electing some to everlasting life? On what ground, I say, will you affirm that this number includes all infants as well as others incapable? That is for you to settle. What I say concerning Dr. Briggs is that he simply desires to find a theological ground for your affirmation. And there is no other theological ground on which you can affirm the election of all infants except this, that Christ by his atonement redeemed the race so far as original sin is concerned, and therefore all infants dying in infancy are redeemed.

Now, will this Assembly, which views with favor this change in the Confession, nullify the usefulness of a professor of theology in our Church because he desires to be consistent and to find theological grounds for the belief which you all hold? I do not believe it.

But, sir, the most serious problem of all is the point which has been denominated progressive sanctification. I do not altogether understand Dr. Briggs's doctrine upon this point. [Laughter.] But I think—let me say that that is no reason why it may not be perfectly clear. [Laughter.] The Confession of Faith has been misunderstood; the Bible has been misunderstood. This fact in itself is no argument against the clearness and perspicuity of either one. Now, sir, it impresses me that Dr. Briggs has not thoroughly worked out his doctrine. I think that is true. So much concession I shall be glad to make; but if we are to condemn every theologian who publishes a system without having it thoroughly worked out, where will you begin and where will you end? The doctrine of the Confession of Faith is, that those who are not redeemed, are, after the final judgment, consigned to the place reserved for the Devil and his angels, “there”—I quote now from the Larger Catechism—“to be punished with unspeakable torments, both of soul and body, forever.” Now, sir, do you know how much that means? You know what the population of the globe is. Do you know that in every minute of time seventy human beings pass out of life? According to the most liberal construction of your theology, how many of these do you suppose are effectually called, redeemed, justified and sanctified? Including infants and incapables, certainly not one-half. The doctrine of the Presbyterian Church is, therefore, that in every minute of time thirty human beings drop into that abyss of unspeakable torment, to be punished with the Devil and his angels there forever. Every hour an assembly the size of this drops into that yawning chasm. And this goes on twenty-four hours in the day, thirty days in a month, twelve months in a year. The centuries roll by. Ten thousand years, at least, Dr. Warfield says, the centuries have rolled by, and this awful procession has gone yonder to that bourne whence no traveler returns. Now, sir, do you ever reflect upon these facts? Do you reflect upon them, and keep out of the lunatic asylum? Do you face this awful problem of the destiny of the race? What do you do with it in your system?

Elder Graham, of Nebraska: Leave it with God.

Professor Smith (continuing): Now, sir, I think the most of us have a secret hope that God has reserved some way to himself by which he may at some time restore some at least of these lost souls. That, however, would be at any rate but a pious opinion. It is not held certainly as a theological dogma, a theological doctrine, by any one in the Presbyterian Church. But, sir, if any one can find relief from it in the Scriptures, so far as I am concerned, he is welcome.

Dr. Briggs thinks he has found some relief in that he supposes that regeneration takes place in many souls in which we do not see the evidence of regeneration; that it takes place before they leave this life, but that the subsequent process of sanctification goes on in the other life. Now, on a strict construction of the Confession, Dr. Briggs is wrong. The Confession, or Catechism, at any rate, affirms that the souls of believers are made perfect at death. Dr. Briggs thinks that he finds Scriptural ground for holding that the process of sanctification, at least the process which leads toward absolute perfection, goes on in the other life, and that the regeneration, which is its beginning, occurs here in many souls in which we do not see the evidence. Now, will you, who hold to such a radical modification of the Confession as is involved in saying that all infants are saved, condemn a minister of your Church who desires to find relief from the oppression of that awful destiny of the race?

We are told not a sparrow falls to the ground without our Father's notice. How can God rest, with a prison, as Dr. Hodge calls it, so full as the one upon which we have been dwelling this morning? When Dr. Briggs, in support of his theory, quotes “He that hath begun the good work anew will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ,” has he not colorable ground at least for a hope such as he expresses?

Now, sir, I believe I have done. I have tried to show that we ought not to condemn Dr. Briggs on the ground, first, of his inaptness to teach, when his fitness is so strongly testified by those who ought to know best; or, secondly, upon the unsoundness of his views. Prejudice is easily raised and not easily allayed. A Western bridegroom, you know, on his tour met for the first time the delicacy known in New England as codfish balls. Supposing that it was the soda biscuit of his native wilds, he took one of the balls in his fingers and broke it open. Struck by its peculiar appearance, he brought it cautiously toward his face and, as the colored brother said, “nostrilized” it. Said he: “Don't eat that, Sal, there is something dead in it.” [Laughter.] Well, now, of course she did not eat it. Nobody would under such circumstances. Prejudice is easily arrayed. The theological stomach, I think, is a little delicate, and it is easily turned. Prejudice is easily raised and is not easily allayed. Shall we, upon the ground of the pronouncements that have been made already, cut short this career of usefulness? This is the question that I desire to ask. I thank you for your courtesy.

SPEECH OF DR. S. C. LOGAN OF SCRANTON, PENN.

I rise specifically to suggest a modification of the action proposed by the Committee. That Committee have done, as they have expressed to us, all they could to give us their very best judgment as the least that the Assembly can do in the premises. I have the very highest respect both for them and for what they have reported. With a single modification it seems to me that their report, if adopted by this Assembly, is the least that in the present condition of the Church and the questions which are involved could be done. Now, I will suggest the amendment, or, rather, two amendments looking in the same direction; and then afterward I will proceed to state some reasons for them. My first amendment which I will propose is this:

That the first resolution be amended by the insertion of the words “for the present”; so that the resolution will read: “That in the exercise of its rights to veto the appointment of a professor in Union Theological Seminary the General Assembly hereby disapproves for the present of the appointment of the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D.” [Cries of “No. No. No.”]

A member: I second that amendment.

Dr. Logan: And I want to give notice of the second amendment, which is the second resolution:

“Resolved, That a committee consisting of eight ministers and seven ruling elders be appointed by this Assembly to confer with Professor Briggs and the Directors of Union Theological Seminary in regard to the whole case, and also with the Directors of the Seminary especially regarding the relations of the said Seminary to the General Assembly, and report to the next General Assembly.”

Dr. Patton: Mr. Moderator, I rise to a point of order. Dr. Logan has a perfect right, I suppose, to move a substitute for the entire report; but I would suggest, sir, subject to your ruling, that he has a right to move only one amendment at a time.

Dr. Logan: The Doctor forgets, sir, if there is anything in this world that I am it is order in the way of ecclesiastics. [Laughter and

applause.] I have been some forty years connected with that business, and I am quite a young man yet. No, sir; I am not out of order. I read the last simply as a notice, as I distinctly stated. Now, I have seen and heard many controversies in the Presbyterian Church, and I have never yet found one quite so complex as the one before us now. There is an actual trial in the hearts and judgments of the brethren not only a Professor, but a Board of Directors and a whole system of control concerning the education of the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. Each of these must enter into the consideration of this question which is brought before us to-day. My experience in all the controversies that I have known in the Church is the great danger of men substituting their sentiments and feelings for their deeper sense of Christian love and Christian judgment. Now, I presume it would satisfy the Church and tend to the peace of the Church if we could to-day postpone action. The whole matter has come up so quickly and the cases of irritation are so many, and the winds have blown from so many quarters that it is almost impossible for a sincere, faithful presbyter to come to a conclusion. The moment an attempt is made to pass judgment on Professor Briggs, the accusation comes of ignorance and want of charity, of misconception and wicked perversion, so that an honest presbyter is afraid to say anything lest he shall say that which is wrong. This arises from the condition of things, for which we are none of us accountable. It may be the fault of the times. It may come from the telegraph, which does occasionally misinterpret. I have in my pocket now, sent from another State, a paragraph from the report of the sermon of our Moderator, in opening the Assembly, which, if it teaches anything as it is printed teaches the doctrine of universal salvation [laughter], as far as I can understand it; and the man who sent it to me asked to have the General Assembly pass a resolution that every minister and every theological teacher shall be required from the 1st of June, for one year, to speak exactly what he means, and to submit it to the girl in the kitchen before he preaches it. If there is anything which a life of service in the Presbyterian Church has impressed upon me, it is the wickedness and the wrong of improperly touching the character of God's ministers—to carry in the treatment of God's servants with us the warning, "Do my prophets no harm," because the treasure is committed to earthen vessels, we must never forget that the charity of the Gospel, must be carried along in all the treatment which we give to the servants of the Church. Now, I believe that the General Assembly must control theological teaching in all the seminaries of the Church. This Committee reported in favor of the proposed action because they believed under the circumstances that no action would be equivalent to positive action, and they would lose their right of veto. Now, if the Assembly adopt my proposed amendment, and refuse to confirm Dr. Briggs for the present until they have more knowledge on the subject, that will meet the demands of the Church. It is not the custom of the Presbyterian Church to condemn any man without his presence and without his witnesses. [Applause.] You cannot decide a man's orthodoxy by a resolution. It must be done by the judgment of the Church court after a proper hearing. Now, another reason why I am in favor of this action is that the whole intention of discipline is the saving and not the destroying. The discipline of the Church is for the edification of the Church, and the great power in the edification of the Church is charity, the love that never failed it. The great power in the edification of the Church is charity. That is my feeling on this subject. Why, brethren, in my presbytery, which stood up to a man upon the overtone which we find recorded in this report, every man of us protested his unwillingness to appear to judge Professor Briggs before he should be investigated according to the administrations of the Church; and that was the spirit, I have no doubt, in every presbytery. What we want to do is to save this man, if he be the man that his friends say he is—and I am sorry to say that I have no personal acquaintance with him—but if he be the servant of God, a man cultured in the mysteries of the Bible, a man who has devoted all these years to the service of the Church, I say, let us not with rude hands nor with hasty words utterly destroy him. [Applause.] Let us save him. But, as I have said, the whole subject is complicated further because this action is against the wisdom of the directors of that noble seminary who have selected Professor Briggs. The whisper has gone abroad that these directors propose to forestall any judgment of the Church in the matter and to rush this man through from one chair to another under the shelter of the sacred covenant of the Fathers in the union of the Church. That is an impeachment of the character of some of the best men in the Church of God. We will assume that these directors are as good and as faithful servants of God as we hope to be ourselves. Is it fair to them that we shall take this action—an action for which we give no reason—before we have given them the privilege of showing the ground of their action? I say it is unfair to them, and my amendments look directly to that end. More than this, they look directly to such conference with the Professor himself as that he may expound himself to the understanding of, the Church. Now, what is the objection to that course? Are you afraid of the Church of God? Cannot the General Assembly trust this old Presbyterian Church for a year, even if the brother should insist upon going on with his work in the Seminary or even if these directors should insist in keeping him there? The hand that strikes slowly shall strike surely. Let us then look without passion upon this simple state of the case. The Church cannot be satisfied to-day unless this Assembly shall refuse in some form to confirm that brother in his chair. Shall we not have the Word of God that we can trust in the way the Church looked at it, that these simple men that love to preach the Gospel look at it, and it is the way you will find that the whole Church will look? And we are therefore compelled to say, in view of the shock to our conscience by the announcements which these brethren say we cannot understand, that we do not sustain that thing which we do not understand. We must say that for the present Professor Briggs cannot occupy that chair. By saying that we hold the matter in abeyance, and we send our committee to that seminary and to that Professor and seek what explanation is there accorded. It may be that the Professor can be led by the grace of God and the present position of the Church to realize that he has made a mistake, and he may be ready to confess it. Why, I imagine such professors of theology as God gave me the privilege of listening to being approached by a Committee of the General Assembly:

"Brethren you are misunderstood; you seem to teach so and so; it may be that you have; if you have, cannot you see that you are wrong; cannot you confess it and so re-establish yourself before the Church?" And imagine the effect of such a visitation upon such men as Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, Archie Hodge, McMaster, John D. Matthews, James Wood—the whole galaxy of stars that God has given to the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Oh, the effect of such a visitation upon such men as those would have been to bring them from the furthest outskirt of wonderful speculation back to the simple work of teaching men to preach the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Now, brethren, is this man worth saving? Let us so after him then, and try it. [Applause.]

The Moderator: Dr. Logan's amendment is now before the house, namely, the insertion of the word "for the present."

SPEECH OF CHARLES A. DICKEY, D. D.

Mr. Moderator: I do not anticipate that anything I may say, quietly and plainly on this subject, will induce applause; but I certainly join heartily with the request of the Moderator and others that we cease applause and remember that we are considering a matter that not only interests character in many directions, but interests the whole Church in the great question of conserving in its best wisdom

the peace and harmony of the Church, as well as its purity of doctrine. Mr. Moderator, I desire to say, first of all, that it would give me the greatest pleasure of my life, as I can now conceive of pleasure, if I could make at this point a second contribution to the unity of this Assembly. I have not imposed myself upon your attention during any of the discussions, and I have tried to make the contribution of silence. I do not regret my first and only act in this Assembly, and I desire in the midst of our deliberations to declare that if this were the first day, I should most happily, with my evidence of these days of fairness, put again in nomination the Moderator of this Assembly.

I desire to say, in the second place, that as I listened to and considered as carefully as I could the report of the Assembly Committee presented through its honored chairman, not having a copy of it in my hands, but remembering it as well as I could from the reading, sleeping over it as little as I did sleep, thinking over it until this moment, and trying to know my own duty in a delicate relation, I want to say that with the single exception already presented by Dr. Logan, I do not say in that form, but in entire sympathy with the suggestion of Dr. Logan, no matter what may be the form in which it may be put—with that single exception, or the consultation which that exception would provide, I say now, without saying more, for I do not think it necessary, that I can take this entire report and will give any voice or any help that I can in any position that I now sustain to make that report, with that single change, the unanimous voice of this Assembly. I have no plea to make for Dr. Briggs. I abominate the spirit that is in the Church, dividing God's ministers into ranks and calling them by names of men. I am not a Briggs man, if you mean by that that I follow Dr. Briggs's leadership and endorse Dr. Briggs's views; but I am a Briggs man, if you mean by that that if I stand alone I will plead in this crisis that any man shall have fairness, and that we shall not act in haste in possibly determining not only his entire future in the Church of God, but the entire future of the institution with which he has become identified. What I have to say I want to say with more distinctness, for I think I owe it to myself and to the position in which I am in the providence of God and have been for sixteen years. I was chosen, not because of any views I entertain, not because of any record of special qualification for the position; chosen only because, coming out of the old United Presbyterian Church, my first charge when this union was consummated chanced to be in a New School church. Because of that simple fact and trifling consideration I became a member of the board of directors of Union Theological Seminary. Because of that relationship I know that my position in this Assembly is exceedingly delicate, and I am trying in all honor and with ill caution to regard it. I want to say here that anything I say pertaining to the seminary, I say it on individual responsibility and am only individually responsible for the utterance, and I do not wish to be understood as committing anybody but myself to anything that I may say touching the seminary in its inner life and in its relations to this great question that we are considering. I am not an anti-Briggs man, if you mean by that a determination that no matter what shall be said, no matter what shall be done, that no matter what shall be attempted, that no matter what may be accomplished or attempted to be accomplished, that feeling of condemnation shall continue. I am not an anti-Briggs man in that sense; but I am an anti-Briggs man, if you mean by that that I most sincerely and to the very depths of my nature deplore the fact that Dr. Briggs has issued the inaugural address which has created this offense and this terrible state of unrest in the Church. While there is much in him which I know by personal contact to love and to admire, I could not in justice to him, treating this solemn question, make any defense for the spirit of that inaugural address. Neither can I defend many of the utterances that have succeeded that inaugural address. There is, we must all confess if we will be entirely fair with one another, a vast deal in the spirit, in the animus of the address in question, that has greatly saddened and distressed the friends of Dr. Briggs. I should not, even if I thought myself capable, intrude upon you any discussion of the points of that address, for I want to confine myself entirely to the simple question of what ought to be done at this moment and in this crisis. I shall confine myself entirely to the question—if you will allow me to use the word in the better sense—of expediency. I do not want to use that word in the sense of covering up or putting off or getting time; but I mean by expediency what Paul meant when he said all things were lawful, but all things were not expedient. When he had the interests of the Church of God at heart, when he had the lives and the salvation of men at heart, he could make the distinction between lawfulness and expediency. I think those who would admire and follow him can make the same distinction without being misunderstood. I mean what is expedient in a time when the strain is so severe and the situation so delicate that it is possible for us to make a mistake that the future will not correct. Oh, how much better, my brethren, to wait a little while and take any other risk than to make haste and take the risks that we may not be able to correct. Why, we are told by this Committee that there is but one risk. That has turned the whole report from the way that I would wish it to go to the way that they feel compelled to declare it ought to go. Now, what is it? I hope the brethren will examine this with great carefulness, for it is to this point that I want to call your attention. I believe this to be an honorable and faithful Committee; for, altho I have not been in their confidence—because I have not sought it—I believe I know that these brethren have labored with zeal and earnestness and prayerfulness and with Christian charity of the broader sort, to bring, if possible, to this Assembly an action that might postpone; and in this desire the Committee and myself—as I advocated this point—are in entire agreement. We all seemed to want to wait, if we only could.

Now let us give ourselves to that one point. Can you wait? The only reason given in this report for not presenting as their conclusion and their finding the desirability of a postponement for a year, is, first, that they believe the compact, rightly interpreted, will not allow it, and still preserve the right of veto. It is presumption for me to set up my judgment against the judgment of the President of Princeton College; but I will take the risk of such presumption in the hope of helping my brethren see what I think can be discovered. Has not this Assembly just as much right to give its construction as the Assembly that is quoted? We have nothing to do here with constructions. We have to do, and only have to do with compacts; and the compact seems at the very beginning to have been capable of two constructions. One Assembly saw fit to put its construction one way. Perhaps the experience of the present might incline this General Assembly to put its construction another way. And I cannot see why the construction put upon it by this Assembly that faces the present most serious condition may not, before God and before law, stand as the construction that deserves the greatest consideration.

Now, it is argued by the Committee that if we do not veto at this time we have lost the power of veto. And then it is suggested that a committee go to the Board of Directors after the act is done to consider the construction of the compact. Now, my brethren, I ask you to face that fairly. I will bury every passion that I have, and I will make no threats as to how I would treat this action; for I am loyal to my Church, no matter what my Church may do. But I do say in all earnestness that it puts such men as Dr. John Hall, Dr. Robert R. Booth, Dr. Erskine White, Dr. Hall of Brooklyn, Dr. Frazer of New Jersey—not mentioning my own self—William E. Dodge, John Crosby Brown—I wish I had the roll that I might call it; for there is not a name among them that is not honored in the Church—Charles Butler, whose last act, when he felt himself trembling on the grave, in his love for his Church, was to lay down his possessions, and his gift has been the occasion of all this trouble. Now, it is said all around that Mr. Butler asked for the Inaugural Address. Why, brethren, that is too

ludicrous to answer. Mr. Butler does not claim to be a theologian; but the fact is this, that he has loved Dr. Briggs from his boyhood and nursed him through all these years. It has been the dream of his life at the proper time to endow a chair of Biblical Theology; and when that time came he not only endowed the chair but he named the professor, as you have it in print.

And I want to tell you right here, in answer to all this talk about forcing things: Dr. Briggs's election was the most informal election of which I have any knowledge. I cannot say surely whether he was elected by the constitutional majority that is required. I know that I had no intimation as a director that that was to be the object of the meeting. It was done so informally that the condition was not even looked into as to whether he was elected by a constitutional majority. I was neither present at his election nor at his inauguration, but I know these home facts, and I tell them because I think they are facts in defense of the action of the Board of Directors. Mr. Butler, after asking the privilege of giving \$100,000 and the privilege of naming his old friend for the chair, was seen by Dr. Briggs. Dr. Briggs went to him. Now, we have been told that Dr. Briggs anticipated, and with long deliberation flung this glove into the face of the Church. I do not believe it, for I know that he went to Mr. Butler and said: "In honor of the memory of Edward Robinson, whose name you have attached to this chair, I propose to make the subject of my inaugural the geography of the Bible." Oh! would to God he had made it geography [laughter], for I do not believe he would have taken such risks in geography as he has taken in theology [laughter]. But says Mr. Butler: "No, just take up your own subject, the authenticity and authority of the Scriptures, and give us your address on that thing." Now, does anybody suppose that Mr. Butler asked for all those barriers to be presented? Does anybody suppose that Mr. Butler, in making that request, had any idea of drawing out an inaugural that might provoke the Church to wrath? Surely not. The subject was taken, and how I wish that some of the good things had been enlarged and some of the objectionable things had been omitted. Oh, I wish that he had confined himself to his text and discussed in the good old way the authority of the Word of God, instead of trying to air the scholarship that was to pick flaws in and raise questions about the Word of God! But here it is.

And now having given you these open secrets of the way by which we came to this, I return to the point which I had in calling that roll. Brethren, can you trust those men one year? That is the question. That is the proposition of the Committee. They do not intimate that they cannot trust in one sense; but I am sorry to say that as a director I cannot fail to read in the manner that it is presented at least the shadow of a doubt. Oh, if it is merely a question as to compact, cannot you trust us to interpret it as well as we can trust you? Is it not a fairer way to consider the compact in conference and not to determine the compact here and put your action upon it and then come to us to ask what we think the compact means. That is the simple question.

A Member of the Committee: I would ask where in the report there is any committee appointed to find the compact?

Dr. Dickey: I have not asserted it. I have only asserted that the Committee brings in a report which defines the compact so far as to say that it must be acted on now or never. That is what the Committee says. If that is not interpreting the compact, I do not know what is. And all I plead for is that men should serve the Church to the best of their ability and as conscientiously as the commissioners of this Assembly serve it, have as much right to be trusted in a time like this as to be doubted to the extent of saying, We must do it now, or perhaps we cannot do it at any time. And as I said, I am only responsible for myself, but before my brethren, I make the pledge that unless God shall burden me with his care, as he has burdened the brother who has passed away—I believe Dr. Van Dyke has gone out of the excitement of this hour; God only knows who more may go who carry it upon their heart as he carried it; I say if God shall permit me to abide for a year, I make my pledge in public, not to be retracted, that I will do all in my power to bring about a fair and honorable reconsideration of this question, and if we consider it in the light that we may have—and in the light that you may give us—it must be reconsidered if any man asks it, or there will be a protest, and if it be reconsidered then I say by your very act of asking us to reconsider it you have bound us as honorable men to hold this compact in abeyance until you have a chance to give your final vote. [Applause.] On the way to Jerusalem, on the way to His cross, the Disciples in their anger at the sight of a barren fig tree said: "Lord cut it down." But the Master, with the burden of your sins and mine upon him, the Master with the load of the world's guilt upon him, was not too burdened or too much given to his own thought of his own self or even of a dying world, to decide the question of the barren fig tree; and he said to his disciples, who would have acted in their anger, had they had the instrument to destroy the tree, "Let it alone, this year also, and it bear fruit, well, and if not, then cut it down." And this is my only plea; I defend no heresy wherever it may be found; I defend no sight upon the Word of God whoever may utter it; I defend no bad spirit in issuing even heresy, whoever may indulge in it; I make no defense for anything you condemn, I make but this one plea, for my seminary and for my Church: Let it alone this year also, and we will dig about it, and if it bear fruit, well, and if not, God will give you another way, if he shall take out of your hands the veto God will give you another way to cleanse your Church of heresy and to preserve the Word of God. [Applause.]

SPEECH OF DR. J. J. FRANCIS.

It fell to my lot, in the close of the great discussion in the Presbytery of Cincinnati, to follow with a brief speech the speech of my brother and fellow presbyter Dr. Smith, and I rise at this moment for the purpose of replying to his speech, which I will do with a historical argument, which will occupy about two minutes.

The Moderator: The question is as to the amendment.

Dr. Francis (continuing): The speeches all bear upon the amendment in the sense that we are to decide whether or not we are acting for the good of the Church for the future, or simply with reference to the present as it may affect certain individual interests in the Church. This matter has been placed in the light of hasty action here, and this bears directly upon the amendment.

Last February the first overtone, I believe, of all these overtures that have been brought before our committee and assembly at this time was introduced into the Cincinnati Presbytery, and for eight weeks we sat and listened and discussed and debated this whole subject. We were treated day after day to papers in defense of Dr. Briggs and the higher criticism by the professors of our theological seminary in Cincinnati. Dr. Smith, who has spoken to us to-day, spoke to us for two solid hours from his carefully prepared manuscript, since printed. Dr. Evans, with his wonderfully eloquent tongue and pen, charmed our ears while he saddened our hearts during two solid hours with his paper, which also has been published.

A Commissioner (interposing): I am very reluctant to interfere with this eloquent speech, but I rise to a point of order. We are discussing the amendment, and not the main question.

The Moderator: The question is on the amendment, and the speaker will confine himself to that.

Dr. Francis (continuing): The question is upon the amendment, that we shall take action for the present, and that, sir, has been urged upon the ground of undue haste; and I am speaking to show that these presbyteries, to the number of seventy or eighty,

who come up to you to-day with the interests of the great Church of Christ at heart, asking action at your hands, have not acted with undue haste [applause]; that they have considered this matter as you cannot consider it here to-day; that they have looked at it with a calmness of deliberation which is impossible in this assembly, and that, should you fail to hear and heed that voice of our great Church throughout this land, you will not fail to save a man, but you will risk the dearer interests of the great Church of Christ. Therefore, sir, I appeal to you upon the action of the presbyteries, taken with this calm deliberation through weeks and months that are passed, to act with promptness in your decision to-day, and with that finality which shall give to the Church an assurance that this Word of God shall be kept intact, that its blessed messages shall not be torn to pieces by us or by those who misrepresent us in the higher institutions of learning of our church. I wish simply to say with reference to this debate that after it all the Presbytery of Cincinnati, including almost every pastor, including all our great missionary workers, including all those that represent the benevolent interests of the Church, voted fifty-four to seventeen to send up this overture to this General Assembly. This was the answer of the presbyteries to my brother, Dr. Smith.

Dr. Smith in his speech referred to an incident of the war that touched the experience of many a father and many a mother, and it recalled to my mind a single little incident of my own experience, with which I shall close these few remarks. When in the days of my boyhood I left the old home, the old mansion, where I had been born and reared, going out from that place that was made for evermore sacred by the daily reading, morning and evening, of this blessed book at family prayers, my mother placed in my hands a volume of the sacred Scriptures, with tears streaming down her cheeks, and watching me as with it in my hand I walked away never more to return as a member of that dear home circle; and when I opened it, on the fly leaf of that Bible was written in her own dear old familiar chirography and is written there to-day, as I shall preserve it to my dying day, these words:

"Remember, boy, who gave thee this,
When other days shall come;
When one who had thy earliest kiss
Sleeps in her narrow home,
Remember 'tis no idle toy,
This mother's gift—remember, boy."

And to-day, as I say before this assembly and before the great Presbyterian Church and the whole Church of Christ looking on, God forgive the man who shall in any way attempt to destroy my faith in any word or sentence of that blessed book. [Applause.]

SPEECH OF DR. W. A. BARTLETT.

The great simple question is as to whether this shall be postponed another year. That is the question, and the main point is as to whether it can be done. The interpretation of the record is that it must be done this year or that the General Assembly loses its power to veto. That seems to be final. If there is any way in which all parties could be considered, and in which the unity and harmony of this great Presbyterian Church could be preserved, I am certain there are no two purposes about the advisability of doing just that thing. Now, we are here as a company of Christian believers. We are Presbyterians that have heads and that have hearts, and we are to use them. Now, I am in favor of the immediate action on this report, if action must be taken—and I don't say that we should veto this appointment "for the present." We cannot act for the past, and we cannot act for the future; and, if we act at all, we act for the present, because it will put an end to an exhibition that we have had when this question has been up for the past year in the Church, of the charge of ignorance and imbecility on the whole Presbyterian Church at large, which I resent. [Applause.] The imputation always is, by men that argue for the higher criticism, that every Presbyterian minister is a fool, and that nobody ever read the Bible or had any private secret revelations but themselves. [Laughter.] I wish to say that over thirty years ago I was in the German universities, and I can take Dr. Briggs' books and do for them with absolute certainty what he guessed at with Moses, and can show him where he took every one of his positions from a rationalist German professor over thirty years ago; and I am prepared here to vindicate that statement. [Applause.] Now, gentlemen, there is scholarship and there is scholarship. No one ever doubted what Strauss was a scholar. He is not a very learned man, and he began his career by tearing Moses to pieces, and he ended by stripping Christ of everything but being a plain Nazarene peasant. Yes, there is scholarship and scholarship. Why, Ignatius Donnelly, our great Congress man, is a scholar. He has marvelous secrets that nobody else has ever pried into. And right here I wish to say, about these intimations in all these addresses that I have heard on the higher scholarship—about the marvelous teachings they are gabbling about, the wonderful things that they see which nobody else has ever explored—why, gentlemen, you could talk that a thousand years back to peasants, but that is the charlatanism of scholarship to-day. I tell you, we know every fact that any man knows on higher criticism or anything else. There is water in the sea, there is water in the air and there is water in the rivers; but they are in communication with each other. Now, bring out your facts. The truth of it is that there are some peculiar minds in every age that look upon a class of facts that are perfectly familiar to Christian scholars, and they see in them the solution of great, doubtful and perplexed problems, which the great average level-headed scholarship of the day don't see. They have the same state of facts, but they differ in their interpretation. For instance, there are seven or eight hundred theories as to the origin of the Pentateuch. Now, I, the great level-headed scholar, look over them, and I state what I see, and I see it raises great doubt in my mind. And so the great scholar gives his students all the information he has upon it; brings it from the depths and puts it before them. Now, I say, state it, bring it before the students, keep nothing back, they are entitled to it. But they are entitled as well not to have a man with a peculiar tendency of mind and a peculiar mental sympathy fix the stamp of his authority on some one of those theories and say that, if he knows anything about Moses, Moses did not write the Pentateuch. Now, that is what I complain of. The higher criticism doubt has proved that Bacon wrote Shakespeare. In the Oxford investigations as to the origin of Homer they proved, I believe, that Homer did not write Homer, but that Homer was really written by another man of the same name. [Laughter.]

I was going to move a committee consisting of Donnelly and Keely and Briggs and half a dozen others to settle all questions of modern times. [Laughter mingled with hisses.] I wish further to say a word about scholarship. The impression is always made that we don't want light. We say, Let the light in. The Presbyterian Church seeks scholars, but it does not on insufficient evidence ask men to draw inferences that shatter the very foundation of faith. And now, in regard to heresy. This is not an age of heresy; why, there is no such thing in the air. The response that the Presbyterian Church officially has made to ten years of heresy hunting is this morning in the report of this committee. The heretic has hindered the Church, and not the Church the heretic, if there is any heresy. For ten long years book after book, peri-

odical after periodical, culminating in the inaugural address, the Presbyterian Church has been pursued. The man has been rubbed against it with chips on his shoulder defying it in every way. Now, I say that even a fire company has a right to have rules. Their rule is that their members shall wear red shirts. A fellow comes in with a blue shirt and says he is going to wear it. Of course, it is a small matter, what color their shirts shall be, but their rule is that only red shirts shall be worn. Now, I say that any society has a right to have some defined rules, and after a church has been pursued for more than ten years on this question I say it is to be commended for long suffering patience and for tender mercy and for quietness and peace. The implication has always been that there is heresy being sought; that this is an age of thumb-screws, and all that species of humbug. In this case it does not apply. Every church is free, but the church must be free enough to decide the question independently and fairly. I like Professor Smith's dog story. It was a good one, and it reminded me of one that I will tell you. We had a bench show in Washington this Winter and there were several three and four and I believe one five thousand dollar dog exhibited there. One day this \$5,000 dog got out. He was a rather ferocious fellow, though very expensive, and running down the street he seized one of my fellow-citizens in a convenient place in the back (Laughter), and his owner, who was chasing him, cried out to the citizen who had been seized, "Don't injure that dog you might spoil him, and he is a very valuable dog"—and all the while the dog was gnawing away, and the poor man had the impression that he was not in any great danger of injuring the dog, but that the dog was in great danger of injuring him. And so it is. We have been pursued and finally caught, and we wish for them to make the apology. Who has made this disturbance? Is it the Presbyterian Church, through spies and queer and double construction chasing a man down to convict him of heresy? And the church is forced to regard it, and we simply say: Let go; let us alone, and if the time has come when you must go out from the beautiful land of Egypt under the repression of this awful Pharaoh, the Presbyterian Church!—We have had enough, and we say, Go and take all your intimate friends with you. (Laughter and applause.) There is the end of the matter. We must face it fairly. There is no personal thing about it. We have talked of trying to save Prof. Briggs. I know him and I love him personally as a man. But there is a question about saving the Seminary and about saving the Church of God that is a little one. The physician, when he came out from the sick chamber, said the mother was dead and the child was dead, but he thought he might possibly save the husband. (Laughter.) I think it is about time for us to save the church that is so true to us. In kindness my heart responds to every kindly feeling. I was a Union Seminary man. I was there under that grand scholar whose fame is over the earth, Edward Robinson. I was under the scholarship and careful training of Henry J. Smith. I was under the superb rhetorician, Hitchcock, and I was there under that Chesterfield of a teacher, old Dr. Skinner, so sweet in his exterior, and a St. John at his soul. In that elder day to be a Roman was greater than to be a King. But I confess I have stood all my life in the advanced line. I have been a radical of the radicals, but I drew the line when I have known the quality of this criticism for over thirty years—and I got it fresh from Germany, too—I know its tendency, and I know where it leads. Give us the learning, give us the study of the books, give us Professors that know how to handle it—tho' implication always is that it is never studied in any other seminary but New York—but I believe in every theological seminary of the earth, and I believe that in them all to-day these things are current facts. Bring them to their natural result, and then let the students find that the subordinate things are relegated to the rear, that we are not ordained to discover whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not, because it may be a question of such delicacy and difficulty that it could not be absolutely and finally settled in all its shades, but that we are to preach Christ. This is a mighty world lying in wickedness. This is a mighty Gospel that we have. We are here to teach young men to preach Christ, and to carry to this last age the mightiest message freed from much that has been imperfect and misunderstood, but this mightiest message to this mightiest day.

SPEECH BY DR. PATTON.

I think that what I have to say, although it may seem to traverse the entire report, will be really relevant to the amendment that is under debate. I say that lest one might be moved to call me to order. And before I speak to the question, for my own sake and by way of privilege I would like to eliminate from this debate, as far as is possible, the personal element. So far as I am personally concerned, and I think I may say so far as the members of the Committee are concerned, they will be (certainly shall be) willing to go down into the history of this discussion upon the simple record of this report, word for word, and without a single syllable in its defense. Let me further say that so far as Dr. Briggs is concerned I will yield to none of his friends, not even the best, in my recognition of his learning, in my admiration of his industry, in my conviction respecting his piety. He is my friend. It is my privilege to call him so. I venture the hope that in spite of my relations to this debate he will not be unwilling to reciprocate my expression of the relationship between us.

So far as the Directors of Union Seminary are concerned, let me further say that what passes my power of comprehension, and I really have looked at the matter, is how under any circumstances the action proposed by this Committee can be looked upon in the light of a reflection upon the directors individually or upon them in their corporate capacity. And let me say again that it is my privilege, and I count it a high privilege, to know these directors personally and count many of them my friends, and I am willing to indulge the hope that they will not disallow the claim I make. I know something of the history of Union Seminary. A more ardent admirer of Henry B. Smith, of Roswell Hitchcock, of Dr. Schaff and of the other men that have composed and that now compose that faculty, I think it would be hard to find than I am. And I have said so on more occasions than one. And it was only the fact that I did not know, or was misinformed, respecting the time, that prevented me from being present at the inauguration of Dr. Briggs and of sitting on the platform in response to the kind invitation of President Hastings. If to veto the appointment of Dr. Briggs in view of the utterance that he expressed on that occasion is a reflection upon the acts done in ignorance of what he was about to do and of what he did, is a reflection upon the directors, it is a reflection upon those who consciously and with a knowledge of what they were about went to that inauguration, and, inasmuch as I was there in spirit though not in flesh, it was a reflection upon myself, and I will take as much share as under the circumstances I ought to be credited with. But it is impossible for me to see how a body of men who in good faith elect a man to a certain position, not knowing what he was going to say, can be blamed now for action that we take in view of utterances that he made subsequent to their electing act. Therefore the personal interest is out of the case, unless prejudice is stronger than reason and the feelings of men control the logic of discussion.

Now, sir, we are confronted with the whole question. I had intended if I said anything upon this subject to begin with the importance and necessity of vetoing the election, but the exigencies of the debate require me to reverse the order of procedure. The question now before us is really whether we have any constitutional right to veto this election. That is the question. Now, sir, your Committee are of the opinion that this constitutional right to veto the transfer of a professor from one teaching place to another in the same institution is given in the right to veto the appointment of a professor. The fact that comes before us officially is that Dr. Briggs being in one chair was transferred to another chair. That is the fact. There is no doubt about the fact. The question is whether the inference that the transfer is an appointment and therefore covered by the terms of the contract, I say is a correct inference; an inference that we can adequately maintain, an inference that we suppose this Assembly will stand by. Of course—and I call the attention of the Assembly to this—we are the supreme judicatory of the Presbyterian Church, and therefore we cannot shirk if we want to, and if we wanted to the question as to responsibility is involved. We cannot shirk the responsibility of putting an interpretation upon that compact. At the same time we recognize the fact that besides being the judicatory, construing the contract, we are parties to it. We are one party; the other party is Union Seminary. Now, it has been said on the floor: "What right have you to construe this your way any more than we have to construe it our way?" Well, dear friends, I suppose (it was not necessary to say this in the report) that we all know that when we have done our duty conscientiously in construing the contract as the judge we cannot possibly avoid the responsibility of answering when by proper authority we are called upon as a party to defend our position. So that we have to recognize that. We have recognized that as a judge we are bound to construe, and we have recognized that, as a party, Union Seminary may claim that their rights have been infringed by our construction, and, if they see fit, they can take us into the civil courts for a judicial and authoritative interpretation of this compact. We cannot avoid that if we wish to, and whether they will do it or not is a matter for them to determine. Now, then, we have contemplated that possibility. We have said in our report that it is possible—we do not make any surrender of our claims, but we have said that it is possible—to put this other construction upon this contract; and, therefore, inasmuch as we know that the Union Seminary directors, if they see fit, may throw this into litigation, we say that we will appoint a committee of conference with the Union Seminary Directors respecting the relations between Union Seminary and the General Assembly. We do not instruct them. We do not tell them, "You shall not give any expression of opinion." We simply appoint the committee of conference. Now, think of some of the possibilities that might be involved in this committee of conference. They may go down, and if they are generously met, as I have no doubt they will be—because when your feelings cool down, brethren, you will see that this is a much kinder thing than you think, and it is not so cold, either; we made it cold, but it is not so cold—when this committee meet the directors of the seminary they will say: "Now, gentlemen of the directory, this is our construction; this is what the General Assembly think; the General Assembly did not dare surrender any of the rights that it thought it had under the compact, but the General Assembly did recognize in the appointment of this committee that it was a party as well as a judge, and it sent us down to talk about this matter; now, we understand that you intend to take us into the courts. Well, brethren, is that the best course to pursue? Can't we talk this matter over? It is possible, you know, that you may be wrong." Isn't it possible, therefore, that they may come around? You might elect a man as professor of elocution and then transfer him to the chair of theology. Isn't it possible that the directors will feel that the Assembly was right after all? Why, certainly. On the other hand, isn't it possible that your committee would change their view and that they would recommend the next Assembly to reverse the judgment of this Assembly? Isn't that possible? Why, of course it is possible. All things are possible. [Laughter and Applause.] That would be a representative committee, eight ministers and seven elders, composed of the best men, the wisest lawyers, and to such a committee would we entrust this duty. Isn't it possible that both parties in their inability to change their views may say: "Well, we don't want to go to the courts; we remember what Paul said about prosecuting these matters before the Heathen Court; but cannot the General Assembly on report of this committee and the Board of Directors of Union Seminary agree to refer the constitutional interpretation of this old compact, which is liable to come up and be a source of disturbance in years to come—refer it, not to this committee, no: to the General Assembly, not to the Board of Directors of Union Seminary, but to some Christian men outside known for their wisdom, praised for their fairness, and saying on our part as a General Assembly, and while they say on their part as a Board of Directors: "Dear brethren, we are perfectly willing to let any fair-minded set of men arbitrate this question." These are the possibilities in the case. Therefore I think that the kindest thing we can do, if we should be shut up to the necessity of a veto, is just what we propose to do: Appoint this committee for this purpose. That is the strength of that second resolution. It is the kind, the fair and the honest thing; it is the right-minded thing, and I for one would be unwilling to see this report adopted shorn of the second resolution.

Now, let us go back. The question is whether we have the right to veto. I think we have. There are men on this floor who are abundantly able to defend that right, and I leave them to do it. I am satisfied with respect to my own judgment, and I suppose the Assembly is satisfied with respect to its judgment that we have the right to veto. Very well. Suppose we have that right; how long does that right last? One General Assembly has said that it can last only through the Assembly immediately following the election of the Professors. Very well. I think that is a good rule. It may seem a singular thing for me to play the role of an advocate of freedom [laughter], but I am. I am a Professor. I have been a Professor in two theological seminaries. I have the prejudices of my class, and I tell you that, in the name of that class, I will protest against the right of an Assembly to hold the threat of veto over me for a dozen years in succession. They have their chance once, and if they don't veto my appointment then, they ought not to have the chance four or five years hence. Suppose you admit that you can postpone this veto. By and by some other Professor will be saying something that is not right, as we think, and we shall say, "Let us go and veto him. We did not veto him then, but we will do it now." Who is safe? I tell you it is in the interest of freedom; it is in the interests of a proper freedom that you should not allow that it is possible to postpone the veto. You have to do it now or not at all. Very well. Now, then, you have the right to veto, and if you veto you must veto now.

Is it wise to veto? The question under this amendment is whether you shall veto or not veto. Because the amendment reads: "Resolved, That we disapprove, for the present." Now, think of that. If we are now going to veto under the terms of the compact I submit my judgment to the better judgment of my legal friends, and I am only talking what I think is sense. I don't know law

(laughter); but if we are going to veto under the terms of the compact, we must veto in the terms of the compact.

Dr. Moore (the Stated Clerk): Excuse me, Doctor, a moment. I want to call attention to the fact that while the first of that is the compact, the second is simply the decision of the General Assembly.

Dr. Patton: That is not relevant to my remarks. I am talking about Brother Logan's amendment, and my point is this: The question under this amendment is whether you will or will not veto, because to pass this amendment is to determine that you will not veto.

And so I go back to my statement, in spite of the instruction that I have received, and I say that if you intend to veto under the terms of the compact, you must veto in the terms of the compact. Now, what are the terms of the compact? We have drawn this very carefully. We have not said, "Resolved, That the Assembly veto Dr. Briggs' election," but we have said: "Resolved, That in the exercise of the power of the veto in the appointment of Professors the Assembly hereby"—and it used this word advisedly and for technical reasons and after due deliberation—"disapproves of the appointment," etc. Now, when you talk about disapproving "for the present" you depart from your compact, and you have simply expressed your moral dislike and put the stigma of your moral disapproval upon the case, but you have done nothing. You disapprove for the present—simply the expression of your opinion. That is all. If you wish to act under your rights given in the compact you must disapprove.

That is all you have to do. Now, that is my objection to Dr. Logan's amendment; that if he means it to be an amendment to a resolution that proposes to act under a compact it is an illegal proposition. If he does not mean that, then he means to wipe out this whole resolution altogether. I am not ready to have it wiped out.

Dr. Logan: Mr. Moderator, with the speaker's consent, I am willing to—

Dr. Patton (interposing): Pardon me, Dr. Logan. I do not propose to accept an amendment while I have the floor. If Dr. Logan has any suggestions to make to the Assembly and an amendment to the amendment to offer, in the light of my speech, I have no doubt the Assembly will give him an opportunity to present it after I have finished what I have to say; but I trust that I may be permitted to prosecute my remarks to the close without interruption. [Applause.] Now then, the question is whether it is wise to disapprove; whether there is not upon us a responsibility in the case. Please look at this matter. It is one thing to look on sorrowfully and express regret for a condition of things in regard to which you feel no responsibility and in respect to which, therefore, you are not called upon to take action. It is another thing when that same condition of things comes before you and appears at the bar of your conscience in such a sense that for you to neglect action is to be *particeps criminis*.

Now, we are just in that position. If Dr. Briggs had never been transferred, if there never had been an occasion, if we had never been confronted with the question as to whether or not he is a proper person to be a Professor in Union Seminary, I think we should have been all of us very unwilling to seek such an opportunity. But we are here; the presbyteries have sent us here, and the report of the Union Theological Seminary has brought this question right up to the bar of every man's conscience, and you cannot avoid it, and you dare not avoid it. I do not use the word "dare" in an unkind sense at all; I simply use it in the moral sense. There we are. Now, for us not to express technical disapproval is for us to express technical approval. And it is not a matter of reflection upon Union Seminary, or a matter of sentiment or regard for their feelings, or a matter of how much disturbance this is going to occasion the Church, but it is a question as to the discharge of the solemn duty at the bar of your conscience and of mine here and now.

Then, I think that every man of us will agree that the question is here. It is here. We must say, seeing we have the right to veto, and seeing we can never veto if we do not do it now—we must say whether or no there is an occasion for the veto. Now, is there an occasion for veto? I have heard it said as an objection to this report that the report gives no reasons for the proposed action. Well, that was considered very carefully; and in the interests of what we thought best, most Christian, most charitable, most kind, we determined to recommend a disapproval without reason. Some, I dare say, would have said, "You ought to say that Dr. Briggs is incapable of making himself understood, and for that reason is an unfit teacher." Now, just see what that would have been. Again, I say that I am in the interest of fairness. I wish that Dr. Briggs were here, and I want to say one word parenthetically; I want to say that in all this controversy I have never put pen to paper to write a single line on this discussion; and I want to say, moreover, that I have never said a single word that would indicate as to what I thought the action of the Assembly ought to be; but I have said again and again to men who have asked me, "Gentlemen, I want you to remember that I am the President of Princeton College just now; that is my whole function, but if my Presbytery sees fit to send me as a Commissioner to the General Assembly"—I did not go and tell them not to send me [Laughter]—"when I put my commission into the hands of this Assembly then I am a Commissioner of the Assembly, and I am nothing else." [Applause.] Now, that being the case, I say we have done this in the interest of kindness to Dr. Briggs. I would be unwilling for this Assembly to pass a resolution in the body of which there should be the stigma of a constitutional kind that would affirm that Dr. Briggs' idiosyncrasies are such that he should not be a professor in a Seminary. Why, a man's idiosyncrasies go with him through life, and I don't know but they go into the middle state [Laughter,] and I am not willing to say that Dr. Briggs is not fit to be a professor in any seminary; I am not willing to say to say that he is not fit to be a professor in Union Seminary. Not at all. Then they say: "Why didn't you charge him with heresy?" Again, I said it will not do to put as a reason for your veto the fact that he is teaching erroneous views. Why? Simply because to do so would have been, in the event of our report being adopted, for us to put a weapon into the hands of the Committee of Prosecution in the Presbytery of New York which, fair minded as I know they are, they might have used, and I would not do it. I said, keep out this question of Dr. Briggs' heresy. "Well," but it is said, "could n't you state some reasons without involving the question of heresy?" "Yes," I said "I could." "Well," said one, "you have been working in theology, couldn't you draft such a report?" Yes; I said I might. I could draft a report that would give theological reasons why his appointment as a professor should be vetoed that would leave absolutely untouched the question as to whether he was justly liable to the charge of heresy, but it would be so difficult to do it and it would be so difficult after that to prevent the men who read it from making use of it in the heat of debate, that I said: "Brethren, it is not kind, it is not right for the Assembly in its explicit utterance on the adoption of a report to say a word that can be construed, even remotely, to the detriment of Dr. Briggs." That is why we did not give reasons, but it was not because we had no reason. We had reasons. Now, as I have said, I could draft a report that would express reasons if I were only sure that they would be used rightly.

Now, brethren, let me say one thing more. I say there are reasons that I could put in a report, but I do not think it would be expedient. I do not think it wise or right for this Assembly to put into its official action a reason, in view of the conditions of the case. I want to say another thing. In the original draft of this report, as I had presented it to the committee, I had proposed that the functions of this committee should be two-fold: That, in the first place, they should be appointed for the purpose of conference with the Board of Directors, in reference to the contract, and, in the second place, that they should be appointed for the purpose of conference in free and frank interchange of opinion with Dr. Briggs himself. This committee, if there was occasion for it, might report something favorable even if it were only in an informal way respecting Dr. Briggs himself. But I was met with this objection, and I confess it weighed so much with me that I yielded to it at once, and I think the objection was wise. It was said, "You must remember that although the Assembly has no official knowledge of the fact that a process of prosecution is in progress, or is likely to be—the court has been moved in that direction—and while you must be very careful to protect Dr. Briggs, and, by abstaining from every sort of utterance that would seem like a prejudgment of the case against him, you must be very careful also not to clothe this committee with powers which they may construe in a different light, and which may look to the Presbytery within whose jurisdiction Dr. Briggs is as though we had elected a court of jurisdiction to deal with the case separately and independently, and without waiting to reach it in the ordinary course of appellate jurisdiction." Now, I think there was wisdom in that suggestion. If (and we are not members of the Presbytery of New York) the Presbytery of New York, in the exercise of what is its prerogative, and in doing what it thinks is right, shall prosecute Dr. Briggs for heresy, I think it is a matter of almost absolute certainty that there will be an appeal to the Synod, and thence to the General Assembly, and the General Assembly will have to do with the questions raised under the formalities of judicial process in a court of appellate jurisdiction. Therefore, we thought it was fair and but right that we should appoint no committee of conference with Dr. Briggs. We have not prejudged the case. We have regarded the rights of all parties. There were reasons why this committee believed that the Assembly should exercise its power of veto in the operation of disapproval. It is not the question as to whether Dr. Briggs has so departed from the teachings of the Confession of Faith as to be liable to judicial censure. Upon that question we are not called upon to express an opinion. And I want to say for one that I do not intend to express an opinion anywhere, unless (which I hope may never be true), it should be my duty to do so after I have been solemnly charged by the Moderator to remember that I was a member of a solemn court of Jesus Christ, and that the dearest interests of a Christian minister were at stake.

But, apart from that question, it seems to me that Dr. Briggs has expressed himself on certain questions in such a way that, as the report says, "acting on the light we now have," we are in an unfortunate position. We would like to wait. We cannot wait. We would like not to act, and we would be obliged to act, we must act on what light we have. Now, what did we have? We have this. We have it as a well-known fact that Dr. Briggs' position with regard to some matters in the sphere of dogmatic theology is so uncertain—I don't say what it is, but it is so uncertain—that sixty-three Presbyteries have asked this Assembly to inquire into his views, mentioning him by name. The question is whether a man whose utterance on a single occasion and during the lapse of sixty minutes has awakened such distrust is a man who when you are obliged to vote and when you must either sanction or disapprove, is a man who you are ready to say ought to be sanctioned for a position of official theological teaching. Again, it is a fact (you do not judicially know it, but you know it, and you cannot shut this light out of your conscience when you are coming to conscientious arbitration of the question)—it is a fact. We are not responsible for it. We did not advise it. But it is a fact that at the very time when we are asked to say whether we shall disapprove or whether by our silence we shall give consent to his continued relationship to Union Seminary, and under the solemnities which come only at this occasion and which can never come again, at this very time we know that his own Presbytery (not at the instance of an individual prosecutor, who might be prompted by improper feelings, but that his own Presbytery), on the charge of common fame and through a committee of prosecution of their own appointment, and by a majority vote, have initiated proceedings that look to a trial for heresy. Now, isn't it perfectly clear that a man of whom, with respect to important theological doctrines, there is so much doubt as to what he believes that this Presbytery has taken responsible duty upon itself of putting him upon trial for heresy—can there be any doubt in our minds that whatever be the issue of that trial (and of course we hope that trial will be his vindication), but that pending the decision of that question can there be any doubt that we ought not to say he is the right man to teach Biblical theology? I do not think I risk much when I affirm that there are no two possible opinions about that, when you look at the matter free from prejudice and as a purely intellectual matter.

Now, let us say further, Dr. Briggs is in an uncertain position—that is to say, the church does not know what he believes. Now, I say a man in a theological position ought to have the confidence of the church. That his position is uncertain is self-evident. Why, his friends say this. I would not risk the saying of some things that even Dr. Dickie has said when speaking in his defense. It is true that instead of keeping the friends of truth a solid, undivided front, and saying, "In spite of differences of opinion we are one in our loyalty to the Bible," he has poured his shot right into the thick of the friends of the faith. Now, spirit, *animus* is a difficult thing to define, but we all feel it. We all feel that there is an undefinable spirit running through the inaugural discourse, which makes us sure that though he may be sound in himself, he is not a safe teacher. I am simply expressing convictions that others have formed.

Again, there are many things in his address that I agree to. When a man says that reason is a source of authority in religion, I say so, too; and if that is heresy, I want to be tried. This passage is perhaps the worst thing in his address—it is not heresy. When a man says I believe for myself, that if I have got the ague, quinine is the only specific that will do any good, but that cold water is just as good as anything else for other people, he is vacating in what he says about other people the affirmation he makes in respect to himself. I am the last man to intimate that Dr. Briggs would ever teach anything contrary to the fundamental principles and truths of Christianity, so far as these truths are articles of faith. But the question is not only that a man shall believe that this is true, but that a man shall believe that this truth stands so related to a man's eternal salvation that he perils his soul if he don't accept it. Dr. Smith says that he is not familiar with Dr. Martineau's writings. I am. And I want to say about Dr. Martineau that I regard him as my guide, philosopher and friend with regard to some questions, that I have read him studiously, and that I have been inspired by him as to style and mode of dealing with some questions as I have been by no one else, and if it were a question as to whether I should be a

materialist or a pantheist, I know no one that I would quote quicker. But this same Dr. Martineau, Unitarian, and all that, has been illustrating the principle of *facilis descensus Avernus* until he has reached the lowest place that a man can get unless he absolutely denies the existence of God; for he has vacated your creed of the doctrine of inspiration and of the fact of revelation and of the great truths of Christianity, and he has laughed to scorn the fundamental truths of a Nicene Theology. And yet Dr. Briggs says that the average Christian would not think he was any less to be respected than Spurgeon. I do not say that he says he believes this. I say he has left an impression upon the mind of the reader that is altogether in the direction of this apologetic interpretation of the worst enemies of the Christian faith. That is a reason with me, not why he should be tried for heresy, but it is a reason why, being a candidate for approval as a professor of theology, I at least cannot approve for the present.

There is his doctrine of progressive sanctification, which Dr. Smith says he does not understand. Well, if Dr. Briggs holds the doctrine of progressive sanctification, which is the natural and obvious inference from the inaugural address, then he ought not to be confirmed, because that doctrine is one that ought not to be taught in our theological seminaries. If he does not hold that doctrine, in spite of the text as it was written and in spite of the explanations of the text and in spite of the explanation of the explanations, and in spite of the exegetical resources of his most intimate friends, who themselves say they don't know what he means, it is impossible for us to find out what he does believe, then I think that pending an inquiry as to what he does believe the obvious thing is for us to disapprove; and it is perfectly clear that this Assembly cannot do otherwise for the reasons that I have given and for more that I might mention.

Now, you say this is unkind. Well, let us see. Just let me say if there is any one here who needs help, if the directors of Union Seminary cannot read this report, and see in it the holding out of the olive branch, and if the report is so imperfectly constructed and is so open to criticism, on the ground of vague statements, that it cannot be understood, I venture to offer my services at any time as to the interpretation of that report, because I think I know more about it than any living man, for I wrote it.

Now, you must veto now, if you veto at all. If you veto at all you must veto in the terms of the contract—not in the terms of Dr. Logan's amendment. If you do not veto now, in view of the facts, that I have recited, you do sanction Dr. Briggs, and put the imprimatur of this General Assembly, given under the most solemn conditions, upon the broad church comprehension principle. That is all.

Now, suppose you veto. You have closed the door. That is the least you can do. It is the most you need do. You send down your veto. Meanwhile Dr. Briggs has an opportunity to make an explanation. Suppose now that in view of the action of this Committee it should be found that the Union Seminary regard this interpretation of the law as the true interpretation; suppose it should be settled that our interpretation is not the true interpretation. Very well; then we cannot touch him. Suppose it should be found that our interpretation is the true one. Very well; then what have we done? We have simply shut the door. We have vetoed Dr. Briggs. We have taken cognizance of facts in the past. We have said nothing; we have uttered no predictive prophecy. Suppose now an entirely new state of facts should emerge between now and next May, and that we should find that after all we have dreadfully misjudged Dr. Briggs. Why, the temper of this Assembly is manifest. We all have but one mind. We want to save Dr. Briggs if we can, and we know very well that good men are scarce and learned men are few, and if he, besides being good and learned, is also sound, and will vindicate that soundness in a frank way and without standing on his dignity and waiting for a judicial investigation, but will come out and say to this Committee, "Dear Brethren, I am sorry I have given you all this trouble; now I am here, I want you to know exactly what I believe," and if the Committee should be satisfied that it had misunderstood him, why isn't it the simplest thing in the world for that same Board of Directors to re-elect him and for the General Assembly to let the election stand? Why, I venture the prophecy that if such a condition of things were to come about and that between now and next May it were found that we had been in the fault and that Dr. Briggs was only partially in fault, and that he was really where his friends think he is, and where we hope he is, and where he ought to be, the General Assembly, when the story of his re-election was announced, would not wait for the question to be put as to whether it had any technical right to confirm, it would not wait to ask what it could do, you couldn't keep it still—it would by a rising vote reaffirm with gratitude to God its confidence in Dr. Briggs as a teacher of our students of theology. [Applause.]

Dr. Hays: I now make my motion, Mr. Moderator, that all orders of the day be postponed until this discussion is ended and the report now before us is disposed of.

The motion was seconded and carried.

SEVENTH DAY—AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Moderator: The Assembly will now continue the discussion of the report of the Committee on Theological Seminaries.

SPEECH OF JUDGE S. M. BRACKINRIDGE.

I am opposed to long speeches and I shall not inflict one upon you. I did not think I ought to say anything on this subject, but some of my friends have thought that as I have given a great deal of attention to this matter a legal statement from me might have some weight in forming the opinion of those who are to consider this matter.

Let us go back to the history of the case. You will remember that some years ago Union Seminary was not subject to this General Assembly, and in 1870 they presented to the Assembly a request, saying in brief: We regard the dangers arising from the election by the General Assembly itself of the professors of seminaries as so great, that if the General Assembly will waive that right, as applied to the seminaries subject to its jurisdiction, we on our part will concede something to them which now they have not—that is, not the approval, not the confirmation, not the election of our professors, but the disapproval of any election of professors which they do not elect. That being the case, we have no right whatever to approve, and the attempt to exercise the right to approve might well be regarded as an invasion of the rights of the seminaries. We have no right to approve as to Union Seminary. We have no right whatever as to their election of professors, but to disapprove any election which we do not approve. More than that, the next Assembly afterward, the Assembly of 1871, being moved to it, as the minutes show, by the Rev. Dr. Smith, and being seconded by the Rev. Dr. Musgrave, both well-known names, added to this something of great importance, as I think—namely, that this election being reported to the next Assembly held after the election the duty immediately rests upon the Assembly, and the power to disapprove, if not exercised at that Assembly, is abandoned and abdicated and not used, and the election is thereby approved and stands.

Now, it is suggested by some persons, as I have heard, and I

has been suggested to me, that this last action of 1871 is a mere expression of the wish of the Assembly of that year. It is true that it is the expression of its wish, but I think it is more than a wish, for, having been added by its terms to the compact already made, it certainly stands bound by it, and the other party acting upon it, as it well may, consents to be bound by it.

It has also been suggested to me by some of my brethren that, as they understand it, it is the fact that there are cases in which when courts get possession of a controversy limitations stop at once and the rights of either party are unprejudiced by reason of the lapse of time caused by the delay of the courts. Now, there are cases in which this is true, but this is not that case, for we have deliberately made this offer of our own act a part of the compact which we have made, and, as we have reason to suppose, the other party accepts it. It is not for us to question it. That being the case, our duty as a matter of law seems to be absolutely clear—our right and our duty—not our duty as a matter of law, perhaps, but our right. We are clothed with power if we preserve it at this assembly, otherwise not, to disapprove the election of Dr. Briggs. We have no choice. We have no power to delay it. If we do, the power ceases, and the right ends with the dissolution of this Assembly.

I do not think I could make that more clear if I were to dwell upon it at any length. Out of it, let me say, there arises this suggestion: that the amendment of Dr. Logan ought not to be adopted. Why? To undertake to modify the sentence of any court is a course which nearly always brings trouble and impairs the force of the judgment, but in this case it is absolutely unnecessary, since it is only with the present we are dealing or can deal; and besides that it seems to me that it might be vicious because it is calculated to mislead and create false expectations and to delude those who may trust it. It means absolutely nothing unless it is an attempt to impair the force of the judgment. You cannot approve; you must disapprove. And if you will observe the resolution which is reported by the committee, and before you now upon the amendment of Dr. Logan, it is drawn with great care for the purpose of meeting all the exigencies of the case: "That in the exercise of its right to veto the appointment of Professors in the Union Theological Seminary the General Assembly hereby disapprove of the appointment of the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D., to the Edward Robinson Professorship of Biblical Theology in that seminary by transfer from another chair in the same seminary."

That is to say, this Assembly claims as its construction of the law that if a transfer is made from one chair to another it is an appointment. They have no right to deal with transfers, but with appointments. But it is the judgment of this Assembly, if it should adopt this resolution, that a place under these circumstances is an appointment, and the Assembly says that appointments thus brought about is disapproved. We are obliged to use the word "appointment" because that is the language of the law. We are to disapprove an appointment, and that is the reason that sentence is so elaborately constructed.

Now, then, it is proper to say, as you have noticed in the reports, that if, as we suppose, the excellent gentlemen composing the Board of Directors of Union Seminary have acted upon the theory that they had a right to transfer from one chair to another professors already in the service of the institution, we say that is not our view. It is, I presume, the view held by those gentlemen. Now, they assert their views; we assert our views. Of course, neither is competent to decide finally if there be dispute as to this right. Though we are in the position of a court deciding upon our rights, we must be careful not to trample upon the rights of the other side, which involve the right to construe for itself. We claim if this resolution is adopted, that the transfer is an appointment, and being an appointment, we claim that we have the right to disapprove it. They claim, possibly, that it was a transfer which they had a right to make, and therefore did not contravene the terms of the compact. Out of this, if from no other consideration, arises as it seems to me a good reason for the appointment of a competent and weighty committee who will be ready to receive from these gentlemen composing the Board of Directors any statements they wish to make with regard to the view they entertain under which they took this action. More than that, I ought to assure you again, as the Chairman of the Committee has already done, that all this was conceived and done in kindness, with the earnest desire that those to whom we spoke would understand that we were animated by the kindest feeling for them, and that now we are engaged simply in the exercise of a delicate and responsible duty.

As it seems to me under the circumstances which surround us, there are only three courses that we could pursue, possibly:

First. We could approve, and yet I ought to say I hardly think we should. We will not, I am sure. But that is one of the questions.

Second. We could take the course we have taken here.

Third. We could take another course, which I know is in the minds of some persons: We could disapprove of Dr. Briggs. We could express formally, mildly or violently, as might seem well to you, our disapproval of Dr. Briggs and his opinions. Then we could say to the Board, "We are sure, excellent Christian brethren, that you have done what you have done under a misapprehension, and we are also sure that you have, without intending it, violated the compact; we therefore decline to disapprove, and we send the matter back to you confident that you will in the exercise of your office correct all this by taking some measure which shall relieve the church of its difficulty."

Now, that is a charming course to pursue, if it were possible, especially if the directors are ready to suppose that in a disapproval we are treating them unkindly. But how can you satisfy your own minds to allow the possibility of disapproving it to pass away while you are entrusting to somebody else to do something that you ought to do yourselves? What would you think of an agent who being entrusted with the care of your estate, and being confronted with a question which addressed itself to his piety, would allow your legal rights to slip away? Wouldn't you call him unfaithful? Whenever I have thought in that direction it has simply come to that. I am confronted with the fact that if I fail to exercise this right to disapprove I am giving up something which the church had committed to me, and which I cannot return to it as its faithful agent ought.

Piety may degenerate into weakness and kindness into imbecility, but neither of which permit—much less require—the betrayal of a great trust.

Now, if you please, I am on the verge of making a speech which I determined I would not do. In closing I only wish to say that I do not see under the circumstances that it is possible for us to do anything but disapprove. I think it is wise for the Assembly not to give its real reasons. We men of the legal fraternity know that the decision of a judge may be often wise and satisfactory and his reasons absolutely unsatisfactory. Many a time a wise and able judge has been reversed and put to the worst because he ventured to give his reasons—bad reasons for a good act. Never give reasons if you are not obliged to, and when you are obliged to, make them as brief as possible. If I had time, I think I could find forty reasons for that. Certainly it would be folly to attempt to give such reasons in the presence of such an Assembly as this. But it does seem to me beyond question that the condition of the mind of the church,

solicitous for the future, doubting, is a sufficient reason for disapproving of this election. The mind of the church disturbed; the impossibility of ascertaining what is really in the mind of Dr. Briggs! If he cannot make it clear to us in all this time that has elapsed, how does he make it clear to the students whom he has under his instruction? Again, not wishing to say one word of unkindness, let me ask you: Is it an edifying spectacle that a man under indictment in a very precious matter of the truth shall be permitted to teach the boys of the church seeking to learn the ways of the ministry? Is it possible that it should be so? Would it not be a reproach to us that we permitted it? I feel that I have discharged my duty faithfully, and I ask you to excuse me from further—

At this point Judge Breckinridge suddenly fell prostrate to the floor, and was carried in an unconscious condition to the Pastor's study, where he expired within five minutes.

Dr. Hays: I suggest, Mr. Moderator, that you call on some commissioner to lead us in prayer under the circumstances.

The Moderator: Dr. Hays, will you lead us in prayer? Dr. Hays then offered prayer.

Dr. W. C. Roberts: Mr. Moderator, Judge Breckinridge is dead. I would suggest that we adjourn until to-morrow morning and that action be taken in regard to the banquet, which of course cannot now take place.

Dr. Hays: I would suggest that a committee be appointed by the Moderator to take suitable action in regard to this terrible bereavement. I make that motion.

The motion was seconded, put and carried.

Dr. Hays: It certainly is the impression of all those about me here that none of us will be in any mood for a banquet to-night, and I hope the Assembly will not adjourn until there shall be some understanding about postponing or omitting the banquet; and I would suggest that we have a prayer-meeting in this house this evening as a substitute for the banquet. I make that motion.

Dr. S. C. Lowrie: I second that motion.

Carried, and the Assembly adjourned until Friday at 9 a. m.

EIGHTH DAY—MORNING SESSION.

The Assembly to-day, after a long debate, adopted the resolutions presented by Dr. Patton, vetoing the appointment of Dr. Briggs and appointing a committee of conference with the Union Seminary directors. The vote was 446 to 60. On a previous motion to draft a substitute favoring the approval of Dr. Briggs and the appointment of a committee of conference with the directors requesting them to reconsider Dr. Briggs's election and to advise them not to have him teach during the coming year, the vote was 390 to 106 against the substitute. The following is a stenographic report of the day's debate:

CONTINUATION OF THE BRIGGS DISCUSSION.

Israel W. Hathaway: I think that I know something of the spirit which rests upon this Assembly, and I believe it does not desire any long speeches. I will not inflict any lengthy remarks upon the Assembly at this time. But, having heard from the generals of our army, the leaders, I thought it not out of place that we should hear a few words from the rank and file.

I rise to speak for a few moments in behalf of the amendment of Dr. Logan, which I hope with all my heart will prevail in this Assembly. I feel that this is the very least that the majority of this Assembly should concede to the minority in the interests of harmony, in the interests of the kingdom of my Master, in the interests of our beloved Church. I believe that this is feasible and that it is right. We will suppose for a moment—and you will bear me witness that I have good authority for supposing, because our brother Patton builded so much of his speech upon the supposition—we will suppose for a moment that it is true that we must veto now or never. If that be true, if you of the majority of this Assembly will concede that, what are you losing? Nothing. What would you be giving away? Nothing. For is it not in the interpretation of that compact that this action should be taken in the first Assembly after the election of the professor? and is it not to disapprove if we pass this amendment? I find nothing, when we deal with this matter technically, in the compact which says that we are compelled to disapprove forever. We are in harmony with the letter of that compact and the interpretation thereof if we disapprove for one year and hold it in abeyance until sufficient time shall have been given for the Presbytery of New York to act. I say that it is in the line of the letter of that compact, and I ask you, brethren, is it not also in keeping with the action of all civil order? Is it not the custom of the judge of a court to grant a limited prohibition or injunction until time shall have been given to ascertain whether that injunction shall be made permanent or not? I think it is. I say, dealing with it upon the letter, there is nothing to hinder this action of this Assembly, and I plead with you, brethren, in the magnanimity of your hearts and under the spirit that should govern all our actions, that you will concede it.

Secondly, I do not admit for a moment that the position taken by our honored committee is necessarily binding upon our individual judgment. There is no man upon this floor to whom I will yield in my regard, my esteem, my love for that committee, for their judgment, for their scholarship, for everything that fits them to occupy that position. But nevertheless it is one of the glories of our Presbyterian Church that every minister, elder and brother is to do his own thinking. Notwithstanding my regard for these brethren in high places, yet I must in duty to my own conscience and to the Presbytery which I represent here, do my own thinking. We have seen here the master-strokes of the great giants of debate; but nevertheless I in my humble position have the temerity to controvert their conclusions. This beautiful argument, so finely drawn by Dr. Patton, is builded upon the supposition that it is impossible for us to postpone this action, and Dr. Patton said here yesterday in our hearing that he wished it were possible, that we all would love to postpone this action if it were possible. Now, I claim that it is not in the precedence of the ecclesiastical courts of our Church, in interpreting the law, to give that construction to the technical interpretation of the law as it is given in the civil courts. It has never been the custom of the Presbyterian Church so to do. I will admit that technically they are right, but that is the letter that killeth, while the spirit giveth life. And it will be a sad day for the Presbyterian Church when we allow the technicalities of the law to defeat justice. It is that justice may prevail, and not that we may use technicality in order to defeat justice, that our ecclesiastical courts are constituted.

It is upon this point now that I make my argument, that it is in the precedence of the Presbyterian Church to interpret this in the spirit and not in the letter. Now I say that on that supposition and upon that fact all the argument of Dr. Patton topples

to the ground. He admits it himself if we can maintain this point.

And now, brethren, I ask you to note for a moment the form of that report. There is no reason given. Dr. Patton tells us here that the reason why there are no reasons given is that it would be unjust, that it would be unfair, that it would prejudice the case before the New York Presbytery. Well, now, I ask you in all candor—for I have the utmost confidence in the judgment and the scholarship of all the members of this body, and in their ability to think for themselves—I ask you, brethren, whether you have carefully noted what the ultimate effect of this position is? Why, sir, whoever heard of a man being condemned without a reason given? And this report is thus drawn without reason. It seems to me, whether in the intent of the committee or not, it is a fact that its effect will be to catch all possible votes, that you may read into it all the reasons that you choose. The very widest opportunity is given for every member to have his own reason. Some of our brethren who will vote to sustain this report will so vote because they feel that Dr. Briggs is heretical. Others of you will vote to sustain this report because you feel that the infelicities of his manner and his idiosyncracies incapacitate him for his position. One will vote upon one ground and another will vote upon another, because there are no reasons given.

And now one word as to the justness, the unfairness and all that. Why, I had rather meet a thousand foes with square reasons given than an inference. If there be any unfairness in putting the reasons in, there is an hundredfold unfairness in leaving the reasons out, because then it is open to all manner of construction.

And then, Dr. Patton, in your hearing, after saying it would be unfair and unjust, proceeded to give us the reasons in part, and said that there were many others lying back, opening the field for our imagination to play in its largest scope. Now I ask you furthermore, what will be lost by postponing this for a year? Where is the danger? Why, it is said here that the Church is being run down. Our brother from Washington yesterday drew his illustration of the dog, you remember. Why, if the great Presbyterian Church of America is likely to be destroyed by this man, then how much is it worth? The danger, dear friends, is on the other side. How long has this beloved brother been a professor in this seminary? He has been teaching the same things that he will teach to-day, and has the Church been ruined thereby? Can we not afford to wait one more year? And I am sure, brethren, that our brother, by reason of the warning and by feeling the pulse of the church as he has, will adjust himself to the conditions, and I am sure that it will be possible to adjust this in all harmony if this time be given.

Dr. Patton says, "Have we not the right?" I concede the right. Shylock had the right to have the pound of flesh. So has this Assembly the right to veto and destroy the usefulness forever of that brother, and perhaps lose the Union Seminary to our beloved church. Dr. Patton himself intimated that it might go into the civil courts, that it might take its course through all the courts and vex our Church for years. And this action that is proposed to take will be the very thing that will precipitate that result. But let us not claim the pound of flesh. Let us not draw the blood that shall make much of the inheritance of our beloved church confiscate. Now, dear brethren, I plead not for Dr. Briggs, for I am a loyal Princetonian. God has given me a son who has chosen the ministry, who graduated with high honors under Dr. Patton last June, and who has already made his arrangements with our beloved moderator to enter the seminary next September, while he might attend Union and board at home; but with my advice and approval he goes to Princeton, and thus I prove my loyalty to that institution. I plead not for Dr. Briggs; I plead for charity. I plead for peace I plead for the broadest liberty of investigation in the scholarship of our Church. And if it be possible for Dr. Briggs, or those whom he represents, to destroy our Bible, then I want it destroyed. I do not give a farthing for a Bible that is conserved by the deliverance of a General Assembly. Let us not be afraid of dangers that I think have been magnified in our mind. I think there has a sort of a wave of enthusiasm for the old orthodoxy taken possession of us, so that we know not of what spirit we are. I plead that you will halt; I plead that you will for a moment wait and think of that which is before you. We are making history to-day, brethren. Let us be careful that we do not make a history that our children will have to apologize for, as the Presbyterian Church has ever been apologizing for Calvin when he consented to the burning of Servetus in Geneva. Let us not make history so that our children will have to apologize for our position as some have in their position toward Albert Barnes. Let us halt until the waters shall quiet down. I plead not for Dr. Briggs, I plead not for heresy. I plead simply for the broadest charity and the broadest investigation, the most liberal investigation in our Church. I do not believe that the Presbyterian Church can afford to take any other position than this. Some of my brethren have said to me, "We care not what the world says; we must not be influenced by the world." But, dear brethren, we are dealing with a world lost in sin. We are here to bring them to grace, to bring them to a knowledge of the saving love of God in Jesus Christ our Lord. We have to deal with the world, and the world may misinterpret this if we take this action to-day. They will not even give you the credit of honesty of purpose, some of them; and so I plead that you will in the magnanimity of your hearts consent to the adoption of this amendment in the interest of the peace and harmony of our Church.

Suppose that it was one of you. Suppose it was you, my brother, that had made some mistake, that had said things you ought not to have said, and the eye of the Church was focused upon you, and that this General Assembly was discussing your case. Would you consider it a great thing if they held off their hands for a little until 'his matter could be investigated in the judicial manner provided in the form of government of our Church, through the Presbytery of New York? I think not. I think you would think it was a very hasty action to do otherwise. It makes a vast difference, brethren, whose ox is being gored. So it is for this that I plead. Let us turn to the great thoughts and objects of our Church. This is not the greatest subject. This sinks into insignificance beside the great commission, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Why, if the position occupied by Prof. Briggs be false it will come to nothing. If it be true, what are we that we shall stand against it? Lest with Paul we be found able to fight against God.

SPEECH OF DR. SAMUEL BOWDEN, LE ROY, N. Y.

I purpose, in whatever remarks I shall now make, to make no references whatever to Dr. Briggs. I shall certainly make no attempt whatever to appeal to your feelings. I am going to look at the legal aspects of the question. I had hoped to immediately follow Judge Breckinridge in order to carry out in my own way the conclusions of the able speech to which you listened on yesterday. I hope this assembly will not allow itself to be confused and perplexed by the amendment proposed to the report of the Committee on Theological Seminaries. It was shown most clearly by the very able speech of Dr. Patton on yesterday morning that any action here taken must be made in the terms of the compact

between the General Assembly and the directors of the Union Seminary. When we come to the execution of a compact we must adhere to technicalities, offensive as may be that word. As Dr. Patton said, we must execute the compact in the terms of the compact, and in none other. Judge Breckinridge, who with Judge Humphrey were legal advisers of our committee during their three days' session of this week in what may be called his dying speech, made this clear, I hope, to the minds of every one of you. And associated as I have been with him these three days in such pleasant and profitable intercourse, I trust you will pardon me if I make some reference to his death which occurred so near to where I stand. Sudden death, sudden glory; it was the nearest to a translation that I can possibly conceive of. That gentle and loving soul was in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, made perfect in holiness and immediately received up in glory. Who doubts it! How do the vain figments of men disappear in the bright light of these blessed facts.

But let us look at the language of the compact itself by which these eminent judges told us, in the committee, we must be guided. We there went over the whole matter in detail. Suggestions of every kind were made, and in the end it was decided that we could do what we did, and that we could do nothing else. Now, what is the language.

"All appointments shall be reported to the General Assembly, and no appointment of a professor shall be considered as a complete election if disapproved by a majority vote of the Assembly."

And further the Assembly the true meaning of the act subjecting the election of a professor to the veto of the Assembly is that such election be reported to the next General Assembly thereafter, and if not vetoed by that Assembly the election shall be regarded as complete, according to the plan ratified by the Assembly of 1870.

There you have it in the exact language of the compact, and in perfect concurrence with the language of that compact is the first resolution presented to you by our committee, which I will again read. I repeat these things because I meet with men at the dinner table and everywhere else who say that the thing has not yet been made clear to them, that they do not understand it; and they tell me I would confer the greatest service if I could make it plain to their minds. The resolution the amendment to which we are now considering reads:

"Resolved, That in the exercise of its right to veto the appointment of professors in the Union Theological Seminary the General Assembly hereby disapproves of the appointment of the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D. D., to the Edward Robinson professorship of Biblical Theology in that seminary by transfer from another chair in the same seminary."

That is what we did, and that was the only thing we could do in the premises. We might have done one or other of the two things. Either we could have done nothing whatever, and then in the oft repeated phrase which our legal advisers told us was also good law, "silence gives consent," and Dr. Briggs's appointment would be complete, not to be interfered with by this Assembly; or else the only other action that could be taken is contained in the first resolution of our committee that has just again been read in your hearing. That action, whatever may be said about the matter, must be taken now or never. We have no election whatever in the case. The appointment must be reported to "the next General Assembly," and if not disapproved by that General Assembly the election is complete, and with it this Assembly has nothing further whatever to do. It is a complete and finished transaction. We could not alter the language of this resolution in the slightest degree. If we had said "Entirely disapproves" it would have made our action null and void. If this matter comes before a civil court, as we are told from time to time it will come, then if in the action proposed by our committee, and which we hope is to be adopted by this General Assembly, we should use any word whatever but the word "disapproved," then if the General Assembly were the plaintiff in a civil case we would be thrown out of court. We would have no case. We would be consulted of necessity. And if the General Assembly were the defendants, the plaintiff would take his judgment just as rapidly as a judge in New York throw out of court the heirs who hoped to catch the millions under the Stewart will. We would have no case. We can have no case whatever if we use any word except the word "disapproved." To "disapprove for the present" means to approve. Properly speaking, the amendment proposed is not an amendment to the resolution offered by your committee, but it is to substitute for that a resolution which utterly and entirely negatives the action proposed by the committee; and Dr. Briggs's election stands, and you will have nothing further whatever to do with it. It may be said that this is technicality, that it is not the spirit of the law; but should it ever come before any judge, any competent judge will tell you, "I have to do with the letter of the compact." It may be compared as a figure of rhetoric to the pound of flesh, but with that we have nothing whatever to do. We must keep ourselves safe and be sure that we abide by the compact. This episcopal convention, this assembly of the ministry and eldership of the Presbyterian Church, is the highest court in the Church. Higher than it there is none other. It is comparable in that regard to the Supreme Court of the United States, and when a case comes from a lower court to that Supreme Court the action of our highest tribunal is to reverse or sustain. Did you ever hear of such a thing as the Supreme Court reversing "for the present" any action of the lower court? No; it says *simpliciter* "We reverse" or "We sustain." In this case we cannot sustain. We have nothing whatever to do with approving or sustaining. There is nothing in the compact between the seminary and this Assembly that gives us the right to approve any of their elections or appointments. The one sole and entire right that we have is to disapprove, to disapprove *simpliciter*, without the slightest qualification. That right we have exercised, and no other right have we in the premises. To substitute the amendment "Disapprove for the present" would simply nullify the proposed action of the committee. There is a shorter and much easier and a better way to arrive at that result. Let the question come simply and squarely before you and approve or disapprove of this resolution; but let us not attempt to do it by indirection, which necessarily involves the approval of Dr. Briggs's election and forever prevents this Assembly from having anything whatever to do with that appointment. I trust I have made the matter plain to you in its legal aspects. It is the first time I have ever appeared on this floor. Like Judge Breckinridge I would gladly have remained away from it, but I have heard so many things said by brethren who stated that they did not understand the legal aspects of the question that, being a member of the Committee, and having for three days had this matter presented to us in every possible form and manner, I have trusted that I might at least be able to throw some light upon the subject. With these remarks I leave it to you and shall not speak upon the question again.

SPEECH OF ELDER McCOOK.

John J. McCook, an elder in the Fifth Avenue Church of New York: Mr. Moderator, Fathers and Brethren:—It is with no small sense of responsibility that I stand as nearly as possible upon the spot from which my beloved friend, Judge Breckinridge, after he had fully discharged his duty, was called to his

reward. God in His providence called him from the General Assembly here below to the General Assembly of the Saints above. If it were in my power I would like to burn it into the hearts of every Presbyter here, so that when the time comes to vote upon the questions that are before this house, you would remember the appeal that Judge Breckinridge made, not only to your judgment and discretion, not only to the duty of the instructions from your presbyteries under which many of you have come up to this Assembly, that you should do the only thing that you have the right or power to do, if you revere and respect and honor and obey the laws that control the action of the Presbyterian Church.

When my brother, Doctor Dickey, appeared yesterday and made his eloquent appeal to our sympathies to defer action upon the ground of expediency, I could not but feel how easy it is for us to be generous and to give away that which belongs to another. But we, as Commissioners, have come here to deal with the affairs of our beloved church, and to stand up in defense of the purity and the honor of that Word of God which we believe to be inerrant, and to do that which is right in the sight of God and man.

I am aware that I must confine my remarks, as I shall, to the strict motion before us, which is the amendment offered by Dr. Logan. While my heart burns to get away from all these technicalities and dilatory motions to the real question before us, to the question that has called us here as Presbyters and as members of the High Court to perform a duty for which we are accountable, not only to our Presbytery, but to the God whom we honor and whom we wish to obey.

This question, to those who have studied it from the beginning, is a very simple and a very clear one, but personal appeals have been made to us now and again, not in the open sessions of the Assembly, but about the lobbies of the hotels and in other places, to be careful, to be careful of what! Careful to take counsel of our fears and to consider the call to expediency as higher and stronger than your call to duty. Such appeals ought not and I hope will not affect us. We have come here to do our duty, and if God continues to bless us and to guide us by His holy Spirit we will send forth to the world the only deliverance which we as honest men, controlled as we should be by the laws of our Church, can send out to the world.

Now, sir, with the permission of the Assembly, I turn with much regret to the legal technicalities controlling this case. We must understand how this compact came about. At that blessed reunion of the Church in 1870 such godly men as Dr. William Adams, who was then a director and shortly afterward the President of Union Seminary, whose presence was a benediction whose spirit was such that those who came in contact with him cannot fail to remember, came up to the General Assembly of the Church and said: 1. The harmony, the union of our blessed Church will be advanced if we can secure some plan upon which all the theological seminaries shall be controlled upon a basis uniform in instruction and in government, and so as to secure to each seminary the confidence and support of the entire Church. 2. This memorial Dr. Adams carried to his friends at Princeton, who opened their arms and hearts to receive him, and they so promptly responded to his request, that if you will take the trouble to read any of the papers prepared in advance of and while the reunion was under discussion, you will find a clause inserted in every one, outlines for a basis of reunion, strongly expressing the necessity of guarding the purity and securing uniformity in the instruction and government of our seminaries. Dr. Adams gave much of his attention to this subject, which resulted in the production of that memorial printed in the Assembly minutes of 1870, which will be forever a lasting honor to the Union Theological Seminary. The directors of the Union Seminary came up to the General Assembly, and of their own motion suggested that while they were entirely free, as two other seminaries were, from the control of the General Assembly, they proposed to subject themselves to the authority of the highest court of the Church to the extent of giving the Assembly the right to "disapprove" thereafter the election of all professors in the seminary. The directors in their corporate and aggregate capacity did that which the ministers and the elders composing that body had done when they assumed their responsible duties—they agreed to submit themselves to their brethren in the Lord, and they came before that Assembly with this memorial. It contains, besides the recitals which are most instructive and interesting, but two propositions. Those propositions have been read over and over, but they are so short that I hope I will not weary you by again repeating them:

First. That the Board of Directors of each theological seminary shall be authorized to appoint all professors for the same.

Second. That all such appointments shall be reported to the General Assembly, and no such appointment of professor shall be considered as a complete election if disapproved by a majority vote of the Assembly.

The preambles recite the reason it was then thought to be wise to do this business in this way. It was not, as was intimated yesterday, by a professor in Lane Seminary, that the ministers and elders of the Presbyterian Church are not competent judges of what should be taught by professors in certain chairs in our seminaries.

No; Dr. Adams and his associate Directors did not so address the General Assembly. He gave reasons: Because of the large number composing the Assembly, the short time it is in session, of the distance of many of the Commissioners from the Seminaries. For these reasons they thought it a wise thing to submit the election of all professors to the Directors of the respective Seminaries. They said, in substance, that the Union Seminary should be placed upon the same plane with the other seminaries of the church. They therefore came and requested that the General Assembly should surrender the right which it then had to elect the Directors of Princeton and Western and McCormick and other seminaries whenever the Directors of Union Seminary appointed a professor, to submit the same for the approval or disapproval of the General Assembly before such election should become complete. There was a valid reason for this in the desire to secure soundness and uniformity in the instruction given in all the seminaries as well as to secure a proper share in the benefactions, and to provide a guarantee upon the basis of orthodoxy for seminaries the endowments of which have been so generously provided by those godly men and women in New York who have given the money to build up this great institution.

Suggestions have been made that legal complications may grow out of our action here to-day. I beg that you will not permit such a suggestion to have lodgement in your minds for a single moment.

I know that the Directors of Union Seminary are clear-headed, vigorous, able, honorable, and conscientious men and intelligent Presbyterians, and I do not hesitate to say to you now, whatever may be said to the contrary from this platform, that the honorable Christian men composing that Board of Directors are anxiously awaiting the expression of their views of this Assembly, and I am perfectly sure they will meet its conclusions in that manly and Christian spirit in which they have obligated themselves to meet a suggestion that comes from the highest court of our Church, the confidence and endorsement of which they have asked, and to the jurisdiction of which in this matter they have daily submitted their action.

Now, let me tell you how the legislation that resulted in this action of the Assembly of 1871 originated. Of the three independent seminaries, the one at Auburn was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, with two Boards of Commissioners and Trustees.

These Commissioners convened after the action of the General Assembly of 1870 upon the memorial of Union Seminary, studied the matter thoroughly, and before the next General Assembly convened they raised the question as to whether they had the power as a corporation of the State of New York to submit their appointment of professors for the disapproval of the General Assembly. They referred the matter to their Prudential Committee. That Prudential Committee took the advice of counsel and the case was examined with great care by them—just as was done, as I am informed, on the part of Union Seminary by that distinguished lawyer Daniel Lord, who was then the legal adviser of the Union Seminary. Every step was taken by the Boards of both Union and Auburn with the utmost regard to the technicalities involved as well as to the interest of the church. There was no objection at all to their accepting the authority and oversight of the highest court of the Presbyterian Church in this matter. They advised that all elections of professors should be conditional and to become effective only when approved by the General Assembly. After considering fully as to what they should do, the Auburn Board sent up to the General Assembly to fix the time within which this power of disapproval or veto should be exercised. This point is essential. Auburn was independent, as Union was. The Board sent to the General Assembly an expression of their great desire to co-operate in this movement for uniformity and to secure the indorsement and support of the Church, but before adopting the plan proposed by Union Seminary and recommended by the General Assembly they insisted on knowing when the right of veto to be left in the General Assembly should be exercised? Now, in order to be prepared for any legal technicalities which might arise, I sent to Auburn to get a copy of their action, and the clerk of Auburn Seminary sent me a copy of the proceedings taken. They passed a resolution in both their Boards of Commissioners and Trustees, which I infer never came under the eye of Dr. Moore, who has done so much for the church in making us his most valuable Digest, as I do not find reference to it therein.

The Prudential Committee approved, but the question was how long this right of veto should continue. The Secretary of the Auburn Board wrote to Dr. Hatfield, who was then the Stated-Clerk of the General Assembly, at that time in session in the city of Chicago, that they were prepared to take this proposed action; they had been advised that it was lawful for them to take it; that they did it with all their hearts, but that it was very important to determine before final action how long the veto power should continue. I shall read this letter, to be sure that I stated it correctly.

"One of the embarrassments to our compliance with the proposition that the General Assembly should have a vote in the election of professors was that no time was fixed for the action of the General Assembly for the exercise of that power. A professor might be elected, but it is not readily perceived how he could with propriety be inaugurated before the General Assembly had decided upon it, and, as no time is named for action, the inauguration might be unfortunately deferred."

Please notice what follows, for from this letter we get the first reference to the word "Veto," which accounts for its appearance in that action of 1871. It did not appear in the memorial of Union Seminary. It came up to us from Auburn, and as a condition which ought to control this whole decision. The letter goes on:

"As in the case of legal enactments there is no time fixed for the Executive to act on the passage of a law by the Legislature. On falling to do so the act becomes a law without his signature. So provision should be made in this case."

This letter was presented by Dr. Hatfield to the General Assembly, and the General Assembly promptly responded to the request of Auburn, and wrote into that compact, which controls us here to-day, the fact that the election of professor should be acted upon at the next General Assembly; falling in which, it should be complete.

Gentlemen come here and say that one General Assembly can do a thing and another can undo it. I say to them, Nay, this General Assembly, will, I am sure, never, if it fully understands the question, do that which is wrong. This is not simply a compact between this General Assembly and Union Seminary, but it is a compact with Auburn and Lane, and Princeton and McCormick, and all the rest of our seminaries, thirteen in all.

I do not like the suggestions that have been made by some that we, when entering into this compact with Union and all the other seminaries, are and we ought to be bound by that action. We are under the obligation as honest men—as Christian men—to carry out in its exact terms all the provisions of that compact, and we cannot, we dare not postpone action; we must act now or the right to disapprove is lost forever, and Dr. Briggs's election will be complete, and because of our failure to act and to perform the responsible duty for which we have been sent as Commissioners to this Assembly. We have upon us the obligation of honest men in the interpretation and fulfillment of an honest contract. I appeal to every instinct in you as Presbyterians that we as Commissioners shall not do anything that can be cast up to us as a breach of contract to this agreement.

The note on the minutes of Auburn Seminary, where the act on of the Assembly is recorded, says:

"The suggestion contained in the above letter—the one I have read to you—and in the published minutes, say that the Assembly declared that the true meaning of this act subjecting the election of professors to the veto power of the Assembly is that such election be reported to the next General Assembly thereafter, and that the action of the Assembly should be taken by such Assembly and report made thereon before adjournment."

That is the way Auburn Seminary understood this compact. That is the reason why Auburn did not ratify this contract in 1871 with the other seminaries. The Board, carefully and in compliance with the trust that they had assumed, asked a deliverance from the Assembly of 1871. They got it, and we are bound by it as firmly as man can be bound by any contract. We must act—we must act now—and we must act with the deepest sense of responsibility, from which we cannot relieve ourselves except by taking the only course consistent with our duty and vote to sustain the report and recommendation of the Committee on Seminaries to disapprove the election of Dr. Briggs.

W. E. MOORE, D. D., the permanent Clerk: I just want to state one thing in explanation. The Digest and its editor have been quoted, and quoted fairly and rightly, as insisting that the action as it stands there does not imply or show a compact. Col. McCook has shown from documentary evidence that it is a compact. I beg, therefore, that the Assembly will regard the permanent Clerk as for another time (as many times in his life) to have been mistaken, but mistaken because the records of the Assembly failed to show the facts that Col. McCook has read. [Applause.]

SPEECH OF DR. S. C. LOGAN.

I have been earnestly requested to withdraw my amendment, and I have been thought to be heretical because I introduced it.

Now, I want to give one or two reasons directly for the amendment itself, and if, after that, the House would like to have me withdraw it I will be glad to do so. [Applause.] It is not a very gracious task to undertake to attack such an ecclesiastical lawyer as Dr. Patton or such civil lawyers as have spoken from this platform on this subject, but it is a queer kind of law that these brethren have given us, as it strikes an old Presbyterian. I am amazed at the report of this committee. It gives such a queer statement. Now, what is the contract. Here is the authority of the Presbyterian Church, and this court represents it. This is a court of last resort—the court of control. In 1870, in remodeling certain institutions and for the adjustment of the control of this high court, the high court determined upon what lines it would exercise its administrative control of the theological training and teaching of its ministers. By the old administration the control was direct by the Assembly over every professor. When the Union of the Church took place another system was brought in; the other branch had control in a different way. And in order to meet the case this General Assembly issues its expression of the way by which it proposed henceforth to control theological education in the whole Church; and it set that forth in two propositions. The first: "That the Board of Directors of each theological seminary shall be authorized to appoint all professors for the same;" second: "That all such appointments shall be reported to the General Assembly, and no appointment of a professor shall be considered as a complete election if disapproved by a majority vote of the Assembly."

Now, how that came about you and I do not know. We are not dependent upon the records of Auburn Seminary, or of Union, or of any other seminary. We are to decide by what the law is in the minutes of the General Assembly, and I am amazed at my brother to get up here with records from Auburn to show us what our compact might be with this party or that party. There is the law of the Church. The next year in comes Union Seminary petitioning to come in under this law. Does the General Assembly enter into and become a party to a compact with Union Seminary under a law that governs all the seminaries? Where are the parties? They petition to come under that law. And you will find recorded as the next point that the General Assembly simply granted the petition—adopted this child, under the law by which it controls its own children. That is all. Then comes another point: The question as to when shall it be known whether the man elected is to take his place. That is answered by one Assembly in the interpretation of its own law for itself. It cannot answer it for all time. It becomes no part of a compact or fundamental law. The fundamental law itself must be changed. But this cannot be made a part of that fundamental law. The brethren who constituted the General Assembly in 1871 acted for that Assembly alone. The Church may accept that action, but cannot bind the liberty of the General Assembly in its administration. It is supreme in itself. In that act they simply put out a sort of programme of mode of action for the time being. But has not the time come when it is necessary to change that? Even if it were in force, has not the time come to change it? Now, according to the interpretation which these gentlemen have given, this is a part of the compact. Can there be a contract without both parties assent to it? Was Auburn Seminary present? Was Princeton present? Because they are all equally under it. Why, that idea of law and of administration is to be absurd. Now, let us come directly to this question that is before us. According to the interpretation which these brethren have given of the law of the Church and of the administration of the Assembly, it is the theological seminaries that are running the Assembly and not the Assembly controlling theological teachings. That is just what it means. You cannot do it unless you do it so and so; you have adopted me into the family, but when I need a spanking, if you do not do it at the moment you have no authority to do it at all. My mother didn't believe that kind of Presbyterianism. [Laughter.] She used to take her children aside and pray with them, and let it hang over them a little, and mention it now and then and—[Laughter.]

Now, I trust that this Assembly will act likewise. This is a question of administration; it is not a question of law. This Assembly has the control, and not only is it not limited to the exercise of its authority to to-day, or to this Assembly, but it continues. Suppose we confirm Dr. Briggs in his chair to-day, and suppose in the course of one year when the next Assembly meets he shall have demonstrated that he utterly denies the authority of the Word of God; is there no remedy? [Voices: "No."] Well, the Lord never made a church of that sort. He provides a remedy: "Be sure your sin will find you out." You will find this demonstrated in the whole history of the Church, that there is no power outside of the General Assembly to limit it to save that which comes directly through the action of the Presbyteries in an organized and direct way. Dr. Patton makes a beautiful point in this, that he asks that the action of the Church shall be taken at once on the confirmation of a professor, and he says because one of them, not willing to remain under the power of the Assembly in that matter, even for a year after the General Assembly has confirmed him in such position, has to let him go. If he should go as wild upon theological as he has upon ecclesiastical law, is there no way to reach him? Has he stepped into the sublime position of a teacher in God's seminary that shall put him over the whole authority of the Church of God? That is the issue which is reached by such ecclesiastical law as these brethren have been teaching yesterday and to-day. Now, the question before us involves the character of the directors of this seminary, for our refusal to assent to the act of the directors is not an impeachment of Dr. Briggs, but it is an impeachment of the men that put him there. [Cries of "No." "No."]

A Commissioner: I rise for information. What is the definite specific point that the brother is coming to? [Laughter.]

Dr. Logan: I cannot be responsible for the brother's perception of vision. [Renewed laughter.] Now, it is a question whether it is absolutely necessary for us in order to control that professorship to act to-day, or whether we may act to-day as a respite—as not an act completed in all its parts. Shall this seminary step out from under the control of this Assembly because we fail to meet their judgment of what we mean by our own act? Our act is that we shall disallow for the present the election of this brother or the fulfillment of the act of this Board of Directors.

Dr. Francis: I would like to ask Dr. Logan this question: When will we have an opportunity to reverse that if we want to do it?

Dr. Logan: As soon as the Assembly shall come together again.

A Commissioner: This Assembly continues through its officers. The Assembly never dissolves.

Dr. Logan: No, sir; this Assembly does dissolve, and as soon as the next Assembly comes together they may take up the same question. If there is disorder they will be bound to do so, and they can control in accordance with the compact as it has been announced. They can control in accordance with the fundamental principles of the responsibility of the high court of God's house, and I am not afraid of any of the courts of this land, because that question has been decided over and over again. I have seen the declaration of an Assembly of the Presbyterian Church that a certain set of men sitting on the steps of a church constitute the church when the doors of the church were

locked against them, and the Supreme Court of the United States sustained that declaration. It is a question whether the seminary shall run the church or the church shall run the seminary in its fundamental principles. I say it is not wise as a work of administration to take this judgment as announced by the Committee, which impeaches the act of the Board of Directors of Union Seminary, which impeaches the character of Dr. Briggs as a professor—and all this without having the parties before us, and without having a full understanding of the case, and in the face of those categorical answers to direct questions, which the Board of Directors have issued as a vindication of their acts—I say it is not wise. It will lead to bickerings and misunderstandings; it will lead to controversy, and it will have a bad effect. But, on the other hand, if we go slowly, if we go to these men kindly, they may see the wrong; the things that need mending may be mended, and, if not, the evil will develop itself distinctly so that the Church of God shall be able wisely to destroy it. That is my reason for this amendment. I beg you to walk slowly and reach your decision, on which you may be able to present a united Church before the living God for the glory of our one Lord. [Applause.]

SPEECH OF DR. JAMES S. RAMSEY, OF NEW YORK.

You have already found out that the delegation from New is distinguished for its modesty. I say this in your presence conscious of an echo favorable when I tell you, as I believe I am right in so doing, that thus far Col. McCook is the only gentleman who has been heard upon any question; and I think, sir, in view of the fact that the Presbytery of New York is more closely related to the settlement of the question before you than any other Presbytery, that we are entitled to a little courtesy in the house. [Applause.] It is an unpleasant thing for a man to speak against the sentiment and the feeling of a house. I admit that, although not as modest as some of my brethren from New York, at the same time I do feel a shrinking in speaking against such a feeling, and I will take this precaution not to put before my speech the words that I will not make a long one, for I have found that every man who has done this and said this has spoken wonderfully long. I also say this, that I cannot claim to speak for my brethren of New York Presbytery. We stand there generally for ourselves. We are accustomed to do our independent thinking. We do not get very frightened either at being cried down by "Question," for we get it very frequently. Some one in seeking to compliment our Presbytery has said that it is sometimes like a bear garden, but it is not. I wish also to state this, that my two reasons for begging your attention this morning are, first, because I am a member of the New York Presbytery, because I am on the side of the prosecution there; and secondly, because I find myself in difficulty here, and my difficulties are constitutional ones. So that standing for myself alone, though I am sentimentally opposed to Dr. Briggs, though I am in favor of the prosecution, though I expect to go back to New York City and stand behind the prosecuting committee, yet at the same time I feel—I cannot help feeling—that if anything is right it is the proposition now before you in the form of an amendment. [Applause.] I cannot understand if the nations of this world can arrange a *modus vivendi* of a treaty that expires by limitation, why this Assembly cannot arrange something of the same kind. If every constitutional difficulty were out of the way, I would feel my way clear to vote for this popular paper of Princeton's philosopher. But, whether you can see the propriety of my position or not, I have a sense of consistency, of congruity of my convictions with my action; and I say as I stand here that I cannot vote for that paper. And yet, sir, I shall continue the prosecution of this case in its proper place.

Brethren of this General Assembly, I am perfectly aware that I occupy an anomalous position. I may seem inconsistent to you all. I cannot help that. If it is impossible for me to explain my consistency, attribute it to what you please—to cerebral disturbance, possibly congenital, or to the climate of New York; I do not know what. But the point in my case is just this. I do suggest it with extreme hesitancy. My first objection, my constitutional one—and when I think of myself stating it, whose brain is but as a floating atom in a broad beam of light compared with Dr. Patton's—I hesitate; yet, sir, I do throw a doubt upon the very bedrock of this question. I do, sir, most decidedly doubt whether the General Assembly has the right that it is now so willing and so certain to exercise. "Before any overture or regulation proposed by the Assembly to be established as constitutional rules shall be obligatory on the churches it shall be necessary to transmit them to the presbyteries, and to receive the returns of at least a majority of them in writing approving thereof."

The Assembly is a derivative body. It gets all its power from the presbyteries. And I would like to know how the Assembly obtained this authority; it was not a charter right at the reunion—as it was assumed afterward. I would like to know, friends of this Assembly, when consenting overtures came up to the Assembly giving to it the right? And, even if they had done so, I venture to doubt the constitutionality of any presbytery passing over its right of original jurisdiction to the court of final appeal. I believe, sir, that whatever we may do in this case, however we may disguise it, it is a virtual trial of the case.

This leads me, therefore, to the second point that I regard as unconstitutional. This proposed action infringes on the right of the individual. He is not here. He has no case in court. The directors of Union Theological Seminary, in their plight, in their anxiety, ask that Dr. Briggs (and, mark you, I am not a Briggs man in the sense that that term is used)—asked Dr. Briggs to solemnly state what he believed, and he wrote that short Catechism with its yes and with its no, and which, if it had been handed in by any other man than Professor Briggs, would have been received as the correct interpretation of previous utterances. In stead of that, sir, as you all know, it has met with a destructive analysis, and this catechism has been finally interpreted back by the inaugural.

Brethren, if there is one thing I do, I stand for the rights of a man, whether he be my friend or my foe. I do not believe that this glorious Presbyterian Church can even let the semblance of a trial pass without the due form has been taken; and yet we are drifting toward a virtual verdict before the presbytery has even framed its indictment.

Now, that is the case of this man as he stands before us. His last utterance, solemn utterance, satisfactory to the Directors of Union Seminary, has been utterly ignored here; and, sir, if it means anything, it means that we doubted its sincerity. Perhaps you say, "We have the right." But God Almighty grant that the day be far distant when we may impeach an uncondemned brother's veracity, or receive his words as if they came from a Delphic oracle, or assume that his writings may be read between the lines. Why, in all probability, certainly if the evidence is convincing, I shall follow up this case and be found voting against Dr. Briggs. Yet, sir, he shall have every guard thrown around him that I can possibly aid in giving him in every stage of his trial. The other week in the Presbytery of New York a committee appointed to look into church affairs censured a respectable colored preacher. I took the ground that no censure should rest, implied or expressed, on any man until it had

been reached by verdict and by the due processes of trial. [Applause.] And, sir, I was glad it was a colored brother who tested this principle, and I rejoice here to say that the committee threw out the censure at once, and then the presbytery sustained my position unanimously.

I could say much more, but I pass on to the last point, and that is that I think this proposed action is an *infringement on the constitutional rights of the Presbytery of New York*. It is an advanced shadow of a decision, at least, in a higher court. Brethren, it meant something in New York to stand for what we believed to be truth and to demand that Dr. Briggs be brought to trial. It meant to be called persecutors instead of prosecutors. It meant to be spoken of as mossbacks and men behind the age. And yet we stood to it, and we can stand yet if this Assembly only stands by us. But I fear that if this report goes through, the whole matter of a trial in presbytery may degenerate into a weak farce. We have a committee in that presbytery, and a good portion of it belongs to this General Assembly. They are able men. They are brave men. They have the grip and the grace to see this thing through if it takes a cycle and God spares their lives. And this latest expression of Dr. Briggs's faith, while it should have had some deterrent effect on the action of this General Assembly, will not necessarily check or change action in Presbytery. Since the trial has virtually begun, then and according to our book, even a man's confession does not do away with a trial, though it may shorten the process. Of course Dr. Briggs's paper would have its due weight, but the trial will proceed, notwithstanding. But if this General Assembly refuses to pass the amendment, and does exercise its veto, then the case is practically decided before the presbytery has even taken any testimony. It should, certainly, as the court of original jurisdiction, have the right to render the first decision, while the Assembly, later on, would have the case properly before it on appeal, and would render the final decision. Why, then, cannot this General Assembly, according to Dr. Dickey's request, let this matter alone for one year, until presbytery can exercise its primary right? You say the Assembly loses its grip on the case if it does not veto this year. Granting the truth of this, is it not better to let its authority lapse than by its exercise deprive a brother of his right to an unprejudiced trial, and cramp the presbytery by rendering a virtual decision in advance of its own action? For, say what we may, the Church and the world will regard your action in the light of a verdict, but it will not command the same respect as if it had been rendered after the slow-it-may-be-but-sure processes by which decisions are constitutionally reached. I protest as a New York Presbyter against any action by this Assembly that anticipates final action, and to that extent prejudices the case of the accused in the lower court. Better waive a right than commit what may prove to be a wrong. Then I plead for time simply that the rights of all parties may be respected and guarded.

To this Church—represented by you—that has ever protected its weakest members by all possible safeguards, that by its cumulative courts lifts the poorest man's case up to the highest judicial throne, that has guaranteed the sacredness of a man's reputation until convicted by his peers of wrong, that claims the indwelling of the Holy Spirit—to this Church I plead:

"First to thyself be true,
And then it follows as the day the night
That thou canst never be false to any man"

or truth. *Postulate lente.*

John H. Worcester, Jr., D. D., of Chicago: I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment. In place of the amendment of Dr. Logan I desire to move this paper as a substitute for the entire report of the committee.

The Assembly recognizes that the present relations of our theological seminaries to the General Assembly were brought about through the voluntary and generous concession by Union Seminary of a portion of its independence. In the interest of a better adjustment for all, it recognizes that in the recent transfer of Professor Briggs to the Chair of Biblical Theology the Directors of Union Seminary acted in perfect good faith upon a possible construction of their powers under the act defining those relations. It recognizes also that the present widespread uneasiness and agitation in the Church has grown out of utterances of Professor Briggs subsequent to that transfer. At the same time it regards these utterances as certainly ill-advised, and as having seriously disturbed the peace of the Church and led to a situation full of difficulty and complication; yet the Assembly desires to act in the spirit of the largest charity and forbearance consistent with fidelity to its trust, and of the most generous confidence in the Directors of Union Seminary.

Therefore, *Resolved*, That a committee be appointed by this Assembly, consisting of eight ministers and seven ruling elders, for the following purposes, to wit:

First. To confer with the Directors of the Union Theological Seminary in regard to the relations of the said seminary to the General Assembly, and report thereon to the next General Assembly.

Second. To request the Directors of Union Seminary to reconsider the action by which Dr. Briggs was transferred to the Chair of Biblical Theology.

Third. To advise that in any case Prof. Briggs be not allowed to give instruction during the year previous to the meeting of the next Assembly.

The Moderator: Is that offered as an amendment to the amendment of Dr. Logan, or to take the place of the report of the Committee?

Dr. Worcester: It is offered technically as a substitute to the amendment of Dr. Logan, but, of course, it takes the place of the entire report of the Committee. That is the form of my motion.

Dr. J. G. Mason: I second that substitute.

SPEECH OF DR. WORCESTER.

Dr. Worcester: Now, sir, as my substitute is properly before the House, I desire to make a few remarks. Under the circumstances under which we are met this morning any attempt at excited rhetoric would be out of place, even if I were capable of it. In the presence of that solemn Providence by which our hearts have all been startled, and, I trust, calmed, the only kind of discussion that seems to be in place is quiet dispassionate, matter-of-fact, reasoning together. I do not stand here as the advocate of Dr. Briggs, though I honor his learning and respect his piety. Still less do I stand here as the opponent of Dr. Briggs, though he has said many things with which I totally disagree, and in a spirit which I utterly disapprove. I stand here as the advocate of peace. From the day I was elected a Commissioner, as I have thought of the responsibilities which would confront me here, one word of Holy Writ has been constantly in my thoughts: "Study these things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." Most earnestly have I prayed that this Assembly might be guided to a conclusion in this grave matter which would unite this Assembly, calm the agitated Church, which would allay this threatened bitterness of strife and send the church forward a united phalanx to more glorious and peaceful victories under the banner of our Lord Jesus Christ. And I do not believe, Mr. Moderator, that on this hope and in this prayer I stand alone. I believe there are multitudes of calm and thoughtful men on both sides of this question—if you call them sides, so far as men's sympathies with Dr. Briggs are concerned—who have been looking for some safe middle course which would avoid extremes and

keep the Church in harmony. And when I heard that this matter had been entrusted to some of the clearest brains in the Church I felt reassured, and it was with profound disappointment that I listened to their report when they presented it to this Assembly. The course proposed in that report is an extreme course. Dr. Patton told us yesterday that this was the very least that this Assembly could do. What more could this Assembly do? You cannot hang Dr. Briggs; you cannot imprison him; you cannot cast him out of the Church; you cannot depose him from the ministry; you cannot impeach his orthodoxy or touch his moral character. The one thing that you can do is to veto, bluntly, absolutely, without a reason given, his appointment. Even upon your power to do that the Committee admit there rests the shadow of a doubt, sufficient to make them think it necessary to appoint fifteen wise men before another year to clear it away. But in the meantime—and I wonder if I am the only Commissioner to whom the relations of the two resolutions in the report was a surprise—while we admit that there may be some question about our authority to do this, we will behead the man and then we will confer with the directors as to whether we had the right to do it.

Then I object to this report because it is an arbitrary report. It says that we disapprove this appointment, and gives no reason. Judge Breckinridge said yesterday, and we all recognize its force, that a judge might often give a very wise decision founded on bad reasons, and therefore it was better never to give reasons if you could help it. But in a matter which touches the standing, the reputation of a man, in a matter which may produce an ecclesiastical trial already initiated, you cannot help it; you have no right to help it. Why, if I remember rightly, it is not so many years since there was a great controversy over the question whether the President of the United States had the right even to behead a postmaster without giving a reason for it. Now we propose to behead officially a theological professor without stating any reason for it. We were told by President Patton that a great many reasons might be given. Why didn't the Committee give a reason? Mr. Moderator, I fear it was because the Committee knew that no one reason would carry a majority of this Assembly with it. Dr. Patton admitted that it would not do to say that it was on account of the idiosyncracies of the professor. He said that theological reasons, not amounting to a charge of heresy, might have been given; but he admitted that, with all his power of lucid statement, in which he has no peer in this Assembly, those reasons would be so intricate and obscure that very few would be able to distinguish them from a charge of heresy. He admitted it would not do to charge him on the ground that he is not sound in faith, because that would be anticipating the decision of the Presbytery of New York. And the only reason I could discover that he would urge as a practical reason that might have been given was that Dr. Briggs is under suspicion. Sir, shall we disapprove of this appointment because Dr. Briggs is under suspicion, when we know that steps have already been initiated to sift this suspicion and ascertain whether it is right or wrong? Is it not one of the principles of our Church to stand by a man who is under suspicion until the suspicion has been sifted to the bottom? At all events, I protest against a bare disapproval of this election without any reason being given. I protest against it because it will inevitably, as Mr. Ramsey has so well said, have an influence upon the judicial proceeding in the Presbytery of New York. The world will believe, and the New York Presbytery will believe, that if this Assembly had not suspected Dr. Briggs of serious departure from the faith it would never have taken this action, and the only way in which you can prevent that impression from being made on the mind of the Church and on the mind of the country is to give some other reason with your resolution.

Now, the Committee feel this; they realize that it would be very desirable to take some milder course if it were possible, because they have said so in their report. "Your committee would have been disposed to recommend that the report of the directors of the Union Seminary, so far as it has reference to the transfer of Dr. Briggs to the Chair of Biblical Theology, be referred to the next Assembly, if such a disposition of the matter had been possible." Dr. Patton said the same thing in his address. Judge Breckinridge said the same thing in tender words of deep feeling in this dying speech that he made to us yesterday. It is simply a question whether any middle course is possible. I cannot believe that a great Assembly like this, desiring to avoid extremes, desiring to do nothing which can in any way cast a shadow of unjust suspicion upon a man under trial, desiring to find some middle path out of this difficulty in which we are all involved, will sit down helpless before a problem like this. It must be possible for this Assembly to find some middle way out of this difficulty. I would have been satisfied, notwithstanding the technical objections of Dr. Patton and the legal argument of Judge Breckinridge, to vote for the amendment of Dr. Logan, and I would not have introduced this substitute for Dr. Logan's amendment at this stage if I had not perceived that the technical difficulty really weighed upon the minds of many judicious men in this Assembly who have just the same desire for peace for which I stand here. But I saw there were technical questions involved. I felt the force, to a certain degree, of Dr. Patton's point, that we must approve or disapprove *simpliciter*. Therefore I propose that we reach the same result in another way, about the legality of which there can be absolutely no question. The only question that can arise is about its safety, and on that I will touch in a moment. The General Assembly can waive this authority if it wants to.

Now, what do you gain? You avoid prejudicing Dr. Briggs before the Presbytery of New York, and I think this Assembly ought to heed very carefully the words of Mr. Ramsey. As he has pointed out, the prosecutors in this case are in a sufficiently trying and delicate position. They stand for the faith once delivered to the saints. Shall we, who stand for the same faith and are animated by loyalty to the head of the Church and to the Word of God, do anything to prejudice their position and make their task more difficult? You make your action consistent with itself, in that you first confer with the Directors of Union Seminary as to the relation of the seminary to the General Assembly before you act upon your own construction of those relations. You take a course calculated to conciliate Union Seminary rather than to alienate it. The Directors of Union Seminary are loyal Presbyterians, and they are waiting with intense anxiety for your deliverance on this subject. Nevertheless, as I know from personal conference with two or three of them, they are not waiting with eagerness for such a deliverance as is proposed in the report of this Committee. They feel pained and hurt and aggrieved at the haste of this Assembly to rush to such extreme action, as if it had no confidence in their wisdom in this matter. You conciliate the Directors by going and asking them to do in their own action and in their own loyalty to the Church what you claim you would have the right to do if you chose to exercise it. And above all, you give time for calm and due consideration of this case.

Dr. McNece: I would like to ask Dr. Worcester a question right here.

Dr. Worcester: If it is necessary you may, but I would prefer to finish. This is the first time I ever addressed a General Assembly,

and it is somewhat an embarrassing position, to make the best of it. Now, what is the best course? Judge Breckinridge said: "There are two courses before us—to approve or disapprove. It may be suggested that we take a third course—to refer this matter back to the Directors of Union Seminary"; "and," said he, "I have wished that such a course might be taken, but it does not seem to me possible, because in that case we should lose our control over this matter." Now, if we refer this matter back, there are but three things that the Directors can do. They can reconsider it and revoke the appointment of Dr. Briggs. Then your whole difficulty is removed and in a peaceful way. They can reconsider it and reappoint Dr. Briggs. Then he comes to the next Assembly in precisely the same position he comes to this—that appointment having been made subsequent to this Assembly will be subject to the vote of the next Assembly, and you are in the same position in which you are to-day, except that by that time you will know a great deal more about the theological views of Prof. Briggs than you know to-day, and that that Assembly will have before it a report from this Committee of fifteen making clear the relation of the Union Seminary to the General Assembly. The only other thing that you can do will be, in the face of this earnest request of this Assembly and its Committee of fifteen, to refuse to consider the case at all. And that is the only peril to which this Assembly exposes itself by this action. Mr. Moderator, it is possible that there are ten men in this Assembly who are fighting any such specter as that? Is it possible that this Assembly believes for a moment that men like Dr. Dickey, Dr. Erskine, Dr. White and Dr. Hall—that these men, when the Assembly says to them, "We request you to open this matter and look into it in all its relations," they will snap their fingers and say, "Gentlemen, you have lost your control now; we will do as we please." Sir, if that is the feeling towards Union Seminary, the sooner it is cut loose from the Presbyterian Church the better. If we have not that much confidence in the honor and Christian character and wisdom of the Presbyterian ministers and the men who compose the directory of Union Seminary, then we had better say that we want nothing more to do with Union Seminary, and the sooner it is turned adrift the better for the Church. But, Mr. Moderator, we have not only the integrity and the honor of these men as an authority in this case, but we have an action taken in the last meeting of the Board of Directors of Union Seminary, which was an olive branch held out to this General Assembly—an action which was taken unanimously, as Dr. Dickey informs me. What was it? We understand from this Committee that there is, as I have said, the shadow of a doubt coming up out of the way in which Dr. Briggs was inducted into this chair. There has been a question whether this Assembly had any authority over a transfer like this, and some of the directors are very strongly persuaded that the Assembly has no authority in the case. And yet, by a unanimous vote and without reservation or qualification, they agreed to waive that matter and to come before this Assembly without raising any technical question of that kind. That is an overture of peace on the part of the directors of Union Seminary that I submit this Assembly can afford to meet half way. We can afford to go to the directors and say to them: "Since you meet us in this spirit under the compact which exists, we will meet you in the same spirit; we will waive our right to a veto, and you sit down with your committee and let us come to an understanding about this business."

Now, even in that extreme case that the directors in their bightness and independence, and in their insolence—for it would scarcely be less than that—should defy this Assembly and say "No, we will not reconsider this election," still this case has not gone beyond our control, unless Dr. Briggs can vindicate his soundness in the faith to the Presbytery of New York first, to the Synod of New York second, and third to the General Assembly of 1892.

If there is any real reason, in the theological opinions of Dr. Briggs, which in 1892 shall seem to call for the interference of this General Assembly, this Assembly will have all that before it and in a regular way. It will have it before it under the safeguards and with all the light secured by a proper judicial inquiry, and that will be to your advantage in settling this question in 1892.

So that it all comes to this: Have we confidence enough in the directors of Union Seminary to waive our right of veto and to say to them: "Brethren, we ask you to adjust this thing yourselves; we ask you to do the thing which shall be for the honor of God and for the peace of the Church of Jesus Christ?" Mr. Moderator and brethren, I beseech you to take heed what you do today. I beseech you to remember that it is easy to do in a day what you cannot undo in a generation. I beseech you to remember that the Presbyterian Church has erred many times in the past, with all its wisdom and all its prayerfulness, and it may err again. Let us not repeat here the follies of our fathers. Let it not appear that we have learned nothing from the repented and bitter lessons of the past. I have often found that I have erred through acting hastily. I have seldom found that I have erred through acting deliberately. The Presbyterian Church has never been wanting in courage and loyalty to her Master. She has sometimes been a little wanting in Christian charity and forbearance and brotherly love, and that has been the secret of the sad schisms and divisions which have rent her in the past. It is a divine voice that bids us endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace. We have been listening to the appeals of our home and foreign missionaries during these days. We have seen how God has thrown wide open the doors of the whole world for the introduction of His truth. His own mighty providence is calling us to march forward to grander victories than any of the past, in His name. Let us take an action to-day which shall deliver us from strife and from contention, and which shall leave us hand free and heart free to respond to this divine call. [Applause.]

EIGHTH DAY—AFTERNOON SESSION.

In the afternoon Professor Stevenson, of New York, rose to explain that Dr. Ramsay was not on the prosecuting committee of the New York Presbytery. He said:

Mr. Moderator, my colleague Dr. Ramsay, whose heart is as warm as his voice is loud, was so carried away by his impulses this morning that he hardly weighed his words as carefully as is his custom, and so the impression has gone forth that Dr. Ramsay belongs to the prosecuting committee in the New York Presbytery, which is not the case, as Dr. Ramsay has been in no portion of the process connected in any way with the work. So the appeal which Dr. Ramsay made this morning comes not from the prosecuting committee, nor even from the investigating committee, of the New York Presbytery, with neither of which he has been connected at any time.

Dr. Ramsay: I said I belonged to the prosecuting party. I did not mean to say that I belonged to the committee.

Prof. Stevenson: The difficulty was that he said he was one of the prosecutors.

SPEECH BY DR. WILLIAM McKIBBIN, OF CINCINNATI.

I believe that we are taking part in the greatest crisis through which the Presbyterian Church has ever passed. I believe that

the issue or the issues which were involved in the Old and New School difficulties are mere bagatelles compared with the issue which is now at stake. And that issue, when you put it sharply, is this: whether this Assembly will ever find a justifiable occasion for expressing its disapproval of a professor? If we are to assume that, whenever this body disapproves one of its professors, it is invading some of his rights, we have emptied the veto power of any other basis than injustice. I consider that the most subtle attack which has been made upon the power of this Assembly, a power for which it gave a consideration, a power which it assumed at the request of the Union Theological Seminary; to say that that power can never be exercised without casting reflection upon the board of a seminary or upon the professor concerning whom the action is taken is, sir, to deny that that power exists; for I tell you that the Presbyterian Church does value the rights of the individual, and therefore it seems to me that the proper view to take is that this Assembly settles no questions with regard to the soundness or the standing of any man in the Church unless it shall so express itself; and there may be a question whether it meant at the same time if it is a justifiable action for that. Now we have been told—and I want to say God forbid that I should put anything into this discussion that is contrary to the mind and the spirit of Christ, I want to look back upon the Assembly, as I will look back upon it, if I am spared to survive it, as I will look back—I never saw more tenderness—I never saw men whose spirits were so stirred to their very core, so afraid they might offend against the spirit of Christ. But, my brethren, there are other interests at stake. This Assembly did not seek this issue. I believe when an issue comes that God will give us grace to meet it. If there ever was an issue which was forced upon the Church in which there can be no evasion, it is this issue. I regard it as one of the most serious things for a man, intentionally or unintentionally, to shake the foundations of the faith of Christ. When I think of what that Bible is, I say it is a serious matter I do not say anything about Dr. Briggs' views to-day, but I say that when 65 presbyteries have risen up—when I understand that over 80 have spoken with regard to theological teaching growing out of this discussion—we must recognize, whether we will or not, that the effect upon the Church at large has been to create uncertainty and doubt with regard to the Word of God.

The point I make is this, and here is where the responsibility of the Assembly comes in, and it cannot be escaped. We may say to a brother, You have made a mistake; but, sir, what we are called upon to do to-day is to say whether we disapprove of a teacher who speaks with such failure to express his views clearly, even if it should be in accord with the Confession, that he has startled 65 presbyteries of the Church and caused them to rise up as they have never done before. Are there no interests upon the other side? I know mothers that have shed tears over the effects of this thing. Now, remember these brethren contend that Dr. Briggs is sound. I do not deny it; do not understand me as bringing the question of whether he is in accord with the Word of God or whether he is in accord with the Confession before you. I say that, when inducted into one of the highest positions of the Church, he has spoken, unless the 65 presbyteries are composed of men who cannot understand the English language, in a way so as to shake their confidence in his adherence not only to the regenerating objects of the Word of God, but as to some of the great fundamental truths that are there set forth. Why, when this Assembly rises up and says, after it knows that these things have occurred, "We do not regard that as a sufficient reason for disapproving a theological professor," they virtually say that they will not interpose to arrest the teaching, whatever be the views of the teacher, that leads to the largest distrust throughout the Church.

Now I want to call your attention to another side of this matter. If we do not disapprove of Dr. Briggs and wait until this investigation has been gone through, and then if Union Theological Seminary is satisfied and the Church is satisfied that after the experience through which he has passed he will be not only a sound and a safe teacher, we will allow them to re-elect him. They lose nothing by this disapproval; as far as the law is concerned, they could re-elect him after this Assembly is adjourned, and he could hold over. They have got all the power; and yet we are asked to surrender the power that we possess to say that we disapprove a teacher who is not able to make himself understood. They say that love gives great insight into the thoughts of a teacher. Surely no man will deny that love has been shown to Dr. Briggs by his friends upon this floor; but with all the love, to save themselves, they cannot tell what he believes or where he stands. Now, my brethren, let us face this question as men; and let me say here we have heard about the way in which this Assembly's Church has acted hastily. All right. We have our schisms to answer for; but I tell you we are mighty good at making up, and we have been just loving the Southern Church and will love her into shape yet, just as the Old and the New Schools fought, but they had to come back; for I tell you that Presbyterianism can fight, and Presbyterianism can forgive, and Presbyterianism can make up. But this is the point I make: supposing that after this Assembly adjourns and a year has gone by, or two years, and it is found that Dr. Briggs has matured his views, has clarified his language and his concepts, why, my brethren, I think I would go many a mile to join in an ovation; I would be willing to kill the fatted calf and all the animals on the farm to welcome back that man with his learning to sit at the feet of Jesus Christ and let him decide all questions upon which he has seen fit to speak.

Now another thing, Mr. Moderator: We have been talking about peace. God forbid that any man should needlessly impair the peace of the Church. I wish that Dr. Briggs had thought of that. It is our duty, but it is not a duty that is laid upon the General Assembly alone by the Word of God. Let me tell you what you have got to face on the other side. Presbyteries have got to act, students have to be licensed, and this question will be coming up; and if it be said that this Assembly has by its refusal to disapprove allowed a man to teach, I ask you by what principle of consistency you can say to the young man who comes before a presbytery, "We will not license you for holding what your professor, by the authority and power of the Presbyterian Church, has been teaching?" Why, brethren, you are going to turn the Church into a kind of a series of armed camps; the men are going to be rigidly examined; every presbytery will rise up to defend its orthodoxy and to protect itself against unsoundness when the central power, in full possession of the situation, has become a partner by silence in encouraging teachings which have confounded not only those who are mis-called the opponents of Dr. Briggs, but confounded his friends.

Now another thing: I was very sorry to notice, in that most amiable address of Dr. Worcester's—it went to my heart, it went to your hearts—that he should have intimated that this theological seminary committee had done the most that it could. Ah, brethren, I am somewhat impetuous, and when the now sainted Judge Breckinridge first appeared in the theological seminary committee and pleaded for some simple solution, I almost felt in my ill judgment that he was too zealous; but I am glad now that his work in that committee commenced with the effort for some

way out rather than to exercise this disapproval; but he could not find it, and you cannot find it. There is but one thing, now or never and when he stood there to tell you as he closed, "I have discharged my duty," he meant to tell you that he had been trying to find a peaceful way, that is, that would satisfy the other side, for I do not consider this anything but a peaceful way, as I think I can show. He meant he had tried all he could, and he was bound as an honest man, bound as one loyal to the law, bound as one loyal to the Church, to say, "I must say that you disapprove." And to-day, after that powerful appeal of Dr. Worcester, our theological committee met together; our hearts were tender, and we talked about it; but we unanimously came to the conclusion that there is no other way that is open to us to disapprove this election or become responsible for setting a precedent which may vacate the entire power of the Assembly in the future. Tell me when there can ever arise a case, my brethren, where more reasons could be given than this! Tell me when it would not be possible to argue in defence of the individual right, if it were not possible to do it now. Face that question. The theological seminaries are looking on to know what you are going to do with their rights under the compact. The whole Church is looking to see what you are going to do with their rights under the compact. And there never can be a case which you cannot declare to be in some way casting a shadow over the individual affected. Let me tell you another thing that affected me very much: Dr. Worcester said, "You do not give any reason." Oh, how he has misconceived his theological seminary committee! How utterly he has misapprehended the sense of love which pervaded them! Why didn't we put our reasons directly? We did give you reasons; we recited facts; we didn't call them reasons, we just recited, you remember, in this; that these presbyteries had overruled, mentioning by name; that he was under process in the presbytery of New York; we just mentioned, we did not call them reasons. Why? Because brethren came and said, "Now whatever you do, do not prejudice that case in New York;" and as we sat down we said, "How can we do the least possible damage? And they said, "We will recite these facts, and then we will offer these resolutions, and then, when the Assembly's record is appealed to, there is not a word that says that the Assembly had anything against the soundness of Dr. Briggs." See how we are met to-day—charged with not giving reasons, because we were against him; charged with straining our authority to reach him, when we had strained our authority, and I think strained it, in fact, so as to give as little as would possibly bear on his case, and the inconsistency of saying, "Don't give any reasons for fear you will condemn him," and then saying, "You have condemned him by giving no reasons." Brethren, this means to defeat this approval on any ground, for those things are incompatible. If the failure to give reasons is to defeat this resolution, the giving of reasons would have been legitimate; and the cry that came up from the friends of Dr. Briggs was, "Save him from reasons if it can possibly be done."

Bear in mind another thing. Aside from a few expressions which have fallen from the lips of those who are supposed to be the opponents of Dr. Briggs, I call you to record to-day that, with the exception of a few expressions which have fallen, I believe inadvertently, from the lips of those who are supposed to be the enemies of Dr. Briggs—I think they are his best friends—every personal discussion of Dr. Briggs has been introduced by his friends. Bear that in mind. The discussion of Dr. Briggs upon the floor has been by his friends. The discussion of the directors of the Union Theological Seminary has been by their friends, and if this passage of this paper by the Assembly carries with it any reflection upon the directors or Dr. Briggs in matters which are now in litigation before the Presbytery of New York it is because his own friends have impressed that upon it. It is not there. We have tried to keep still. We do not want to say anything against Dr. Briggs. We want simply to conserve the power of the Assembly, in view of the fact that he has failed to make himself understood in a special inaugural upon truths which I believe are vital, not merely to Presbyterianism, but to evangelical Christianity. I have heard somebody say that Dr. Briggs' friends ought to be saved from Dr. Briggs, but I have found my heart warming to Dr. Briggs and saying, "Save Dr. Briggs from his friends." Why, that paper of Dr. Worcester gives his whole case away. It says, "Oh, don't do anything; we will do it, and you may be sure that Union Theological Seminary will attend to this matter." As a member of this General Assembly, I do not know that Union Theological Seminary has got anything to attend to. I do not know, until the Presbytery of New York has registered its decision, whether Dr. Briggs is guilty of heresy or not. But his friends seem to know it, and they say, "Just keep off, and we will attend to it." It seems to me as if there was an infatuation, a kind of Briggism, running through this whole thing. I could not see for the life of me what Dr. Logan's amendment meant. The idea of a President of the United States vetoing a bill for the present. Yet Dr. Logan seemed to understand it. I do not know about his concepts, but I tell you his language badly wrecked his concepts.

Now, Mr. Moderator, what have we done? When we have offered this paper, without reasons or just reciting in the preamble the facts which have come to our attention, we have said, "Hands off; the Presbytery of New York shall try him; we will not say whether he is guilty, we dare not say that he is innocent." We might have said some things which we didn't. There may be some of my friends will say, "Well, you ought not to have said this." Do you know who has been trying Dr. Briggs pending the action of the Presbytery of New York, pending the exercise of this august power of the General Assembly? The directors of the Union Theological Seminary, and they say they are satisfied. I do not want to impart, and God forbid that I should, any feeling into this matter, but I tell you that if there has been one body in this Church that has been careful to protect the rights of Dr. Briggs, or one committee, it has been your theological seminary committee [applause], and I want to tell you about its chairman. Now, I am going to tell some secrets out of school. The chairman seemed to be hunting so hard for some way to peaceably settle this thing that I began to find my own faith in him weakening. So far from shutting his eyes and his ears—and I know you recognize his master-mind and master-hand in that report—it seemed to me that he was bound to get through the enclosure—if there was a hole anywhere in the fence big enough to let him through before he would consent to say to this Assembly, as he has solemnly said and we all say, there is no other way, because there is no other duty; it is either disapproval or saying an unsafe teacher was not merely percolating with his misleading statements your sons, but that he shall go unchallenged from the Atlantic to the Pacific, yea, to the Isles of the sea; and I tell you, if Presbyterianism stands for one thing, it stands for clear thinking, and it never will put its hand to a compact in which a man is authorized to teach who speaks in doubtful terms of the absolute necessity to those to whom Christ is accepted of receiving him at the peril of their souls. God forbid that I should judge what was in the heart of Dr. Martineau. I don't know, but I know that he stands for one, in the declaration of Dr. Briggs, who has found God. What God has he found? God the Father, the

Son and the Holy Ghost. No; he has found God without the Son and without the Holy Ghost. Brethren, I say that a man's orthodoxy may sometimes give him more power to injure the Church than if you could convict him of heresy. To give the power of orthodoxy to the justification of language like that is to imperil clear thinking and sound thinking from end of the Church to the other. [A voice: Amen.]

I would not have been here to-day except under a solemn sense of my accountability to God and to the Presbytery of Cincinnati and to the Church. I have hurried here from one dear to me who has been laid away, but I said, whether my influence is little or much, it is to be given to this Assembly, to this hour. And I believe that a crisis has come to the Church which surpasses as I said in the beginning, anything of which we have had any experience in the past. If I thought these things were idiosyncracies it would be different, but they are the advance guards of a great tide. Some men may not talk as much of it as others, but it is going to overthrow the supremacy of "Thus saith the Lord," and when I am dealing with men upon the issues of eternal life I would sooner have one, "Thus saith the Lord" undisputed than all the scholarship that the world contains. [Applause.] And I say if I must pay the price of walking out with the unlearned fishermen of Galilee or walking with my Master in his view of the supremacy of God's Word—can we do without it? In his dying hour it comforts me that that sad utterance was a part of a divine poem which had hopes in it as well as sorrow. Now, I want my children to handle the Bible the way my Saviour handled it. I want every man that stands in a Presbyterian pulpit or in a professor's chair to handle that Bible the way Jesus Christ handled it and I don't want to be told in a sharp way, "No heresy." But what is there in it that arouses you? Nothing in the Bible but paper, binding, etc. There was an incident in Dayton some years ago that touched my heart as it was recounted to me. They had a soldiers' reunion there, and they brought down the scarred and torn battle-flags of Ohio and put them on exhibition. An old man was seen with his arms around one of them, tears falling from his eyes, and he was asked what was the trouble, and he replied: "My boy fell with that standard in his arms and his blood is on it." I don't want any man to tell me with his bold literalism, "Oh, that is only silk and a little color." I may not be able to answer him, but I tell you if you destroy that reverence for such things you extinguish some of the noblest elements that belong to the human soul. I tell you that Book is stained with the blood of the best of the world has ever seen. I want it handled reverently; and I don't care whether it be in the name of higher criticism or an angel from heaven, if he preaches any other gospel than that of reverence for the Word of God, I say reject him.

Now, I want to get you to the great issues involved. No man has a defense of Dr. Briggs. If he is in an unfortunate position, shall we vacate the mighty power of discountenancing misleading teaching? I don't say he is unsound. I don't know it; I don't want to know it until the courts of the Church have passed upon it. But I say we are ready under any mistaken sympathy with a brother to vacate this power of the General Assembly, which is the only power that it has by that compact, to keep out of its chairs men who cannot tell their learned or unlearned friends, or the Church at large what they do mean.

I could spend an hour and take up things in that inaugural address that I have not seen in any of the publications upon it—and I have read nearly all—and I do not believe there are ten pages in the whole thing that if you should undertake to present to any one else you would not have to explain two or three things on each page. Now, I ask you elders and I ask you ministers, would you put a man in charge of your business or of any responsible duty if he could not tell what he believed or what he was trying to do, and yet you knew you were to be responsible for what he did and said, and that he was to quote the whole power of your influence in justifying him in going on and in making these misleading statements?

Now, I believe in my soul that, if Dr. Briggs is in harmony with the Confession of Faith in regard to these matters, the action we take this day, if it be the adoption of this report, will do more to bring Dr. Briggs back than anything else. Otherwise, I believe that in five years some men will be apologizing for having asked this Assembly to waive this solemn power intrusted to it by Almighty God to protect the teaching in its theological seminaries. If you vote this paper down, my responsibility is absolved, but I for one am ready to stand to that paper without compromise. If you want to say anything after you have passed the paper that will go to soften feeling, do it, but I will vote for no compromise that implies that this General Assembly, in the exercise of a power which it has secured by a solemn compact, is to be deprived of that power when it is most needed to exercise, because, foonoth, it might cast a shadow of some kind on the man against whom it is exercised. It casts no shadow, save that we do not feel that he is the best man to have in the theological chair.

God help us, with a sense of what is due to Him and due to the Church and with a sense of what is due to Dr. Briggs to decide so that if we were carried out, as Judge Breckinridge was carried out, we can say "I have done my duty." [Applause.]

A number of speeches were made by Dr. Erskine, Elders Junkin and Lyman, and Drs. G. C. Baker, A. V. V. Raymond and W. A. Bartlett. Dr. Parkhurst, of New York, also spoke.

SPEECH BY DR. C. H. PARKHURST.

I have come on to the platform this afternoon not to make a speech but to make a statement. I suppose we shall all of us be tenderly happy when all this thing is out of the way. A few weeks ago, touching in my pulpit upon matters that are current, at the close of the service a poor fellow came rushing up the stairs of my pulpit, with tears in his eyes, and said to me, grasping my hand: "I don't care whether it is Briggism or anti-Briggism; but for God's sake help me, for I am a ruined soul." I longed from the bottom of my tired heart for the time when, these thoughts out of our minds and these tones out of our ears, we can go back to what seems to me the legitimate work of helping those poor souls that seem to be lost.

There have been so many points upon which I would have loved to speak; but being myself a member of the Board of Directors of Union Theological Seminary, I have felt myself tied in a way, not unkindly. I myself, as a member of the Board, am on trial; but—[A voice: "Oh no!"] No, in a way, I only say. Now, if I can by a single word or statement help to contribute in the smallest way to the solution of this problem, I would dearly love to. I feel, brethren, the solemnity of this place. I never spoke before in the presence of a General Assembly. I am awed by my environment. I am awed by what transpired here yesterday upon this very spot. I am awed by the prospects invisible but actual that lie before us.

Now, if there is any degree of misunderstanding, or any possibility of unkindness of sentiment existing between this Assembly and Union Seminary, I would love to help to remove it. We, as a Seminary, are a part of the Presbyterian Church. We are not fighting for one thing and you for another. You know how I love my friend Briggs. I do love him. I know him pretty well, and he is an awfully difficult man to get along with. [Laughter.] At the same time he is

but an individual. What we as a Seminary are laboring for is the interest of the Seminary and the interests of the Church. No private personal consideration for any man or any number of men is going to come between the Board of Direction of the Seminary and the best weal, as well as we can interpret it, of the Presbyterian Church at large. We are working for the same thing; and the more perfectly we can come to an understanding with each other the better. Setting aside myself, the Board is made up of Christian gentlemen [laughter]—of course I feel delicate about making that sweeping remark—who are desirous of handling all these matters in the best and wisest way. Now, there are some uncertainties in our minds with regard to what is the technical legality of certain elements that are involved in the case. We are open to conviction. I am not speaking by authority, but I know thoroughly the sentiment of our Board through and through. We are desirous of knowing what is right and what is best. We, I say, are open to conviction. We are not like the Scotchman—who are tremendously good people when they are only headed right—who said he was open to conviction but he would love to see the man who could convince him. [Laughter.] I think we are fairly teachable. Now, I am profoundly in sympathy with the spirit of the resolutions introduced by Dr. Worcester. I was charmed—Dr. Patton will excuse me—by the brilliancy of the statement made to us by him yesterday. His sentences were like the flashing of diamonds beneath an electric burner. But, friends, it takes light and warmth both to make sunshine, and that is what we want in the present circumstances. It seemed to me that I found not only the brightness but also the warmth and the fervor in Dr. Worcester's resolution. It takes brain and heart both to constitute vision, and I speak with entire confidence, and then I am going to stop, for I said a statement was the reason of my coming on the platform—I can state with entire confidence that if you should see fit, with a good degree of unanimity to adopt the resolutions of Dr. Worcester and to send a committee to confer with our Board, it would receive not hypercritical reception, but an earnest, anxious and sincere reception, with the heartiest desire—I am sure I can say it without any reservation—on the part of every member of the Board of Directors of Union Theological Seminary, to act more strictly in accordance with the spirit and the intent of those resolutions. [Applause.] Then the earnest heart loving the Church, rejoicing anticipatively in what I believe is going to be its glorious future, loving the Seminary and anticipating that the time—God grant it—may come before us very soon when you, as the representative of a great Church, and I, who happen this afternoon to be the representative of a dear Seminary, shall be able to see things eye to eye and shall be able to think and to feel together, in the vernacular of one sentiment, and to sympathize in the warmth of one common mutual affection and Christy hope. God grant it. [Applause.]

REMARKS OF DR. J. T. SMITH.

I think the great realities before us have been thrown into such a short space, I think if language can mean anything, if a compact can be understood and has force, if a suggestion of that coming from the very highest authority that we all recognize can settle anything in our mind, it is that this General Assembly is bound to act upon this matter now or it can never act upon it. Now, here is the simple statement. A brother whom we are all ready to admire for his learning, comes before us with this question for us to decide: Is he such a teacher as we are willing to have in one of our theological seminaries? He says that he adopts the Confession of Faith. He declares that he has not consciously taught anything contrary to it. And yet here is the fact: All this number of presbyteries that have been cited over and over again, come and tells us that his teaching is not understood, that it is not intelligible. For some reason, they say, he lacks the faculty of making what he says intelligible to intelligent hearers, such as make up all these presbyteries, and the great mass of the Presbyterian Church. Now, without anything more, and loving this brother and the Church of God, here is the simple fact that controls my action in this matter: With all there is of excellence about him he fails in this one attribute of a teacher; he fails in the capacity to make himself understood on the fundamental truths of our common Christianity, on the authority of the Word of God. My thought is simply this: that a teacher who does not make himself understood by the average intelligence of the Presbyterian Church on such topics as this, we ought to say that we disapprove of him as a professor in the Seminary.

At five o'clock the balloting began. The first vote was on Dr. Worcester's substitute, and the result was 106 to 300 against it.

Then the amendment of Dr. Logan was voted down.

Finally came the roll call on Dr. Patton's resolutions, which were adopted by a vote of 440 to 60.

The following is the negative vote on the adoption of the resolutions disapproving of the appointment of Dr. Briggs:

Presbyteries.	Ministers.	Ruling Elders.
New Castle.....	Henry S. Bunstein.....	Charles Lyman.
Washington City.....	Samuel M. Johnson.....	Warren S. Dungan.
Denver.....	Horatio S. Beavis.....	James Huff.
Gunnison.....	Edward P. Morse.....	William H. Hillis.....
Bloomington.....	Jno H. Worcester, D.D.....	A. W. Riker, M. D.
Chicago.....	James Lewis.....	David H. Davis.
".....	Charles S. Hoyt.....	Archibald Mets.....
".....	Edward L. Curtis.....	John N. Mills.....
Freeport.....	John G. Cowden.....	Charles S. Converse.....
Muncie.....	Solomon C. Dickey.....	Israel W. Hathaway.....
Concord Bluff.....	William H. Snyder.....	Hon. Geo. W. Ketcham
Des Moines.....	James G. Mason, D. D.....	David M. Reeves, D. D.
Waterloo.....	Charles S. Converse.....	A. V. V. Raymond.
Larned.....	Israel W. Hathaway.....	Charles E. Dunn.....
Flint.....	David M. Reeves, D. D.....	Thos. A. Nelson, D. D.
Grand Rapids.....	A. V. V. Raymond.....	Chargeo H. Beebe.....
Monroe.....	Charles E. Dunn.....	James R. Robinson.....
Potosky.....	Owen J. Roberts.....	Frederick J. Pohl.....
Nebraska City.....	John N. Mills.....	John M. Allis.....
Elizabeth.....	James G. Mason, D. D.....	Asher B. Temple.....
".....	Charles S. Converse.....	Robert Bruce Clark.....
Jersey City.....	Israel W. Hathaway.....	John Service.....
Newark.....	David M. Reeves, D. D.....	John D. Stokes.....
Albany.....	A. V. V. Raymond.....	Alexander G. Russell.....
".....	Charles E. Dunn.....	Jas. S. Ramsay, D. D.
Brooklyn.....	Thos. A. Nelson, D. D.....	C. H. Parkhurst, D. D.
Cayuga.....	Chargeo H. Beebe.....	A. W. Halsey.....
Chemung.....	James R. Robinson.....	Anthony H. Evans.....
Columbia.....	Frederick J. Pohl.....	Gavin L. Hamilton.....
Chile.....	John M. Allis.....	George E. Smith.....
Geneva.....	Asher B. Temple.....	John C. Mead.....
Hudson.....	Robert Bruce Clark.....	John C. Mead.....
".....	John Service.....	William McCluskey.
Long Island.....	John D. Stokes.....	Henry P. Smith, D. D.
Nassau.....	Alexander G. Russell.....	H. C. Hayden, D. D., L. L. D.
New York.....	Jas. S. Ramsay, D. D.	Samuel G. Anderson.....
".....	C. H. Parkhurst, D. D.	
".....	A. W. Halsey.....	
Niagara.....	Anthony H. Evans.....	
Rochester.....	Gavin L. Hamilton.....	
Steuben.....	George E. Smith.....	
Syracuse.....	John C. Mead.....	
Ulster.....	John C. Mead.....	
Cincinnati.....	Henry P. Smith, D. D.	
".....	H. C. Hayden, D. D., L. L. D.	
Maumee.....	Samuel G. Anderson.....	

NINTH DAY—MORNING SESSION.

There was a very small attendance when the Assembly opened in the morning, many of the commissioners having obtained leave of absence and gone to their homes after the settlement of the Briggs case. Little business was

done except to decide on the place of the next Assembly. Two cities on the Pacific coast, San Francisco and Portland, contended for the honor of entertaining the Assembly. By an overwhelming vote it was decided to go to Portland.

The Assembly discussed a question raised concerning Dr. Lowrie, of the Board of Foreign Missions, who has been retired by the Board on a salary. An overture from one of the presbyteries was received protesting against this action as establishing a precedent. After a strong speech in favor of the action of the Board, the matter was referred to the Committee on Bills and Overtures.

The report of the Committee on the Board of Education was represented by Dr. J. Glenworth, of Brooklyn. The report states that there are eighteen depositories besides the central establishment in Philadelphia. The working capital of the business is \$200,000. The total receipts for the year were \$127,478, expenditures \$101,593; balance \$25,885. Discussion on the recommendations of the Committee was deferred until next week.

After hearing a report from the committee appointed to accompany Judge Breckinridge's body to St. Louis the Assembly adjourned. In the afternoon there was no session. Many of the commissioners went on an excursion.

[By Telegraph to THE INDEPENDENT.]

DETROIT, June 1st, 1891.

Final action on the report on the troubles of the Board of Publication was taken this morning after speeches by A. D. F. Randolph, of New York; Dr. E. R. Craven, Secretary of the Board, Franklin Shephard, member of the Business Committee, H. E. Simmons and others. The Assembly adopted the recommendations presented by Judge Hand, chairman of the Committee of Seven.

A long discussion took place on the Christian Endeavor Society, resulting in the adoption of resolutions commending to the loving sympathy and oversight of Church officers the various young people's associations, and recommending each presbytery to co-operate and counsel with them.

The Judicial Committee is to report this afternoon. The Temperance Committee and Dr. Patton's Committee on Theological Seminaries, will report this evening.

It is probable that the Assembly will adjourn Tuesday afternoon or evening.

The Assembly declared the deaconess overture defeated, and referred the subject to a committee of deacons.

LUTHERAN GENERAL SYNOD.

BY PROF. E. J. WOLF, D.D.

ON Sunday the 24th all the pulpits of the evangelical churches of Lebanon excepting the Episcopal, were supplied by the members of Synod. This body imposes no restriction on pulpit fellowship. The Synodical communion, which was celebrated in the afternoon, was a most precious season, and generally interpreted of registering the high spiritual tone pervading the body.

The Church Extension Board, which reported on Monday, made as cheering an exhibit as did the other boards, showing no deficit in the treasury, a considerable debt wiped out, and the total receipts amounting to \$79,855 18. The permanent fund for loans to new churches is \$201,119.66. Seventy-five congregations have been made the beneficiaries of this board.

The Publication House, 42 North 9th St., Philadelphia, reported a large increase in the sale of its publications, its annual business being just double what it was ten years ago. It estimated its assets at \$73,100, and donated the sum of \$8,500 to mission work and education.

One of the most lively discussions of this convention was occasioned by the introduction by Dr. Hamma of a series of resolutions directed against the operations which certain American denominations are carrying on among the Lutheran population of Norway, Sweden and Denmark. Dr. Hamma has recently traveled through those countries and made a careful examination of their spiritual condition. He holds that no other people on earth have been so generally and so thoroughly leavened by the Gospel, that "in the practical fruits of Christianity they are the best living example to the human race"; as they are likewise "the only nations remaining undivided by sectarianism" and illustrating the Saviour's prayer "that they may all be one." That denominations which have maintained fellowship with the Lutheran Church, and some of which have been foremost in avowing their devotion to the cause of Christian union, should now under the name of Foreign Missions be sending their agents to these countries, unsettling some of the people in their faith, creating strife and division, engendering a bitter sectarian spirit and wounding the body of Christ, must call forth the astonishment and reprobation of Christendom, especially while unnumbered millions of Hindu are left to perish without any knowledge of Christ.

A few in the convention deprecated the introduction of this subject, holding it to be discourteous to the churches engaged in this work and not in keeping with the modern ideas of absolute religious liberty; but it was maintained, on the other hand, that the right and the duty devolved on Lutherans to remonstrate, as Christlieb did at the Evangelical Alliance in New York, against this "unfraternal and schismatic" procedure, and "that it was irreconcilable with the spirit of the Gospel," that this species of propagandism did not have the indorsement of the communions whose agents were engaged in it. With but a few dissenting votes the convention adopted a resolution recording its earnest testimony against this procedure as a breach of Christian comity unworthy of those who engage in it, and calling the attention of the Protestant world to "this astounding course of denominational propagandism witnessed in the last decade of the nineteenth century," and appealing to that "high sense of honor, justice, courtesy and sincerity born of the Gospel, which we all

alike profess, and at the tribunal of which we believe our offending brethren cannot stand approved."

An official copy of this declaration was ordered to be communicated to the proper authorities, respectively, of the Methodist Episcopal, the Congregational, and the Baptist Churches.

This action was immediately followed by another of similar import, which was carried without debate and with absolute unanimity. This referred to the spoliation of our congregations by native agents who are in the employ of missionaries sent out to the South Krishna District, by the American Baptist Missionary Union. A number have been won over to the Baptist Missions, it is claimed, not because they are convinced of the scripturalness of Baptist peculiarities, but from various other motives. Such as caste influence, the animosity of teachers whom the Lutherans dismissed, and impatience of strict discipline. To the ordinary methods of the proselyter has been added the seizure of school and prayer houses under the forms and force of law. The saddest result of this propagandism is that it has made the exercise of proper discipline in the Lutheran Mission extremely difficult. No direct charges are made against the American Baptist missionaries who have located in this Lutheran Mission, but it is a notorious fact that the native agents who are employed and paid by them have used the methods complained of.

A charitable view admits that these native missionaries are acting without the knowledge or consent of those in authority; but a number of letters addressed to one of the Baptist missionaries courteously but earnestly protesting against the work of his agents, and especially against "the reception of disciplined teachers" were unheeded and "not even accorded the courtesy of a reply." It was

"Resolved, that we hereby enter solemn protest against the continuance of the practices referred to, and with this statement of the interferences and proselytations complained of, submit the facts to the moral sense of the general Christian public for judgment."

The General Synod maintains fraternal correspondence with the United Lutheran Synod of the South, with the Presbyterian Church, the United Presbyterians, both branches of the Reformed Church and the United Brethren in Christ. The Rev. Dr. Miller, of Winchester, Va., presented the fraternal greetings of the Lutherans in the South. Dr. Kumlér appeared in behalf of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and the Rev. Dr. Klapp represented the Reformed (German). The addresses of these gentlemen were pitched on a fraternal and felicitous key and along with the cordial and clever impromptu responses of President Clutz elicited general applause.

Great interest centered on the Board of Education, which, tho yet in its infancy, has already made a remarkable record for efficiency. The province of this Board is to look after the educational interests of the West. It was instrumental in founding Midland College, at Atchison, Kan., and in rescuing Carthage College, at Carthage, Ill., from serious financial embarrassments. Both of these institutions are now provided with good buildings and competent faculties. Each has the nucleus of an endowment, and a roll of students, indicative of fair prosperity and public confidence. The older colleges and theological seminaries, patronized by the constituency of the General Synod, sustain no official relation to it, but they always receive attention in the form of a report on their condition and their needs, and in resolutions commending them to the support of the Church.

At this stage the convention was treated to a surprise which almost took away its breath, and which created a tempest of enthusiasm such as was never before witnessed on the floor of the General Synod; and the scenes of which can never be forgotten. An alternation of doxologies, prayers, contributions and cheers occupied the hour for several hours. The occasion for this was the offer of \$150,000 to found a theological seminary at Omaha, on the condition of the Church at large supplementing this with an equal amount.

This munificent proposition was made by the millionaire banker, Augustus Kountze, of the firm of Kountze Brothers, Mr. Kountze was present, and was a member of the body. The ability of the Church to meet this condition in twelve months was regarded as a heavy draft upon its growing beneficence, since the claims issuing from the rapid development of Lutheran institutions have been taxing, almost to their limit, the capacity of its liberal contributors. At the same time there was a deep feeling of the need of a theological institution to provide an adequate ministry for that section, which offers to the Lutheran Church a harvest of boundless dimensions; and, along with this, a firm persuasion that the hand of God was in this offer swayed the body. After reasonable deliberation and earnest prayer, the offer was accepted, with mingled feelings of solemnity and rejoicing, and by a rising vote. Scarcely had the assembly been seated when pledges from individual members began to pour in; a Presbyterian layman in the lobby, Judge McPherson, seeking to head the list, but he was anticipated by Dr. Baughn, of Gettysburg. In a short time over \$30,000 was pledged toward the new institution, altho a number of the wealthier lay delegates had already returned home. With such a beginning the success of the enterprise was assured. Mr. Kountze then led the convention in a fervent prayer, after which the members were introduced to him personally, and the day's session closed with vociferous and delightful good cheer, whatever of partisan feeling and heart-burnings were left from the decision of the Common Service contest was swallowed up by the wave of churchly enthusiasm and liberal zeal which swept the convention, and the sense of a united body, the feeling of devotion to a common cause, the prospect of great expansion, and especially the conviction that the presence of the Spirit of God was peculiarly manifest in the proceedings, filled and gladdened all hearts. It was an epoch-making day.

On the following morning the German Seminary at Chicago was reported to be oppressed by a debt of \$5,000. The General Synod has been charged with lukewarmness to-

ward the German brethren and most of these have been folded by "Missouri" and the Council, but the revelation of this indebtedness immediately called forth substantial responses, and in a little while it was extinguished by pledges from the representatives of the District Synods—a step of great importance to the Germans and likely to encourage and strengthen this element.

The founding of one seminary was followed by the relieving of another from all debt, and upon this a Gettysburg professor announced that by the death of Mrs. Stroup, of Bloomsburg, that seminary was about to have \$60,000 added to its endowment. The grateful rains, which during the sessions of the Synod were enriching the farmers of Pennsylvania, had their counterpart in the showers of generous contributions and legacies which were reported at different times. A summons came from the Court of Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania, asking some one to be designated to receive a legacy of some thousands, now in the hands of the Court for the General Synod. Mrs. Utermehle, of Washington, it was announced, had donated land in the City of Washington worth \$30,000 for the founding of a National Lutheran Home for the Aged, and a board of managers has been incorporated. The Hon. Frank Howbut, of Colorado Springs, sent a communication donating for a similar purpose ten acres of very desirable ground in "the Garden of the Gods."

The report on Orphans' Homes, stated that in the institution at Laysville, Penn., which has 200 orphans, no physician's services have been required since early in the winter.

The subject of the new catechism was not reached till the morning of the last day of the convention. A determined and bitter opposition to it had been made in the denominational press and in some of the District Synods; and a stormy debate was expected to be the prelude of its decisive rejection. But after the loving communion of spirit and reciprocal understanding of views which had marked the body for ten days, and the strong and overwhelming tide of positive Lutheranism which controlled it, this opposition had gradually melted away. A solitary voice, that of Dr. Valentine, was heard in favor of repudiating the catechism. He urged the impossibility of improving Luther's Small Catechism by any development, objected to the dogmatic form of statement characterizing it, and warned especially against the quasi-confessional nature of such a manual, holding that the body was in no temper now to engage in any creed-making. After some brief replies the work was unanimously recommitted for further revision with instructions to have it published for submission to the District Synods and with the understanding that its doctrinal tone and type are acceptable to the General Synod. Immediately upon this result Dr. Valentine moved that this action shall not "in any way change or modify the present doctrinal position of this body." This was also carried unanimously and followed by general applause. It was the capstone of the proceedings of this extraordinary convention, which came together possessed largely by the feeling that the antagonisms between the different elements were so serious and so decided that a rupture sooner or later was inevitable, and which, in its closing hours, testified its unanimity in holding fast its present doctrinal standards.

Whatever may be transpiring elsewhere, this body has no trouble with the New Theology or with the Higher Criticism. A burnt child dreads the fire. The Lutheran Church of Europe has had a scorching experience of the spirit and the fruits of rationalism, and there are no present indications that it cares to repeat the experience in this country. It is probably the serious apprehension with which it views the spread of rationalistic tendencies in other communions, that is holding this body more firmly than ever to the Evangelical faith of the Reformers and the Apostles.

Resolutions were passed petitioning the Senate to ratify the treaty of the Brussels Conference, and deprecating the opening of the Columbian Exposition on the Lord's Day; but the request of the W. C. T. U. for a temperance day in every quarter of the International Lessons was declined by a unanimous vote. The good feeling and the successful issue of the convention are in large measure due to the remarkable clearness, decision and fairness of the presiding officer, the Rev. Dr. Clutz, and to the presence of an unusual number of intelligent, able and conservative laymen. These have, as a rule, little respect for the metaphysical hair-splitting of the professors, and an indifferent attitude toward the contentions of the preachers. They made themselves felt in this convention more than their pastors. Such men as Schieren, of Brooklyn; Hartranft and Boner, of Philadelphia; Arthur King, of York; Judge Martin, Alexander Gebbart, and Congressman Harper, of Ohio, would leave their impress upon any deliberative body ecclesiastical or political. The Synod was composed throughout of the strongest men in the Church, and it was notably under the direction of the younger element, a body of energetic pastors who are not hampered by traditional prejudices, and who had no connection with the strife which culminated in the rupture of the General Synod twenty-five years ago. A final proof of the universal good will was the re-election to a man of all the boards of administration. The next Convention will meet on Wednesday after Whitsunday in 1893, at Canton, O.

LEBANON, O.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

BY THE REV. THORNTON C. WHALING.

THE Assembly convened in the busy and bustling city of Birmingham, Ala.—the heart and center of the New South—in the spacious and attractive First Presbyterian Church, on Thursday, May 21st, at 11 A.M., and was opened with a sermon by the retiring moderator, the Rev. Dr. James Park, of Knoxville, Tenn., from the text II Kings, vi, 16: "Fear not, for they that be with us are more than they