

1
REPRESENTATIVE

MEN

42
1356

OF

THE SOUTH.

3 3 3
3 3 3
3 3 3

PHILADELPHIA:
CHAS. ROBSON & CO.

1880.

F208
.R42

1133

COPYRIGHT, BY CHAS. ROBSON, 1880.

~~~~~  
FERGUSON BROS. & CO.,  
ELECTROTYPERS AND PRINTERS,  
PHILADELPHIA.  
~~~~~

1133

to the plough. For seven years he toiled early and late, working in the fields with such assistance as he could get, and doing himself everything required to be done on a farm, from making a horse-shoe to building a house. In the summer of 1865, he was urged to become a candidate for a seat in the State Convention ordered by President Johnson, through Governor Holden, but, having determined to eschew politics altogether, he declined, until, at length, yielding to the repeated solicitations of his friends, he consented two days before the election to stand for the place, and was elected by a considerable majority. His service in the Convention ended, he returned to the plough, and has since uniformly and firmly refused to accept any political office whatever. In 1865 and 1866 he served as a magistrate, and for two years edited a local newspaper called "The Ansonian," besides conducting his farm and an extensive mercantile business. In 1873, the Carolina Central Railroad approaching his farm, he built upon a tract near the line a village, called Polkton in his honor. He was Chairman of the Committee of the State Grange of North Carolina, and assisted in drawing the bill for the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, the passage of which, by the Legislature, he was deputed to promote and succeeded in effecting. The bill as passed provides for a Commissioner of Agriculture, to be elected by the State Board of Agriculture, to consist of the Governor of the State, the President of the State Agricultural Society, the President of the State University, the State Geologist, the Master of the State Grange, and two practical agriculturists. By this Board, duly organized under the law, he was chosen Commissioner, April 6th, 1877, and at once entered upon the discharge of the responsible duties of the office. The system of the department, as defined in the law, is more comprehensive than that of any other like department in the United States, and the system finds in him a zealous and efficient administrator. Himself a thoroughly practical agriculturist; familiar by actual experience with every branch of the art, and taking delight in all of

them, the performance of his official duties is to him a labor of love. He has visited in the interest of his department a large number of the counties of the State, and has collected from every county of the State specimens of its products, the whole of which collection is displayed in his office, where he is never weary in affording information to inquirers, in advising those who consult him, and in setting forth generally the strong claims of the old North State to the attention of capitalists and settlers. His courtesy is as inexhaustible as his information, rendering intercourse with him not more profitable than pleasant. In addition to being State Commissioner of Agriculture, he is Vice-President of the National Emigration Bureau at Philadelphia. He is a member of the Baptist denomination, in everything tending to the interests of which he has always manifested a lively concern. In the establishment of Sunday-schools especially he has taken a marked interest. He has written a history of his old regiment, the Forty-third North Carolina, which he purposes shortly to publish in book form. From the glimpse of the achievements of this regiment given above, it is safe to infer that the volume will be an interesting one.

REV. B. M. PALMER, D. D.

LOUISIANA.

BENJAMIN MORGAN PALMER was born January 25th, 1818, at Charleston, S. C. The Palmers are of English descent both on the paternal and maternal side, and their ancestors migrated to this country in the earliest days of its settlement, making New England their home. From the earliest known records the Palmers have followed the clerical profession, and most of them have attained to a ripe old age. Rev. Samuel Palmer, the great grandfather of the subject of this sketch, was a native of Barnstable, Mass.; a graduate of Harvard College in 1727; ordained at Falmouth, Mass., in 1730; and died in 1775, aged sixty-eight. Job Palmer, his son,

emigrated from Massachusetts to South Carolina previous to the Revolutionary war, and settled in Charleston, where he died in 1845, in his ninety-seventh year. He had two sons, who became scholars and ministers—the eldest, Rev. Benjamin M. Palmer, D. D., was born in Philadelphia while his parents were residing in that city, having been driven from their home in South Carolina by the revolutionary struggle; he was a graduate of Princeton; for many years pastor of the Circular Church, Charleston, and died in 1847, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. Edward Palmer, the second son of Job, married Sarah Bunce, a sister of his brother's (Rev. B. M. Palmer) wife, and after his marriage determined to study for the ministry. He went to Andover, Mass., where he entered the academy, and from thence went to the seminary without taking his course at the college; he had attained such proficiency in his studies, however, that by a special application he was granted the degree of B. A. by Yale College. He returned to South Carolina and commenced his ministry at Dorchester, about twenty-four miles from Charleston; after some years he removed to Walterboro, S. C., where, and in the Beaufort District, he has since resided. He is still living (1879), and in his ninety-first year preaches regularly every Sabbath. Benjamin Morgan Palmer, his son, passed his childhood in a country district where there were no schools. His mother took charge of his early education, and laid the foundation for a sound English education. When his parents removed to Walterboro he was enabled to avail himself of the schools of that town, and having mastered all they could teach him, it was determined, though at the unusually early age of fourteen, to send him to one of the Northern colleges. Accordingly, in 1832, he entered Amherst College, Massachusetts, where he spent part of two years. He was the only student from South Carolina at that time in the college, and party feeling running high among the students as well as their elders, his position became one of much discomfort, and although he had almost completed his sophomore year, he returned home in 1834, and spent the two following

years in teaching. At the commencement of 1837 he entered the University of Georgia, at Athens, in the junior class, and graduated thence with distinction in August, 1838.

On the 1st of January, 1839, he entered the theological seminary at Columbia, S. C., and remained there until he had completed the divinity course. He was licensed to preach the gospel by the Presbytery of Charleston, April, 1841, and finally left the theological seminary in July of that year. He commenced his ministry at Anderson, S. C., and, after three months, removed to Savannah, Ga., in answer to a call from the First Presbyterian Church of that city. In the spring of 1842 he was ordained, and installed pastor of that church by the Presbytery of Georgia, but his pastoral relation was dissolved in the winter of that year by his acceptance of a call from the Presbyterian Church of Columbia, S. C., to which he removed in the beginning of 1843. In 1847, in association with the Rev. Drs. Thornwell, Howe, Smythe, and others, he was one of the projectors and editors of the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, an influential religious quarterly published at Columbia, S. C., which has maintained an uninterrupted existence through a period of thirty-two years to the present time. In 1852 the Oglethorpe University, of Georgia, conferred upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity. In 1853, while still in charge of the Presbyterian Church at Columbia, he became Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, and filled the two offices conjointly until the close of 1856. During a visit to the Southwest, in the winter of 1855, in the interest of the theological seminary, he had been brought into contact with the First Presbyterian Church of New Orleans, then vacant by the removal to California of its former pastor, Rev. Dr. Scott. Protracted negotiations ensued, which resulted in his accepting a call to that church, of which he was installed pastor in December, 1856.

Although thoroughly identified with the "Old School" of the Presbyterian Church, he was too young to take part in the memorable contro-

versy which led to the disruption of the Old and New Schools, in 1837. His sympathies, however, were from the first strongly enlisted on the side of a strict construction of the Constitution of the church, and he participated in the discussions in opposition to the Boards and on the elder question. He passed a quiet novitiate, and about the year 1853 began to acquire that reputation which has since made him the most influential and widely known divine in the Southern Presbyterian church. He received numberless calls, many of them from the large centres of population in the East and West—three or four from Philadelphia, several from Cincinnati, and other cities—and was several times a delegate to the General Assembly.

Although taking but little part in politics, he entertained strong views on the more important political questions of the day, and, as in the church, was a stickler for a strict interpretation of the Constitution. Too young to take part in the nullification agitation, by which his native State was stirred to its depths, he was an earnest supporter of the secession movement. Though deprecating under ordinary circumstances the interposition of the clergy in political questions, he rightly considered that in the latter part of 1860, when Abraham Lincoln was elected to the Presidency on a purely sectional issue, the crisis had come when every patriotic Southerner should speak out with no uncertain sound, at a time when the liberties and the destiny of a great people were in peril. In a sermon delivered in the First Presbyterian Church of New Orleans on Thursday, December 29th, 1860, Thanksgiving Day, he says: "Is it immodest in me to assume that I may represent a class whose opinions in such a controversy are of cardinal importance—the class which seeks to ascertain its duty in the light simply of conscience and religion, and which turns to the moralist and the Christian for support and guidance? The question, too, which now places us upon the brink of revolution was, in its origin, a question of morals and religion. It was debated in ecclesiastical councils before it entered legislative halls. It has riven asunder the two largest re-

ligious communions in the land; and the right determination of this primary question will go far toward fixing the attitude we must assume in the coming struggle. I sincerely pray God that I may be forgiven if I have misapprehended the duty incumbent upon me to-day; for I have ascended this pulpit under the agitation of feeling natural to one who is about to deviate from the settled policy of his public life. It is my purpose—not as your organ compromising you, whose opinions are, for the most part, unknown to me, but on my sole responsibility—to speak upon the one question of the day; and to state the duty which, as I believe, patriotism and religion alike require of us all. . . . As it appears to me, the course to be pursued in this emergency is that which has already been inaugurated. Let the people in all the Southern States in solemn counsel assembled reclaim the powers they have delegated. Let those conventions be composed of men whose fidelity has been approved—men who bring the wisdom, experience and firmness of age to support and announce principles which have long been matured. Let these conventions decide firmly and solemnly what they will do with this great trust committed to their hands. Let them pledge each other, in sacred covenant, to uphold and perpetuate what they cannot resign without dishonor and palpable ruin. Let them further take all the necessary steps looking to separate and independent existence, and initiate measures for framing a new and homogeneous confederacy.

Thus prepared for every contingency, let the crisis come. Paradoxical as it may seem, if there be any way to save, or rather to reconstruct the Union of our forefathers, it is this. . . . It only remains to say that, whatever be the fortunes of the South, I accept them for my own. Born upon her soil, of a father thus born before me—from an ancestry that occupied it while yet it was a part of England's possessions—she is in every sense my mother. I shall die upon her bosom; she shall know no peril but it is my peril—no conflict but it is my conflict—and no abyss of ruin into which I shall not share

her fall. May the Lord God cover her head in this her day of battle!"

This sermon created a profound sensation, and opened his hearers' eyes to the imminence of the danger and the necessity of being prepared to meet it. The breaking out of the war developed a fierce political spirit among the Old School Presbyterians in the Northern States, and at the meeting of the General Assembly in Philadelphia, in the spring of 1861, a resolution was passed declaring "its obligation to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal government," and professing its "unabated loyalty to the Constitution," as interpreted by the Federal government, carefully defining this to be "that Central Administration," existing at any given time. This resolution, introduced by Dr. Spring, of New York, rendered it obligatory on all ministers, Southern as well as Northern, to take the side of the Federal government in the impending struggle; and, as it was impossible that those in the South, whose sympathies almost to a man were with their section, should do this, a rupture was inevitable. This led to the organization of the Southern Presbyterian Church, in which Dr. Palmer took a prominent part. The first General Assembly met in Augusta, Ga., in December, 1861; Dr. Palmer was chosen Moderator and opened the proceedings with a sermon. This Assembly represented forty-seven presbyteries scattered through eleven Southern synods, and the grounds of their separation from the Northern Church were set forth by the Rev. Dr. Thornwell in a paper entitled "An Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth." The following extracts show the grounds of their separation, and the views of the Southern Presbyterian Church on the question of slavery:

"We have separated from our brethren of the North as Abraham separated from Lot—because we are persuaded that the interests of true religion will be more effectually subserved by two independent churches, under the circumstances in which the two countries are placed, than by one united body. In the first place the course of the last Assembly at Philadelphia

conclusively shows that if we should remain together, the political questions which divide us as citizens will be obtruded on our church courts, and discussed by Christian ministers and elders, with all the acrimony, bitterness and rancor with which such questions are usually discussed by men of the world. . . . An Assembly composed of representatives from two such countries could have no security for peace, except in a steady, uncompromising adherence to the scriptural principle that it would know no man after the flesh; that it would abolish the distinctions of Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, and recognize nothing but the new creature in Christ Jesus. The moment it permits itself to know the Confederate or the United States; the moment its members meet as citizens of those countries, our political differences will be transferred to the house of God, and the passions of the forum will expel the spirit of holy love and of Christian communion. . . . We have never confounded Cæsar and Christ; and we have never mixed the issues of this world with the weighty matters that properly belong to us as citizens of the kingdom of God. . . . We would have it distinctly understood that in our ecclesiastical capacity we are neither the friends nor the foes of slavery—that is to say, we have no commission either to propagate or abolish it. The policy of its existence or non-existence is a question which exclusively belongs to the State. We have no right, as a church, to enjoin it as a duty, or to condemn it as a sin. Our business is with the duties which spring from the relation—the duties of the masters on the one hand, and of the slaves on the other. These duties we are to proclaim and to enforce with spiritual sanctions. The social, civil, political problems connected with this great subject transcend our sphere; as God has not intrusted to His church the organization of society, the construction of governments, nor the allotment of individuals to their various stations."

In May, 1862, when New Orleans fell into the hands of the Federal forces, Dr. Palmer was in attendance on the session of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church, at

Montgomery, Ala., and did not return to the former city until the summer of 1865. He made his home in Columbia, S. C., and, though he held no regular commission, spent a considerable portion of each year in preaching to the Western army, moving about from point to point as the exigencies of the war demanded, and returning to Columbia during the sessions of the theological seminary, of which he was the Provisional Professor of Theology, in place of Rev. Dr. Thornwell, his intimate friend, who died in August, 1862.

The war over, he returned to New Orleans, where he has since resided, exerting his powerful influence for the advancement of his church and for the best interests of his fellow-citizens. In May, 1869, the Old School Northern Assembly of the Presbyterian Church made overtures for reunion with the Southern church, which led to a review of the whole question in a series of articles published in the *Southwestern Presbyterian* under the signature of "Presbyter," a *nom de plume* adopted by Dr. Palmer. With scathing irony he exposes the political character of the Northern church, its sycophancy to the Federal government, its tyrannical character, its slanders against the Southern church, and its tendency to imperialism. It would be impossible, in the space at our disposal, to give, in sufficient detail to be understood, the various deliverances of the Northern church during the four years of the war, in which the Southern church was charged with treason, rebellion, anarchy, fraud, disloyalty, schism, disturbance, conspiracy, etc., etc. In 1865, shortly after the cessation of hostilities, and when the South lay panting and bleeding under the heel of the conqueror, it might be supposed that a more Christian spirit would prevail in the Northern church towards their Southern brethren; but, on the contrary, nothing was seen but the flush of fierce exultation in the hour of triumph, and not a whisper was heard but of vindictive retribution. We find the Northern Assembly of that year adopting a policy exactly similar to that of the government towards the seceded States. As the government claimed the right to coerce the

seceded States back into the Union, so the church would coerce the "schismatical" presbyteries back into their old ecclesiastical fellowship. And precisely the same measures of reconstruction were proposed in the church which had worked so awkwardly in the State, viz.: a wholesale disfranchisement of all who were suspected of disloyalty, and the erection of petty minorities in churches and church courts, into churches and courts in whom all the rights and franchises of a true succession were to vest; and if this scheme of disintegration did not generally succeed, the failure was due to the wonderful unanimity of the members of the Southern church, presenting so few fissures in which to drive the wedge of division and strife.

As we are writing a biographical sketch of a gentleman representing the opinions of a large and important class, fairness demands that we should present the facts from his own standpoint; and accordingly we make the following extracts from Dr. Palmer's articles, representing the views of the Southern church on the question of slavery, for which they were so vindictively arraigned by their Northern brethren:

"Slavery, as one of the many forms of human servitude, we have always regarded as one of the consequences of the Fall. Evolving itself out of the curse of labor, pronounced upon man for the primary transgression, it is simply one of those adjustments of Divine Providence by which the necessary subordination in human society is in part secured. In a state of society absolutely perfect, and amongst beings themselves absolutely sinless, slavery, we suppose, would not exist. We cannot conceive of it, for example, as an element of the society in heaven. But it is the sad mistake of those philanthropic visionaries to legislate for a condition of things purely ideal, such as never can be realized in a fallen world, making 'confusion worse confounded,' and establishing universal anarchy in the stead of the imaginary perfection which is the dream of their fancy. We, on the contrary, accept the stubborn fact that ours is a sinful race, placed here under the discipline of a wise and just government; whose method is not to take evil out

of the world, but to transform it, converting it into a stupendous educational system, softening and sanctifying it into an ultimate blessing. We do not profess to understand the vast and complex machinery of Divine Providence, with its immense adjustments and compensations, by which one form of evil is set over against another, mutually limiting and mutually controlling; and all in subordination to the purposes of Infinite mercy and love, gradually disciplining a sinful race to a higher and more glorious destiny. But we can adore where we cannot comprehend. We can admire that combined wisdom and grace which takes poverty and pain, and weakness and disease, and sorrow and death, transforming them all into a mighty and loving discipline for good. This, then, is the 'category,' if our adversaries will deign to believe us, in which we place slavery. One of the processes by which a just, yet beneficent, Providence disciplines and trains sinful man is servitude; and one of the many forms in which that servitude is allowed to shape itself is slavery. At the very opening of history, after the deluge, we meet the mysterious decree of Jehovah, which doomed a portion of the race to servitude; a doom from which, through the whole tract of succeeding history, they were never extracted; and which seems to have the power of drawing within its dark shadow even those who would be their guardians and protectors. . . . Within the sixty years which have elapsed since the abolition of the African slave trade, a race of wild and naked savages has been lifted to a degree of knowledge and virtue which, in the estimation of our Northern brethren, justifies them in packing these new-born freedmen into our Legislatures and courts, to enact and expound the laws under which we live. It is the highest encomium they could pronounce upon the value of slavery as a grand educational and disciplinary system. And though we think they slightly overestimate the benefits this system has conferred, we agree with them so far as to believe that the world may safely be challenged to produce a like example, in which a barbarous people, at the very lowest point of human degra-

ation, has been civilized, refined and Christianized in so short a time. . . . As respects the Christian sentiment of the South, it regarded slavery in the light of a great and solemn trust. Pharisaic Puritanism will of course indulge in its usual pious sneer at the statement. Still we will put it on record, that a Christian people could not construe the providence which called them to receive into their homes four million of an alien, a barbarous and heathen race, but as a commission from God to educate them for eternity and heaven. With some measure of fidelity the Southern church devoted herself to this great duty: a fidelity which the Northern Assembly itself has more than once seen fit to mention in terms of honorable praise, and which has received the signet of the Divine approval in the blessing that has accompanied these labors, and in the large results accruing from them. So long as this trust was continued to us in the working of a mysterious Providence, just so long it was to be cherished and its sacred duties fulfilled. The infidel humanitarianism which 'opposed and exalted itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped,' was stoutly resisted when it proclaimed its 'higher law' above the teachings of Divine Revelation. Slavery being the object of its assault, had to be religiously defended; not so much for its own sake, but because it was the battle-field on which must be fought that peculiar and subtle infidelity of modern times which was seeking to undermine the foundations of Christianity itself. But no sooner did the issues of war settle the question of the continuance of slavery, than the Christian heart of the South accepted the solution of this vast problem which Providence itself afforded. We are now, by the hand of God, discharged from the trust which had previously been equally difficult to fulfil and perilous to let go. Notwithstanding the fact that three-fifths of our property was virtually confiscated by the stroke of the pen which decreed emancipation, with the additional loss of another fifth in the depreciation of our landed estates, yet in all this widespread financial ruin not a whimper of complaint has been heard from Southern lips.

Slavery was one of the stakes of the war; the decision of the sword was against us, and our people accepted without a murmur the result of the struggle. They were too manly to whine over what was irreparable, and took poverty to their bosom as though it were a bride. The piety of the South went deeper. It acknowledged the hand of God in cutting the knot, the most vexatious of the age; and in freeing it from all the responsibilities of a trust which must be 'conserved' so long as it remained, and from which there could be no discharge but through the omnipotence of his own will. Whether the negro race can properly use the privileges of that freedom upon which they have been so suddenly precipitated—whether the degeneracy in character now so apparent will be confined to a brief and transitional period—whether they can ever be educated, even by the forced culture to which they are now subjected, to a due appreciation of their duties and franchises—are questions which we will not in this connection discuss. We would not so much as embarrass the outworking of this problem by the expression of an unfavorable opinion. We are the friends of the black man now, as we were his guardians and protectors before; we wish him well in his new career, and, so far, as may be consistent with the higher duty and respect which we owe to our own race, we would help him onward in the ascending path to usefulness, happiness and honor. So far as in us lies, we would retain him under the influence of a pure and wholesome Christianity, and prevent his relapse into the fetishism of his pagan ancestors. But whatever his destiny may be, we are clear to say for ourselves, that, were it in our power to accomplish his return to bondage by the simple turning over of the hand, that hand would lie unmoved upon the table which is before us. 'Is he made free? let him use it rather,' and 'abide in the calling wherein he is called.' Nor is this a singular crotchet of the writer alone; we are very sure that the entire virtue and intelligence of the South agree in this verdict. With perfect consistency the most earnest pro-slavery advocates in the South, who con-

tended for the conservation of slavery while the institution existed, consent to be divested of all its grave responsibilities as soon as the institution is destroyed, without the intervention of their agency.'

The long-pending negotiations between the Old and New Schools, North, culminated, in November, 1869, in the fusion of the two bodies, and consequently no reply was possible to the overture of the Old School Church, North, as it had no longer a separate corporate existence, and survived only as a constituent part of a new and larger body. At the meeting of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church, at Louisville, Ky., in May, 1870, this overture was renewed from the reunited General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, then in session in Philadelphia. The matter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Correspondence, of which Dr. Palmer was the Chairman, who decided that, as long as the injurious accusations preferred against the whole Southern Presbyterian Church remained on record, they were an impassable barrier to official intercourse. A pastoral letter, in explanation of this action, was prepared by Dr. Paimier, and a copy sent to every minister and every ruling elder in the church. Some years later a further overture was made by the reunited Northern church, and committees were appointed on either side to ascertain if the matter would admit of adjustment. The Committee of Conference, of which Dr. Palmer was a member, met at Baltimore, but no satisfactory result was arrived at; similar overtures have been made from time to time since that conference, but the matter has now been finally dropped on both sides, without any agreement being reached. The Southern church had no desire to exact any humiliating confession from their Northern brethren, but simply desired that they should express regret for the offensive expressions used in a time of great political excitement. In September, 1875, a lengthy correspondence took place between Rev. Dr. H. A. Nelson, of Geneva, N. Y., and Dr. B. M. Palmer, upon the relations subsisting between

the Northern and the Southern Presbyterian Churches. The correspondence was conducted in the best possible spirit, and as representing the opinions of representative men on both sides of the question, was published in the *Southwestern Presbyterian*.

At the outset Dr. Palmer combats Dr. Nelson's assertion, that the war between the sections was "an effort to establish a national organization and government which should protect and secure slavery," as follows:

"The popular judgment that slavery was in any sense the *cause* of the late war, is one which history will replace—whenever she shall assume her judicial function, and revise the errors which are occasioned by looking at the surface appearance of things. It was the *occasion* of the war—the concrete and tangible issue which could be put before the masses on both sides, the rallying cry by which the forces could be marshalled into battle. For the *cause* we must look a great deal deeper, into that fundamental difference of opinion which obtained, from the beginning of the Republic, as to the nature of our complex government and the relation which the original States sustained to the central power which they themselves created."

In answer to Dr. Nelson's inquiry as to whether the Cleveland resolution which "affirms unequivocally its confidence in the integrity and Christian character of our brethren of the Southern church, comes short of what you think becoming in us, or due to you," Dr. Palmer points out that the Southern church "would never have disturbed your serenity with any demand for justice, or for anything else, except at your own constant appeal." That the Baltimore Conference Committee had explicitly stated, "We desire that the imputations which we conceive to be resting upon our church, by the acts of your Assembly, should be removed—we care not in what terms, so they directly and fairly cover the case. If your Assembly could see its way clear to say in a few plain words, to this effect, that these obnoxious things were said and done in times of great excitement, that they are to be regretted; and that now, in a calm re-

view, the imputations cast upon the Southern church are disapproved—this would end the difficulty at once." And that "there the matter must rest until your body can feel free to remove the aspersions, which, because they affect our integrity and honor, disable us from official intercourse with it."

Dr. Palmer has been a voluminous contributor to the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, and is the author of "Life and Letters of James Henley Thornwell, D. D.," pp. 614, Richmond, 1875. "The Family—in its Civil and Churchly Aspects, an Essay in two parts," pp. 291, Richmond, 1876. "Sermons," published in weekly numbers and forming two volumes, pp. 650 and 478, New Orleans, 1875. A number of his addresses and lectures have been published in pamphlet form, among which may be mentioned "The Tribunal of History," a lecture delivered before the Historical Society of New Orleans, 1872; "The Present Crisis and its Issues," an address delivered at the Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., 1872.

He was married October 7th, 1841, to Mary A. McConnell, daughter of Dr. McConnell, a physician of Liberty county, Ga. Of six children five died, leaving but one daughter living, the wife of Dr. J. W. Caldwell, Professor of Natural Science in the Southwestern Presbyterian University, Clarksville, Tenn.

L. A. DUGAS, M. D.

GEORGIA.

LOUIS ALEXANDER DUGAS was born January 3d, 1806, in Washington, Wilkes county, Ga., and is the son of Louis Rene Adrien Dugas de Vallon. The De Vallons were of French West-Indian descent, emigrating from France some two generations ago to St. Domingo, where they became wealthy planters. His father, although born in St. Domingo, resided constantly in Paris, where his ample fortune enabled him to gratify his literary tastes; he was a gentleman of large and varied informa-