

PRESBYTERIANS AND THE POPE.

We publish this week a letter addressed "TO PIUS THE NINTH, BISHOP OF ROME," in the name of the two General Assemblies which met in this city last May. At the first blush the writing of such a letter might seem to be a superfluous labor, an officious and almost impertinent intrusion upon one who considers himself the head of the Christian world. But any such impression is removed by considering that the first motion did not come from us, but from him; and that however august a personage he may be, inasmuch as he has made a formal communication to us, it is on our part but civil to reply. One year ago the Pope sent forth a letter to all non-Catholic communions, inviting them to return to the one true fold—the bosom of the holy Catholic Church. Being thus addressed, we must either ignore the invitation, thereby treating it with contempt, or return an answer assigning reasons why it cannot be accepted. To the latter no objection can be offered, provided the answer is dignified and courteous, such as might proceed from a great Christian body, that respects itself, and knows what is due from those who assume to speak not only for one Church, but in some degree for the whole of Protestant Christendom.

On this point of courtesy we are happy to say there is no fault to find on either side. The letter of the Pope itself was not supercilious or arrogant, except as arrogance may be implied in the assumption that he was the Bishop of the whole Christian world. But it was not offensive in language. On the contrary it was intended to be respectful and conciliatory. Doubtless it was written with the sincere hope and belief that it would be the means of recalling some wandering sheep to the Roman fold.

To this patriarchal invitation, therefore, we now return our answer, and though Presbyterians are somewhat famous for a certain bluntness of speech which is not exactly the language of ecclesiastical diplomacy, yet in this case we think it will be agreed that they are not outdone in courtesy by the Pope himself. The letter does not contain a word of anger, or even of indignant rebuke. On the contrary it is mild and gentle; yet its arguments are none the less weighty because conveyed in respectful language. Under the velvet glove we feel the grasp of the hand of iron.

Thus temperate in phrase, and respectful in address, the letter presents a concise VINDICATION OF PROTESTANTISM—of the attitude of non-Catholic churches toward that vast ecclesiastical despotism, which boasts so much of its unity and its antiquity. So far from admitting its exclusive claims, an appeal to history is quite sufficient to demolish these lofty pretensions, and indeed to reverse the position of the parties, to show that WE ARE THE TRUE CATHOLICS, the true successors of the Apostles, the inheritors of their faith, their order, and their worship. The letter shows very clearly, that we are neither heretics nor schismatics—neither erring from the truth, as taught in the Scriptures, nor reading asunder the body of Christ. We hold to the early faith in its simplicity and its integrity, before it was overlaid and smothered by the traditions of men. We believe in the Apostle's creed, the most ancient symbol of Christian faith, and accept the decisions of the first six Ecumenical Councils as not inconsistent with the higher authority of the Word of God.

Hence we may claim justly that we are the true successors of the Primitive Church. We have a part in the inheritance of the saints. The glorious company of martyrs belongs to us. We have the goodly fellowship of those who worshipped Christ in caves and catacombs. The faith of Augustine was the faith of Calvin, and to no communion of modern times does that great name—the greatest of the fathers of the Church—so truly belong as to the Presbyterians of Scotland and America.

On the other hand, it is the Church of Rome which is the innovator on the ancient purity of faith and worship. By bringing in new doctrines unknown in the apostolic age; engraving strange dogmas on the simple teachings of Christ; by its gorgeous worship, borrowed from Pagan temples and Jewish synagogues; and above all, by its monstrous assumption to be the only true Church, claiming supremacy and infallibility—setting up its head as the Vicar of Christ on earth, who has power to open and shut the kingdom of heaven—it has departed widely from the simplicity of the Church founded by Christ and His Apostles, and has earned the title of the Great Apostasy. So that when the Holy Father summons Protestants to return to "the one true fold," they may without offence respond by calling upon him, and upon all "who profess and call themselves Catholics," to return to a purer faith and a simpler worship.

With this introduction, we commend to our readers this truly Christian Letter, addressed to the Bishop of Rome, which may be taken as a model by all who wish to take part in the Roman controversy. It is a model of manly argument, of plain truth expressed with Christian frankness, and yet with courtesy, and even with tenderness. This is the only way in which we can ever hope to reach our Roman Catholic

The Evangelist.

brethren. It is not by denouncing or abusing them, or holding them up to ridicule or to public indignation. We are sorry to say that some of our Protestant advocates have gone to work in the wrong way. They have been so belligerent in tone, and have waged war with such relentless severity, that they have put every Romanist at once on the defensive. Thus they have alienated those whom they sought to win, have disgusted and offended where it was their duty to conciliate; and done no good to the cause of Protestant Christianity.

THE INTERFERENCE OF CIVIL COURTS.

In our last issue we gave a brief account of certain proceedings in connection with the case of Rev. Mr. Connitt, pastor of the (Dutch) Reformed Church in New Prospect, Ulster county, N. Y. The Classis with which the church was connected, on account of trouble between the pastor and a portion of his congregation, dismissed him from the church. On this he appealed to the Synod that meets in May, 1870, claiming that until that time he was entitled to remain the pastor of the church.

The Classis, however, placed another man in the pulpit. On the Sabbath while he was conducting the services, Mr. Connitt appeared and read a protest against the pulpit's being occupied without his (Connitt's) permission. For this proceeding the Classis met, proposing to consider the case. But Mr. Connitt, by application to the civil court, had procured an injunction, which was served by the sheriff upon certain members of the Classis, prohibiting them from proceeding to censure the offender, till the appeal could be heard by Synod. The Classis, however, holding that the civil authority had no right to interfere, proposed to proceed and issue the case.

Such in substance is the case as reported. Perhaps the statement of it is incomplete. It may be that some facts bearing on it are omitted, or that there is some inaccuracy about those given. Be this as it may, we must say that whenever a civil court grants an injunction against the proceedings of an ecclesiastical court, the case ought to be a plain one, and justifiable on very obvious principles.

The State knows nothing, or is supposed to know nothing, of churches or denominations, except so far as their rights of property and freedom from molestation are concerned. It has nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with their forms of worship, order of discipline, or system of government. It cannot add to, or strike from their creed or rules, one syllable or letter. Their members are supposed to have united with them with a full knowledge of their constitution and methods of procedure, which are really the implied terms of a contract, of which the ecclesiastical authority is the sole judge. That authority may commit mistakes, grave mistakes. It may do injustice in individual cases. It is not only not infallible, it disclaims infallibility. No one can unite with it on the presumption that it will never err. Practically, no one does. But whatever error is committed is to be construed as incident to its normal action, so long as no civil offence is committed. No civil court can call it to account, or is entitled to issue an injunction against its action.

But is it a civil offence when an ecclesiastical body dismisses a pastor; or, on grounds which it considers sufficient, silences or deposes him? Entrusted with the care of the churches, it has a discretionary power. Is a civil court competent to decide the limits of that power, or interpret the Standards of the ecclesiastical body? Surely it can properly propose to do this in no instance where there is not clear evidence that civil rights are involved. But where are civil rights violated by the action of an ecclesiastical body that determines, by rules which it is itself alone authorized to make, or interpret, who shall belong to it, or have the care of its churches? Only by its action—not by that of any civil court—can any man be received to its membership, or be placed over its churches. Whatever rights he may claim, he holds subject to its decisions.

We apprehend that there is good reason to be jealous of the interference of the civil authority with ecclesiastical proceedings. Especially are we desirous to acquiesce in that facility of granting injunctions in which the courts of this State have indulged of late in connection with railroad intrigue, making a mockery of justice, and exposing, in the confusion worse confounded, all the authority and dignity of our courts to popular derision. But to extend the area of these injunctions so as to include a Reformed Classis in Ulster county with the Erie or Susquehanna railroad, and arraign its members in court along side of Messrs. Gould and Drew with other Wall-street magnates, is a consummation from which the loss even of incorporated rights might be a cheap forfeit to escape.

We say this, not to prejudice any case, or throw the weight of our reasonings in the scale with reference to a proper judgment of the Ulster county matter, or any other, but in the interests of ecclesiastical freedom and church autonomy. If any denomination is incompetent to frame or administer rightly its own discipline, without the aid, interpretation, prop or subsidies of the civil power, then let it go by the board. If it cannot command the respect and allegiance of its own members, by reason of its blunders and self-contradictions, God forbid that the injunctions of New York judges, or any others, should help it to stand.

MINISTERS' VACATIONS.

Messrs. Editors: Now that our city pastors have returned from their Summer vacations, we trust they will give heed to a few plain facts. The practice which clergymen now-a-days have of all leaving their parishes at once, is becoming alarmingly prevalent, and demands attention. Serious complaints are made of this, and by those, too, who believe in giving an overworked pastor his full measure of recreation; but who also believe that the custom should be so modified and improved as to have at least one minister in a given locality to visit the sick and bury the dead.

Let me narrate a few facts. A few weeks since, in a city only a few miles from New York, an aged man died, who from his early years had been identified with the business and religious interests of the community. During his last hours inquiry was of course made for his minister, but he was away from home beyond reach of letter or telegram. Where then was Dr. —, who for many years had been his pastor in another part of the city? Gone, too. Where is Dr. —, with whom he was intimately acquainted? He is off, too. Where then is Dr. —, with whom he was quite well acquainted? He is away, too, and not a minister can be found to speak a word of comfort to the aged Christian or perform the last rites at his burial. Alas! replies a friend, "your case is not the only one—I have buried three the past month without benefit of clergy."

Now, Messrs. Editors, is this right? Should a family in affliction be left to bury their dead without a word of consolation from him whose business it is to be instant in season and out of season? Six weeks continued absence is too long to be away from a congregation. Spiritual interests languish and die. Why may not pastors copy the example of our best business men, who rarely take more than two weeks at a time, and then make every provision for an emergency. We do hope this matter will be seriously pondered before it provokes ill feeling among the churches.

The subject to which our correspondent calls attention, is commented upon just now by a number of our exchanges. This shows that the evil of which complaint is made is not local, but is felt in many of our cities and larger towns. Nor do we think it is an unreasonable requirement that ministers should so arrange their vacations that the sick and dying shall not be left without the sympathy and counsel they have a right to expect at their hands. It is true such an arrangement would require the presence of some of them in the city during that portion of the year when they most feel the need of rest and relaxation, and when very many of their people are seeking health in the country. That there is no insuperable difficulty in the way of carrying out such a plan as is here suggested, may be seen from the constant practice among physicians of arranging with each other to care for their respective patients when they are obliged to be absent from home. Even where this is not practicable, as in certain places it may not be, then a change of the time of taking his vacation, or a selection by the pastor of a locality near enough to be within call when his services are especially needed or desired, seems in every way desirable.

The Proper Sphere of Woman.

We have been interested in the discussions of the recent National Convention for the promotion of the education of women, and more particularly in the plain, practical suggestions contained in a paper presented by Miss Catherine E. Beecher. It is clear that she has no idea that the possession of the ballot by her sex, would remedy the evils under which women labor, and that the privilege of a seat in the halls of legislation and a voice in framing the laws of the land, would secure for them the "rights" of which they complain they are now deprived. Accord to them the privilege of voting, and place them upon the same civil plane in other respects with that of men, and you destroy in a great measure those social distinctions which grow out of physiological structure, mental habits, and womanly graces; and entering into contests for political office and power, they will cease to be cared for and protected as now, and from that time forth will be allowed just what they are strong enough to take, and nothing more.

The true sphere of woman in Miss Beecher's view—is widely different from this. It is in the domestic circle, and in those employments which legitimately belong to her, that she is to find her highest happiness and a wide field of usefulness. For the proper discharge of her duties in these relations, she should receive an education which will qualify her for them, just as boys are trained in liberally endowed institutions of learning, so that they may be competent to engage in certain avocations and professions. And the present agitation, if it has not accomplished any other good, has turned the attention of the public to the duty of providing higher and better facilities for the education of young ladies. There is no valid reason why legislative aid should not be as freely extended to such institutions, as in the past it has been given to our higher academies and colleges for males; or else let the doors of our present colleges and universities be thrown open as widely to the one sex as to the other. When either of these things takes place, and equal time and care are bestowed in the education of women for their appropriate work in life, as are now expended in fitting men for their spheres of usefulness the sex will no longer be dissatisfied with their condition, nor will women fall of a just appreciation.

DR. CUYLER'S SUMMER LETTERS.

VIII. Dr. CUYLER'S SUMMER LETTERS. With these cool September mornings comes the farewell to Saratoga, and to vacation-rambles. We are gathered about a warm fire; and the few who ventured over to the Camp-meeting yesterday, found the audience skiving under overcoats and shawls. Hundreds are leaving every day for home. Strolling through Congress Park before breakfast, I found the "old sweeper" with his birch broom almost alone in his glory. I supposed that the clerical fraternity were all gone; but within a day or two a bevy of brethren have come in—homeward bound—among them are Dr. Shaw of Rochester, the junior Stephen H. Tyng, Dr. Buddington, and Rev. Mr. Hitchcock of New York. Brother Shaw has been in the Adirondacks, getting ironed over for his thirtieth year of labor in the "Brick church." An ordinary lifetime spent in preaching Jesus, with rare sweetness and success, from the same pulpit! what a luxury is such a life!

This has not been an overcrowded season at Saratoga. Yet high prices of board, and low prices of breadstuffs, have made it unusually profitable to many landlords. Congress Hall has been constantly packed—and Union Hall grounds have been "sparse" as a church on a rainy Sunday. President Grant is at the "Union" just now; as shy and slow of speech as ever. His modesty is absolutely uncomfortable. Last Sabbath, in church, when a fervent brother prayed over him a prayer-ful of honoied commendation, the poor man blushed like a school girl. His most intimate associates are Mr. A. T. Stewart and Commodore Vanderbilt—who is here through his honeymoon.

In this quiet Christian household we are not molested by any fashionable fooleries. But some of the forementioned fooleries of Saratoga this season have been uncommonly foolish. For example, on last Saturday evening, the monstrous farce of a "children's masquerade ball" (!) was enacted in the ball-room of the "Union." At ten o'clock I saw little groups of children from eight to twelve years of age led along the piazzas towards the ball-room! Some were disguised with silly masks; some were attired as sylphs and fairies and water-sprites, in disgusting approach to indecency; not a few looked as if they belonged to a strolling circus troupe. The poor children were kept dancing until midnight; and I learn, on good authority, that the wretched juvenile revel was protracted into the sacred hours of Sabbath! That this babies' ball was an "aristocratic" entertainment, and that even the President of the United States was enticed in there to give it dignity, is no excuse for the church-members who took their children there, and gave their sanction to such performances. When professing Christians train up their children in the masquerade ball, can they reasonably look for their early conversion? "What concord hath Christ with Belial?"

The dance has raged here this Summer, furiously. And into its giddy mazes have been whirled more than one from whom we would expect better things. For, bear in mind that the dance current here is precisely what Mr. Wilkinson describes in that most pungent and powerful little book "The Dunces of Modern Society." It is open to the three great decisive objections which he brings to fashionable dancing. The dance (as generally practised) is injurious to health—injurious to true and improving social intercourse—injurious to pure modesty through the indelicate familiarities which it requires between the sexes. These three indictments Mr. Wilkinson has made good in his capital treatise; he might have added that it is equally injurious to the spirituality and beauty of Christian character. Those who wish to see the "Dance" well dissected, should read Mr. Wilkinson's little work. It is published (I think) by Oakley, Mason & Co., New York.

The shocking Byron scandal has, of course, been freely canvassed here. As far as I have heard intelligent people discuss Mrs. Stowe's clumsily written article, they have unanimously expressed an entire belief in the terrible charges it contains. In spite of your own editorial judgments, so handsomely rendered, permit me here to register the prediction that Mrs. Stowe's statement will yet be triumphantly vindicated. She has told her story bunglingly, but I believe it to be terribly true.

Among the most vivid recollections I have of Newstead Abbey, is of that tree which stands in the garden, on which one can still read the names "Byron—Augusta." The poet out the two names in the bark of the tree, and in 1857 they were still distinctly legible. (Mr. Barnum offered Col. Wildman, the owner of Newstead, five hundred pounds for the single foot of tree-trunk which bore the marks of the poet's knife!) And now, after fifty years, those two names, thus singularly bleared on that tree—come out together in a fearful juxtaposition, on the yet surviving fame of the brilliant but licentious blasphemer. That handwriting on the tree may yet have a moral significance like unto that on Belshazzar's palace wall.

But my sheet is exhausted. And with thoughts of better men, and of better uses for the human hand and brain, let me utter my cordial farewell to the good EVANGELIST, with whom I have gone on Summer pilgrimage. Henceforth comes home, and happy toil. Henceforth the seed-pouch, the sowing, and the sickle.

I leave behind me here a group of patients seeking recovery under the skilful treatment of our friends the Doctors Strong. I know of no better insitiation of its kind. May they all find here the healing, and the elastic recuperation which I have gathered, for twenty Summers, from yonder Springs!

TO PIUS THE NINTH—BISHOP OF ROME.

In your Encyclical Letter, dated Sept. 13, 1868, you invite "all Protestants" to "embrace the opportunity" presented by the Council summoned to meet in the city of Rome during the month of December of the current year, "to return to the one only fold," intending thereby, as the connection implies, the Roman Catholic Church. That letter has been brought to the notice of the two General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Those Assemblies represent nearly five thousand ministers of the Gospel, and a still larger number of Christian congregations.

Believing, as we do, that it is the will of Christ that His Church on earth should be one; and recognizing the duty of doing all we consistently can to promote Christian charity and fellowship, we deem it right to say in few words why we cannot comply with your invitation, or participate in the deliberations of the approaching Council.

It is not because we reject any article of the Catholic faith. We are not heretics; we receive all the doctrines contained in the ancient Symbol known as the Apostles' Creed; we regard as consistent with Scripture the doctrinal decisions of the first six Ecumenical Councils; and because of that consistency we receive those decisions as expressing our own faith. We believe the doctrines of the Trinity and Person of Christ, as those doctrines are set forth by the Council of Nice, A. D. 325; by that of Chalcedon, A. D. 451; and by that of Constantinople, A. D. 680. With the whole Catholic Church, therefore, we believe that there are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that these three are one God, the same in substance, and equal in power and glory.

We believe that the Eternal Son of God became man by taking to Himself a true body and a reasonable soul; and so was, and continues to be, both God and man, in two distinct natures, and one person forever. We believe that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is the Prophet of God, whose teachings we are bound to receive, and in whose promises we confide. He is the High Priest of our profession, whose infinitely meritorious satisfaction to divine justice, and whose ever-prevalent intercession is the only ground of our justification and acceptance before God. He is our King, to whom our allegiance is due, not only as His creatures, but as the purchase of His blood. To His authority we submit; in His care we trust; and to His service we and all creatures in heaven and earth should be devoted.

We believe, moreover, all those doctrines concerning sin, grace, and predestination, known in history as Augustinian. Those doctrines were sanctioned by the Council of Carthage, A. D. 418; by a more general Council in the same place, A. D. 418; by Zosimus, Bishop of Rome, A. D. 418; and by the third Ecumenical Council at Ephesus, A. D. 451. It is impossible, therefore, that we should be pronounced heretical without including the whole ancient Church in the same condemnation. We not only "glory in the name of Christians, but profess the true faith of Christ, and follow the communion of the Catholic Church." Still further to quote your own words, "Truth must continue ever stable and not subject to any change."

Neither are we schismatics. We believe in true "Catholic unity." We cordially recognize as members of Christ's visible Church on earth all who profess the true religion, together with their children. We are not only willing, but earnestly desire, to maintain Christian communion with them, provided they do not prescribe as a condition of such communion, that we should profess what the Word of God condemns, or do what that Word forbids. If any Church prescribes unscriptural conditions of fellowship, the error and the fault are with such Church, and not with us.

But, although neither heretics nor schismatics, we cannot accept your invitation, because we still hold the principles which prompted our "ancestors," in the name of primitive Christianity, and in defence of the "true faith," bravely to protest against the errors and abuses which had been foisted upon the Church—principles for which our fathers were, by the Council of Trent, representing the Church over which you preside, excommunicated and pronounced accursed. The most important of those principles are the following:

FIRST. That the Word of God, as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. The Council of Trent, however, demands that we receive, *pari pietatis affectu*, the teachings of tradition as supplementing and interpreting the written Word of God. This we cannot do without incurring the condemnation which our Lord pronounced on the Pharisees when He said, "Ye make void the Word of God by your traditions."

SECOND. The right of private judgment. When we open the Scriptures we find them addressed to the people. They speak to us; they command us to search their sacred pages; they require us to believe what they teach, and to do what they enjoin; they

hold us personally responsible for our faith and conduct. The promise of the inward teaching of the Spirit to guide men into the knowledge of the truth, is made to the clergy alone; much less to any special order of the clergy alone. The Apostle John says to believers, "Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and know all things; and the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth with you, and ye have not need that any man teach you."—1 John ii. 20 and 27. The Apostle Paul commands us (the people) to pronounce accursed anything contrary to the divinely authenticated Word of God.—Gal. i. 8. He makes the people the judges of truth and error as accountable to God only; he places the rule of judgment in their hands, and holds them responsible for their decisions. Private judgment, therefore, is not only a right, but a duty, from which no man can exonerate himself, or be exonerated by others.

THIRD. We believe in the universal priesthood of believers; that is, that all men have, through Christ, access by one Spirit unto the Father.—Eph. ii. 18. They need no human priest to secure their access to God. Every man for himself may come with boldness to the throne of grace to obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need.—Heb. iv. 16. "Having, therefore, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, . . . and having an High Priest over the house of God, we may all draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."—Heb. x. 19, 22. To admit, therefore, the priesthood of the clergy, whose intervention is necessary to secure for the people the remission of sins and other benefits of redeeming grace, we regard as involving either the rejection of the priesthood of Christ, or a denial of its sufficiency.

FOURTH. We deny the perpetuity of the apostleship. As no man can be a prophet without the spirit of prophecy, so no man can be an apostle without the gifts of an apostle. Those gifts, as we learn from Scripture, are plenary knowledge of the Gospel, derived by immediate revelation from Christ (Gal. i. 12); and personal infallibility in teaching and ruling. What are the seals of the apostleship, we learn from what St. Paul says to the Corinthians: "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds."—2 Cor. xii. 12. Modern prelates, although they claim apostolic authority, do not pretend to possess the gifts on which that authority was founded, nor do they venture to exhibit the "signs" by which the commission of the messengers of Christ was authenticated. We cannot, therefore, recognize them, either individually or collectively, as the infallible teachers and rulers of the Church.

Much less can we acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be Christ's vicar upon earth possessing "supreme rule." We acknowledge our adorable Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to be the only head of the Church, which is His body. We believe that although now enthroned at the right hand of the Majesty on high, He is still present with His people on earth, whom He governs by His Word, Providence, and Spirit. We cannot, therefore, put any creature in His place, or render to a man the obedience which is due to Christ alone.

As the Church of Rome excommunicates all those who profess the principles above enumerated; as we regard these principles to be of vital importance, and intend to assert them more earnestly than ever; as God appears to have given His seal and sanction to these principles by making the countries where they are held the leaders in civilization—the most eminent for liberty, order, intelligence, and all forms of private and social prosperity—it is evident that the barrier between us and you is, at present, insurmountable.

Although this letter is not intended to be either obnoxious or controversial, it is known to all the world, that there are doctrines and usages of the Church over which you preside, which Protestants believe to be not only unscriptural, but contrary to the faith and practice of the early Church. Some of those doctrines and usages are the following, viz: The doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass; the adoration of the host; the power of judicial absolution (which places the salvation of the people in the hands of the priests); the doctrine of the grace of orders, that is, that supernatural power and influence are conferred in ordination by the imposition of hands; the doctrine of purgatory; the worship of the Virgin Mary; the invocation of saints; the worship of images; the doctrine of reserve and of implicit faith, and the consequent withholding the Scriptures from the people, &c.

So long as the profession of such doctrines and submission to such usages are required, it is obvious that there is an impassable gulf between us and the Church by which such demands are made.

While loyalty to Christ, obedience to the Holy Scriptures, consistent respect for the early Councils of the Church, and the firm belief that pure "religion is the foundation of all human society," compel us to withdraw from fellowship with the Church of Rome; we nevertheless desire to live in charity with all men. We love all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. We cordially recognize as Christian brethren all who worship, trust, and serve Him as their God and Saviour according to the inspired Word. And we hope to be united in heaven with all who unite with us on earth, in saying, "Unto Him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God; to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen."—Rev. i. 6.

Signed in behalf of the two General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

M. W. JACOBS, PR. H. FOWLER, Moderators.