

THE AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES. No. III.—JULY, 1869.

ART. I.—MR. MILL AND HIS CRITICS.

By FRANCIS BOWEN, Professor in Harvard University.

SECOND PAPER.

“MATTER, then,” says Mr. Mill, according to his “Psychological Theory,” “may be defined a Permanent Possibility of Sensation. If I am asked whether I believe in matter, I ask whether the questioner accepts this definition of it. If he does, I believe in matter ; *and so do all Berkeleians*. In any other sense than this, I do not. But I affirm with confidence, that this conception of Matter *includes the whole meaning attached to it by the common world*, apart from philosophical, and sometimes from theological, theories.”

Here is an implied assertion, that his definition of Matter coincides with Berkeley's doctrine of Idealism, and a direct assertion, that it includes the whole meaning attached to the conception of Matter by ordinary people, who are neither philosophers nor theologians. We dispute both positions. Bishop Berkeley affirms the necessity of a Cause, an Efficient Cause, to account for the ideas or sensations in our minds; and as he says “there is nothing of power or agency” in the ideas themselves, as “it is impossible for an idea to do anything, or, strictly speaking, to be the cause of anything,” he has a right to conclude, as he does, “there is therefore some cause of these ideas, whereon they depend, and which pro-

ART. VIII.—HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE REUNION.

By J. F. STEARNS, D. D., Newark, N. J.

THE wise man tells us "there is a time to rend and a time to sew," "a time to break down and a time to build up." And, no doubt, as the world now is, seasons of separation and disintegration must be expected to occur which, in the economy of God's inscrutable providence, may be made to subserve important and useful ends. Such is the case manifestly in the history of the Christian church. The rending and the breaking down perform important functions in the freeing and the purifying. And this may serve to reconcile us, in many instances, to what must otherwise have been regarded as an unmitigated evil.

In the deplorable separation which, for more than thirty years, has impaired the influence and hindered the progress of the Presbyterian Church, we find much to illustrate this principle. Those whose memory runs back to the years immediately preceding the rupture of 1838 will readily call to mind the strife and turmoil which, from year to year, disturbed the deliberations of the General Assembly, and provoked the harsh, and certainly not elegant remark, of one who himself shared the contentions, that "Hell itself held a jubilee whenever that body was in session." Matters had come to such a pass that of two evils that of separation was the least. And, though many believed that the difficulties might and ought to have been settled and the rupture avoided, all must acknowledge, as they look back, that important ends have been subserved by the long season of mutual rivalry and separate action into which the two parties were precipitated. Problems have been wrought out, on the one side and the other, by the logic of experience, which all the arguments of the most cogent reasoners could not have solved. Slavery and anti-slavery, ecclesiastical Boards and voluntary Associations, liberty of thought and expression and a vigilant inquisition against heresy—"the *ipsissima verba*" and "the substance of doctrine," Divine sovereignty and the free agency of man—time has done that for the adjustment of these questions, and to bring about a common understanding in respect to them, which continued controversy, within the pale of the same church, would only have hindered. And, meanwhile, each party going its own way, and acting on its own convictions and preferences, has been able, it may be conceded, to accom-

plish more for the general cause than it could have done in any such union as might then have been practicable.

But separation, whatever temporary or incidental benefits may accrue from it, is not by any means the normal condition of the church, as the whole character and design of the institution as well as the explicit assertions of the Holy Scriptures, constrain us to believe. Temporary necessity may require it. But it is always an evil. They who create the necessity or without a necessity force it on, must be held responsible. And when the necessity passes away, immediately the obligation to reunion becomes imperative. Two bodies of professed Christians occupying the same field, holding substantially the same faith, practicing the same form of worship, governed by the same law, and pursuing the same methods of action, may justly be required to show cause why they should hold towards each other so unnatural a relation. In default of reasons, and those strong and tangible, they can not but be held guilty of schism, and incur severe censure in the eyes of the church at large and of all reasonable men.

Such was the posture in which the Old and New School branches of the Presbyterian Church stood towards each other for more than thirty years. And though the attempt was constantly renewed, by unkind imputations on the one side, which were immediately and indignantly repudiated on the other, to exhibit a justifying ground, neither party ever succeeded in satisfying the judgment of impartial men, nor, with the exceptions of a few rigid sticklers for minute distinctions, their own consciences. Prejudices gained a hold here and there and were but slowly dislodged. But individual members passed from one side to the other and felt no difference. Ministers were transferred from one connection to the other and in a few months melted into the new fraternity as if they had always been of it. Efforts were made here and there to check this natural tendency. Members applying for certificates of dismissal were informed that the church in — street was the only one of "*our* connection" in the place to which they were going, and they should take a recommendation to that, or, if they insisted, a form out of the regular course and containing a sort of protest was perhaps furnished them. We copy a specimen, the production of a distinguished Doctor of Divinity in one of our principal cities.

"This may certify that Mrs. — is a member of the — Presbyterian Church—in good and regular standing. As such she is affectionately commended to the fellowship of *God's people* wherever her lot may be cast. *She has expressed a desire to connect herself with a branch of the Church of Christ not*

in correspondence with the General Assembly with which this church is connected, and so *no form of dismission* is provided in such cases. But she is a dear child of God and we shall be happy to hear of her church relations being pleasantly foamed *anywhere*, as we feel sure she will be a comfort to her brethren in the Lord. Should she be received by *any church* it will confer a favor on us to be advised of that fact by the proper authority that her name may not be retained on the roll of this church.

BY ORDER OF THE SESSION.

_____, 1850.

This letter was intended for one of the oldest, soundest and most respected Presbyterian churches in the land, and shows the embarrassments into which good men were thrown in their efforts to keep up not only a distinction but a separation without a difference. In the nature of the case, such attempts could not succeed, except partially, and, as time wore on, their folly became every year more and more apparent.

The question may be entertained here, whether there ever was such difference in doctrine between the two parties as to justify the separation. From a careful examination of the whole matter, we are quite settled in the opinion that there was not. In every large body of earnest thinkers there will always be more or less of diversity. This every one must admit, although, in times of jealousy and sharp controversy, some will be very reluctant to give their opponents the advantage of an explicit admission of it. Besides minor differences, to which little regard will be paid, there will generally be found two opposite poles of thought, to one or the other of which differently constituted minds will be likely to tend. Among the adherents to the same system there will be an extreme right and an extreme left, as well as a *juste milieu*. Be as minute and stringent as you will in your definitions of orthodoxy, different men, adopting the same statements, and, as they verily believe, holding them in their true meaning and intent, will be found ranging themselves toward one or the other extreme. Cut the body in the middle, and one of the halves will take one of the extremes, and the other the other; and the two halves may be characterized accordingly, though the great body in both will still be substantially alike. Something like this took place in the great rupture of the Presbyterian church—not exactly, it is true, for as the differences of doctrine were but one among several causes of the separation, there was a considerable mixing up in this particular, and both parties had to tolerate more or less of both the opposite extremes.

The Presbyterian Church, as we all know, has a very minute, carefully digested, and clearly defined Confession of

Faith. Nobody can doubt that it contains essentially the Calvinistic or Reformed system distinctively so called. There is no compromise in it between Calvinism and Arminianism, as has been claimed for the "Thirty-nine Articles"—no intentionally ambiguous phrases which men may interpret differently to suit their convenience. But here two things are to be carefully noted. Even this sharply-defined and comprehensive system does not pretend to cover the whole ground of revealed truth, nor to distinguish between the different forms of Calvinistic doctrine. The Confession states, for the most part, only that which all good Calvinists, sublapsarian and supralapsarian, mediate imputationists like Calvin himself, and immediate imputationists, have held in common. Outside of this, the widest differences, whether of philosophy or of statement and illustration, are no breach of doctrinal unity. And then, again, the Presbyterian law of subscription, as contained in the questions answered at ordination, does not require the adoption of the "*ipsissima verba*" even of the Confession itself, nor allow it to be accepted by any as an infallible rule. This prerogative it reserves exclusively for the Scriptures, and prescribes the Confession only as *containing* the *system* of doctrine *taught* in the Scriptures. The real *Basis* of Presbyterian orthodoxy is, after all, the Scriptures honestly and truly interpreted, and the Confession and Catechisms, important as they are, fall rather into the rank of declarations or testimony. This we say in no spirit of latitudinarianism. No man can receive and adopt the Confession of Faith who does not hold as true and Scriptural the system of doctrines contained in it. Therein are found the terms of our fellowship, a solemn affirmation to each other of what we actually believe, a systematic form of what we understand to be the leading truths of our religion. But the Confession of Faith is not the Bible, and the Bible, not the Confession of Faith, is the source and law of Presbyterian doctrine and preaching.

What we mean to affirm, then, in respect to the question before us, is just this, that, leaving aside extremes, which must exist everywhere, to be corrected or excluded as best they may, the doctrines of the Confession as prescribed in the questions for ordination, were at the time of the rupture, have been ever since, and are now, held and preached by the two bodies, in the same sense, with equal truth, sincerity and affection. Differences there are, no doubt. But whereas the differences between the Calvinist and the Arminian, the Trinitarian and the Arian or Socinian, are clear and well de-

finer, those between the Old and New Schools are shadowy, and belong far more to the accidents than the substance.

The question has been raised, whether, since the division, one or both of the parties have not changed. Professor Smith once made the admission that "our branch of the church is much closer to its Standards, taken in the strictest interpretation, than it was a quarter of a century ago," and the remark was seized upon and applied in an offensive sense quite contrary to his meaning. Probably both branches of the church are not conscious, and would be very slow to admit, that they have undergone any material change. And yet, in both, no doubt, there has been a change in some respects perceptible to others. In their modes of "viewing, stating, explaining and illustrating the doctrines of the Confession," the two bodies are much nearer alike than they were in 1838. Causes which then operated to produce difference in all these particulars have now ceased to be operative, and other causes acting equally upon both have had the effect to produce closer agreement.

At the time of the division, and for several years previous, the controversy with Unitarianism in New England was in the very height of its career. With such an antagonist it was of no use to adhere closely to the old phraseology, or confine oneself to the old statements and arguments. The phraseology would be misinterpreted, and the arguments without the slightest effect. The defendants of the old faith had to begin *de novo*, to come down to the first principles, and adopt terms and expressions common to themselves and those who differed with them in regard to the very elements of their faith. Most of the charges of heresy made against Dr. Lyman Beecher had their origin in efforts on his part to bring the truths of the old system of Puritan and Presbyterian orthodoxy into a shape intelligible and undeniable to this new class of antagonists. In some cases the defendants themselves seem to have misapprehended some of the old terms, and to have abandoned them on that account. Even so able a theologian as Dr. Leonard Woods, whose reputation for Old School orthodoxy used to stand pretty high at Princeton, was constrained to confess, in his old age, that in his controversy with Dr. Ware he discarded the word *imputation* because he did not then understand its true technical meaning.

At the same period, in that and other parts of the country, occurred those great revivals of religion by which the churches received a vast increase of numbers and a new stimulus to ef-

forts of evangelization. Had the divine influence reached only those who had been nurtured in the bosom of the Church, and trained from infancy in its principles, the task assigned to the preachers and pastors of that period would have been much less difficult and critical. But it swept through society, from its lowest to its highest extremes. Men of the world as ignorant as babes in regard to the true meaning of the evangelical doctrines—men whose hearts being averse to the truth, and their intellects keen to discern and skillful to attack every weak point in the statements of its advocates, required to be dislodged from the refuges of error into which their convictions of sin drove them, and made to see the reasonableness and feel the binding force of the great saving truths of the Gospel. Many of the statements, so violently assailed at one time, in the writings of Albert Barnes, find their true explanation and their harmony with other parts of his writings, in the consideration of this laudable object. Nor is it strange if some, in their eager pursuit of it, have been betrayed unconsciously into expressions or illustrations imperilling if not impairing the integrity of their own theological system. No doubt they seemed to do so to some, who, not considering the occasion, did not make due allowance for the unaccustomed forms of expression.

In these and similar respects, unquestionably, as times and occasions have changed, there has been a change of methods and views. We think we can see a corresponding change in not a few of our Old School brethren. We do not meet now with those strong expressions bordering on antinomianism which used to startle some of our theologians. Nor do we find among them that eager sagacity in the scenting of heresy. There is no need of sensitiveness in this matter. We must have been dull scholars in the school of Scripture as well as reason and experience, if we have made no progress for the better in the course of thirty-one years. But this we may say: If the two bodies do remain unchanged, they were much nearer alike at the beginning than they generally took each other to be. And, if they have changed, one or both of them, so as to come nearer together, that fact is conclusive against the supposition of a radical difference. Separated bodies are likely to follow the law of their separation. And had ours been a radical difference of doctrine, the current moving in its own line, unobstructed since the division, must have carried us farther apart during these thirty-one years instead of bringing us nearer together.

It is the general conviction, that we are now at least substantially one that has led the two bodies with a unanimity hardly to have been expected to resolve no longer to continue apart. Various causes have operated to bring about this conviction. The excited feelings which aggravated the real differences, and threw a false coloring over the opinions of one party in the eyes of the other, have been gradually subsiding. Many of the men who took part in the contest by which division was effected and whose prejudices were strongest have passed away. A new age with new issues and a new generation of men with new views have very nearly superseded the old. The steady persistency with which both parties have adhered to the same standards and prided themselves in the same denominational name could not but have its effect. The experiences of the late war did much to subserve the same end, as they did likewise to prove the essential agreement of all our evangelical denominations. Men met on the field of battle and in the camp and hospital administering the principles of their faith to the wounded and the dying, and never thought of their denominational distinctions. New School and Old School taught precisely the same doctrines in the same way. And the question, "What is the difference?" failing of an answer, led to the question next in order, "Why are we not organically and ecclesiastically one?"

The first movement towards such a result, as far as we know, was made in the Spring of 1862, when the Assembly of the Old School, at their meeting at Columbus, Ohio, adopted a resolution proposing "a stated annual and friendly interchange of Commissioners between the two General Assemblies," which resolution, officially communicated to the Assembly of the New School at their meeting at Philadelphia in 1863, received the following response :

"Resolved, That this Assembly, with heartfelt pleasure and Christian salutations, accept the proposition thus made, hoping and praying that it may result 'in securing a better understanding of the relations,' which, in the judgment of this Assembly, are proper to be maintained between the two Assemblies."

The telegraph forthwith conveyed the message of peace and mutual good-will from Philadelphia to Peoria, where the Assembly of the Old School was then in session, and immediately delegates were appointed on both sides, who proceeded, as soon as practicable, to the discharge of their respective duties. This was a measure intended, no doubt, by some who advocated it, to be permanent and final. It seemed enough to take off the scandal of thirty years of mutual estrangement

and contention. But it did not and could not satisfy the Christian consciousness of brethren really one in doctrine and polity. The taste which it gave of fraternal sympathy only increased the desire of more and made manifest its practicability.

The next year (1864) witnessed a long stride in the direction of reunion. In the Assembly of the New School, met together at Dayton, Professor Henry B. Smith, the retiring moderator, who had at Philadelphia welcomed and warmly responded to the Christian salutations of the first delegation from the Old School, broke ground in his opening sermon, distinctly and earnestly, in favor of the speedy obliteration of the distinctions that separated us. His discourse, entitled, "CHRISTIAN UNION AND ECCLESIASTICAL REUNION," based upon the 13th verse of the fourth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: "Till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," is a beautiful and masterly argument in favor of union in general, and Presbyterian reunion in particular, which deserves to be carefully studied by all our ministers and members, and to be made a permanent document in the history of the movement in question. Nowhere have we seen a fuller or happier statement of the reasons for the measure, the difficulties that might be expected to obstruct it, the basis on which the reunion must be established, and the spirit and method in which it must be pursued. "Such union," he says, "implies three prime conditions. The first of these is that there be a spirit of mutual concession; the second, that both accept in its integrity the Presbyterian system of church order; the third, that the reunion be simply on the basis of the Standards, which we equally accept without private interpretation—interpreted in their *legitimate grammatical and historic sense* in the spirit of the Adopting Act, and as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures. My liberty here is not to be judged of another man's conscience. Any other view not only puts the Confession above the Scriptures, but also puts somebody's theological system above the Confession."

Meanwhile steps had been taken for a movement in the same direction in the other Assembly, which was to be convened at Newark, N. J., at the same time. At a meeting of ministers and elders in attendance upon that body a paper was adopted and published, both urging the measure and pre-

senting as the basis the same simple ground which had been recommended in the sermon of Professor Smith. "It is believed," says that paper, "that the great majority in each branch sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures, and approve of the same Government and Discipline. On this basis we may unite, mutually regarding and treating the office bearers and church courts of each branch as coördinate elements in the reconstruction." This document was signed by 70 ministers and 43 ruling elders, representing the reunion sentiment of every section of the church.

The ball had now begun to roll, and at every revolution its size and force was destined to increase. In the Spring of 1866, both the Assemblies met in the city of St. Louis, and to both memorials were sent up urging forward the object. In the minutes of that of the New School we find the following: "The Committee on the Polity of the Church report overtures numbered 5 to 16 on the subject of the Reunion of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church—from the Presbyteries of New York 3d, New York 4th, Newark, Dubuque, Greencastle, Alton, Steuben, Athens, Munroe, Keokuk, Long Island, Trumbull and San José. All these Presbyteries, with different degrees of urgency, recommend to this General Assembly to initiate or to respond to proposals looking to an entire reunion of the churches represented by the two General Assemblies now in session in the city of St. Louis." At the same meeting the Rev. Phineas Gurley, D. D., and the Hon. Lincoln Clark, appeared as delegates from the Assembly of the Old School, and presented on its behalf the following communication, viz. :

Resolved, That this Assembly expresses its fraternal affection for the other Branch of the Presbyterian Church and its earnest desire for Reunion at the earliest time consistent with agreement in doctrine, order and policy, on the basis of our common standards and the prevalence of mutual confidence and love, which are so necessary to a happy union and to the permanent peace and prosperity of the united church.

Resolved, That it be recommended to all our churches and church courts, and to all our ministers, ruling elders and communicants, to cherish fraternal feeling, to cultivate Christian intercourse in the worship of God, in the promotion of the cause of Christ, and to avoid all needless controversies and contentions adapted to perpetuate division and strife.

Resolved, That a Committee of nine ministers and six ruling elders be appointed, provided that a similar Committee shall be appointed by the other Assembly now in session in this city, for the purpose of conferring in regard to the desirableness and practicability of reunion, and if, after conference and inquiry, such reunion shall seem to be desirable and practicable to suggest suitable measures for its accomplishment and report to the next General Assembly."

To this communication the Assembly of the New School responded as follows, viz. :

"Resolved, That this Assembly tender to the Assembly representing the other Branch of the Presbyterian Church its cordial salutations and fellowship and the expression of its earnest wish for Reunion on the basis of our common standards received in a common spirit.

"Resolved, That a Committee of fifteen, nine of whom shall be ministers of the gospel and six ruling elders, be appointed to confer on this subject in the recess of the Assemblies with the Committee to be appointed by the other General Assembly, and to report the results to the next General Assembly.

"Resolved, That we enjoin upon this Committee, and upon all our ministers and church members, to abstain from whatever may hinder a true Christian fellowship, and to cherish and cultivate those feelings and purposes which look to the peace and prosperity of Zion, the edifying of the body of Christ, and the complete union of all believers, especially of those who live in the same land and have the same history and the same standards of doctrine and polity."

In pursuance of these resolutions the Committee of Conference were appointed. Those on the part of the Old School were

MINISTERS.

J. M. Krebs, D. D., Chairman,
C. C. Beatty, D. D.,
J. F. Backus, D. D.,
P. D. Gurley, D. D.,

J. G. Monfort, D. D.,
W. D. Howard, D. D.,
W. E. Schenck, D. D.,
Villeroi D. Reed, D. D.,

T. J. Brown, D. D.

RULING ELDERS.

James M. Ray,
Robert McKnight,
Samuel Galloway,

H. K. Clark,
George P. Strong,
Osmond Beatty.

Those on the part of the New School were

MINISTERS.

Thomas Brainerd, D. D., Chairman,
William Adams, D. D.,
Edwin F. Hatfield, D. D.,
Jonathan F. Stearns, D. D.,

Philemon P. Fowler, D. D.
James B. Shaw, D. D.,
Henry L. Hitchcock, D. D.,
Robt. W. Patterson, D. D.,

Henry A. Nelson, D. D.

RULING ELDERS.

Edward A. Lambert,
Joseph Allison, LL. D.,
Henry Williams,

Truman P. Handy,
Robert W. Steele,
William H. Brown.

It is a fact worthy of notice, and which served deeply to impress upon the committee the sense of their responsibility, that before they had opportunity to meet, both the chairmen appointed as above were smitten down in the providence of God,—Dr. Brainerd by sudden death, and Dr. Krebs by an utterly disabling, and, as it afterwards proved, fatal disease.

The committees were called together by the gentlemen next in order on the list, Dr. Beatty of the Old School, and Dr. Adams of the New, who both took the places vacated by their brethren as chairmen of their committees respectively. They met in the city of New York, February 20, 1867, first separately, and then as a joint committee. Dr. Beatty was elected chairman of the joint committee, and Dr. Hatfield clerk. The meeting continued till a late hour on the evening of the 22d of February. Most of the time was occupied with prayer and fraternal conference, apart and together. At first, as was natural, a degree of shyness was manifest between the two parties, but as they proceeded with their deliberations, and the essential oneness of their views and wishes became more and more apparent, reserve was thrown aside, and they communed together with the utmost frankness. By adjournment, a second meeting was held on the 1st day of May, the members having meanwhile charged themselves with the duty of inquiry and correspondence, to ascertain the views and wishes of the church generally in their respective localities. In this case, they remained together an entire week, and the whole time was occupied in hard work, not without much and earnest prayer. In their Report, they say with truth: "All the meetings of the Committee were distinguished by a degree of courtesy and unanimity which was more than common. Composed of men of decided individuality, representing divers interests and sections, they have discussed every question, many of them of admitted delicacy and difficulty, with the utmost frankness, without one word or expression of any kind ever to be regretted by Christian brethren who felt the grave responsibilities of their position." The result was the preparation and adoption of a paper entitled: "PROPOSED TERMS OF REUNION BETWEEN THE TWO BRANCHES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, to be submitted for their action to the two General Assemblies." It consisted of a short Preamble and fourteen Articles, the contents of which we shall have occasion to examine more particularly hereafter. They were adopted with a remarkable unanimity, with only one dissenting voice on the final vote, and that only on three points, and were thus reported by their respective committees to the two General Assemblies, met in the month of May, 1867, that of the New School in the city of Rochester, N. Y., and that of the Old School in Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Report did not recommend immediate action on the

whole merits of the question, but that "the terms of the Reunion shall be published by direction of the General Assemblies of 1867, for the deliberate examination of both Branches of the Church; and the Joint Committee shall report to the General Assemblies of 1868 any modification of them they may deem desirable in view of any new light they may have received during the year." The New School Assembly approved and adopted "the whole report with entire unanimity, appointed the legal committee recommended in Art. 13, and authorized the Joint Committee to recommend needed changes in the Constitution, as requested in Art. 14. In that of the Old School, parts of the Report encountered opposition. The special committee to whom it was referred brought in two Reports. That of the minority asking the Assembly to instruct the Reunion Committee "to obtain a more *definite statement of the doctrinal basis*," the exclusion of "Committee men" from the Church Courts, and a "distinct and formal recognition of the right and *obligation* of every presbytery to be satisfied as to the soundness of every minister it receives," was, after discussion, rejected by a large majority, yeas 152, yeas 64. Pending a resolution to adopt that of the majority, the resolution to instruct the Joint Committee to propose changes in the Constitution, as recommended in Art. 14 of the Plan, was unanimously stricken out, another was added declining to express either approbation or disapprobation of the terms presented by the Committee of Reunion in detail, and the rest adopted without a count, containing the Resolution "that this Assembly has listened with grateful and profound satisfaction to the Report of the Committee on Church Reunion, and recognize, in the unanimity of the Joint Committee, the finger of God as pointing toward an early and cordial reunion of the two sister churches now so long separated.

In this posture of affairs the Report of the "Terms of Reunion" went out to the churches and presbyteries. It was, by order of both Assemblies, published in the Appendix to the Minutes of both and in the religious newspapers, and commended to the careful consideration of the whole church. During the Summer and Autumn the provisions of the Plan were very freely discussed by the press and in the presbyteries, and various opinions and suggestions were elicited concerning them. The PRINCETON REVIEW, in its July number, attacked the whole scheme with great vigor in an article written by Dr. Hodge, and afterwards published under his

own name in a pamphlet form. The object of that article, he says in the preface to the pamphlet, "is threefold: *First*, To show that the true principle of subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith requires that those who profess to adopt the system of doctrine therein contained should sincerely receive in their integrity all the doctrines essential to the *Reformed or Calvinistic system*. *Second*, That this is the principle adopted and insisted upon by our church from the beginning, and to which the Old School body stand solemnly pledged before the Christian world. *Third*, That however numerous may be the orthodox members of the New School Presbyterian church, that church, as an ecclesiastical organization, *never has and does not now* adopt and act upon that principle; and, *therefore*, that union between the two churches under these circumstances would be not only *inexpedient* but *morally wrong*." An answer to this article appeared in this REVIEW in the number for October, handling the whole subject in a masterly manner, written by Professor H. B. Smith, and afterwards published separately and widely scattered through both branches of the church. In this article the charge of loose subscription made against the New School was positively and indignantly denied and proof challenged. On the contrary, it was affirmed that the sense in which the New School church received and adopted the Confession was *precisely the same* with that claimed as the true one by Dr. Hodge, viz., the Calvinistic or Reformed. This discussion was very generally read and had a powerful influence in disabusing many minds of their prejudices or misapprehensions. Both the admissions of Dr. Hodge and the denials and assertions of Professor Smith tended to the same result, the conviction of the substantial oneness of both bodies in the *receiving and adopting* of the Confession of Faith in the true, honest, liberal, common sense and Presbyterian signification of those words.

But the question still remained in the minds of some: Is Prof. Smith, in this respect, a fair representative of the opinions of the New School church?

In the month of November of that same year occurred that remarkable meeting of Christian men in the city of Philadelphia, known as "THE PRESBYTERIAN NATIONAL UNION CONVENTION." "It originated in a proposal, made in the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church at its meeting in the city of New York in May, 1867, by George H. Stuart, Esq., an elder in that body," and had for its object "to inaugurate

measures to heal Zion's breaches and to bring into one the divided portions of the Presbyterian family." Though entirely spontaneous and without ecclesiastical authority, this meeting was composed of delegates sent by the respective presbyteries of the different branches of the Presbyterian family in all parts of the land, and had a most important influence on the progress of the measures in operation for the reunion of the Old and New School. The presence of the Spirit of God was never more sensibly felt, and scenes were there enacted which will be remembered when the prayer of the departing Saviour shall have reached its complete fulfillment, "That they all may be one." In this meeting the proposition was very early entertained and adopted to attempt an *organic union* of these different churches, and a Committee to prepare and report a "basis of union" was appointed, consisting of one minister and one elder from each of the churches.

This Committee went immediately to their work, and the next day brought in their report. Meanwhile, as the discussions and devotional exercises proceeded, all hearts seemed melting into one. The strongest expressions of desire for the accomplishment of the design were uttered by the speakers of every branch of the church represented, and from every part of the land. A Convention of Episcopal brethren in session in the same city had turned aside from their business to pray for God's blessing upon our deliberations. We had reciprocated the fraternal action and sent a delegation with our Christian salutations to them. The delegation had returned, reporting their very cordial reception, and the desire on the part of the Episcopal convention to reciprocate the courtesy by sending a corresponding delegation to us. The Report of the Basis had been read and largely explained and commented upon by the members of the Committee. The highest degree of enthusiasm prevailed. The first article containing an acknowledgment of the Scriptures had been revised and adopted, and the second, declaring that "in the United Church the Westminster Confession of Faith shall be received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," was before the Convention.

All this while Dr. Hodge, a member of the Convention, had remained perfectly silent. Except a short prayer, very guarded in its language, which he offered at the request of the Moderator, he had not uttered a word. The reason, as was supposed, and as he afterward avowed, was his great surprise at seeing the turn which the affairs of the Convention took, and

the spirit and desires of its members. "Mr. President," he said the next day, "I came to this Convention under an entire misapprehension, and I presume that this is true of the majority of our Old School brethren. We thought it probable that some plan of *federal* union, which would allow each member of the confederation to retain its own peculiarities and revolve in its own sphere, might be proposed and recommended. But, sir, from the first hour of our coming together, with the solitary exception of the remarks of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge on the first day of the convention, I have not heard a word uttered or a prayer offered from the members of any of the bodies here represented, which did not assume that the organic union of all the Presbyterian churches in the land was the object contemplated and desired. Such being the case, I have taken no part in your deliberations, but have sat in silence waiting to see what God, in his providence and spirit, would bring to pass."

It was late in the evening at the close of the second day, and the question was just about to be put, when Prof. Smith, also a member of the Convention, and who, unlike Dr. Hodge, had from the beginning taken a warm interest and a prominent part in all its deliberations and actions, arose and said: "Mr. Moderator, it seems to me that, in this article, we have reached the central point, and that here we need to be careful and circumspect, because we have come to the article where there is the most controversy. There will be the most difficulty in respect to the terms of subscription as to the sense in which we assent to the doctrines presented, and receive the Confession of Faith as containing the doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures. I move that the following words be added to that article, namely: "It being understood that this Confession is received in its proper historical, that is the Calvinistic or Reformed sense." The proposition took the Convention by surprise. Some did not see the need of it, others feared it would raise a new and unnecessary discussion. But the mover persisted. To a friend who suggested to him that some would prefer to have him withdraw it, he replied, "I have offered it, and the Convention may dispose of it as they like, vote it down if they do not like it." His object is manifest from the history of the case as already given. It was, *first*, to meet the objections to the organic union then contemplated, on the part of a considerable section of the Old School body, of which the *Princeton Review* was the representative; and, *second*, to test, in an open and explicit manner, the po-

sition of the New School on the subject of accepting and adopting the Confession. In this latter view its success was most signal. There had been no concert. The mover acted on his own responsibility. But when the question was put to the New School portion of the Convention every man, except two, (46 ayes to 2 nays,) immediately voted in the affirmative. And from that time to this we have never heard from any quarter in our branch of the church a single voice dissenting from the position there taken by their delegates. The result proved, as might have been expected, eminently acceptable to all candid men in both parties. Even Dr. Hodge whispered to Dr. Musgrave that it met his approval. It had, no doubt, a most important influence in producing harmony and confidence between the two parties in all parts of the church.

The meeting of this Convention was preceeded and attended with meetings for prayer in various parts of the land, and followed by a series of union conventions in different localities accompanied in some cases with special united celebrations of the Lords Supper, all which served to deepen the influence.

In the month of March following, 1868, the Joint Committee of Reunion came together in the city of Philadelphia, to revise and complete their plan of *Terms* to be recommended to the General Assemblies. Vacancies in their ranks had been filled by the appointment of Dr. J. Edson Rockwell in the place of Dr. Krebs, Dr. Geo. F. Wiswell in the place of Dr. Brainerd, and Elder Jacob F. Farrand in the place of Elder F. T. Brown, since deceased. The transactions of the eventful past year were before them, and they came together with the earnest desire, on all hands, to meet the demands of the case as manifested by what had occurred.

When the doctrinal Article came before them, the members of the Committee from the New School were satisfied to let it stand just as it was. The resolutions of the Convention at Philadelphia had answered their end. They were not intended for a basis for reunion between the Old and New Schools. On the contrary they expressly disclaimed any such purpose. In many respects they were not adapted to this use. But those of the Old School greatly preferred the doctrinal Article adopted at the Convention, especially in view of the Smith amendment, popularly so called. And those of the New School were quite disposed to acquiesce, provided that Article could be so modified as to adapt it to the demands of the case. There was a

little clause in the original Article which they thought ought to be retained, viz., the words "as it is accepted by the two bodies," thus recognizing the equal standing of both churches in respect to their adoption of the Confession. But this was objected to. The clause had met with misinterpretation and objection, it was said, from numbers in the Old School body. We must not throw it back upon them. At one time there was danger of a very serious disagreement. But the New School members of the Committee, wishing to avoid such a result, offered a choice of three distinct propositions, to either of which they would cheerfully assent: viz., to take the original Article, formally approved by one of the Assemblies, and not disapproved by the other, just as it stood. 2. To take the same Article, with the *addition* of the Smith amendment, and with no other alteration. 3. To take the Philadelphia Article, *including* the Smith amendment, with the insertion of the clause from the original plan, slightly modified so as to make it more acceptable: "as it is now *maintained* by *both* the separate bodies." In case these should be unacceptable, their brethren of the other side must, they insisted, furnish something to the same effect more satisfactory to themselves. *It was in these circumstances that the Gurley amendment, so called, was produced.* It had been prepared by Dr. G., no doubt, in conference with his brethren; for they had been in separate meeting, as had also the New School part of the Committee, most of the morning. That amendment, we are happy to say, proved eminently satisfactory to both parties. The New School Committee abandoned all their own propositions, and, after a short examination, the new clause was *unanimously* adopted by the Joint Committee, who thereupon, with overflowing hearts, and even sobs of joy, gave thanks to Almighty God for their happy agreement.

The Gurley amendment was a happy counterpart of the Smith amendment. The one declared the sense in which both the parties do and always have understood the Confession of Faith. The other secured that reasonable liberty within the limits of the Confession which our Presbyterian standards manifestly contemplate. It stood as follows: "It is also understood that various methods of viewing, stating, explaining and illustrating the doctrines of the Confession *which do not impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system*, are to be freely allowed in the united church as they have hitherto been allowed in the separate churches."

The *second* article remained as before, except some alter-

ations of phraseology not materially effecting its substance, and the insertion of the word *expected* after *advised*, and also the clause "within the period of five years," as designating the limit of time within which the "imperfectly organized" churches should endeavor to become thoroughly Presbyterian. The *fourth* had simply a clause added to avoid disturbing rights of property. The *eighth*, relating to the publications of the churches, is less stringent, and trusts more than its predecessor to the candor and discretion of the Board or Committee hereafter to be selected. The *ninth*, relating to theological seminaries, is changed in phraseology and adds a provision for an official recognition and approbation to be given by the Assembly to such seminaries, now independent, as shall put themselves under ecclesiastical supervision. The *tenth* of the old plan becomes the *eleventh* of the new. The new *tenth*, on the subject of examinations, is inserted in its place. The *third*, *fifth*, *sixth* and *seventh* are without alteration. The rest, framed with reference to matters of temporary interest, are dropped and others suited to the present stage of the business substituted in their places.

In this state the Plan was presented, in May, 1868, to the two Assemblies, that of the New School meeting at Harrisburg, Pa., and that of the Old at Albany, N. Y. It encountered in both more opposition than did its predecessor. In the Old School, strange as it seemed to those who knew the history of those additions, the opposition centered chiefly on the amendments to the first article; in the New, on the provisions of the tenth. In both, however, the whole plan was adopted and overtured to the presbyteries for their action by a very large majority. In the Assembly of the New School the minority, having had opportunity to express their dissent on particular points, with few exceptions waived their objections when the vote was taken on the whole plan, and acquiesced in the will of the majority. In that of the Old School a protest was entered, which was answered in a very able paper drawn up by Professor Shedd and adopted by the Assembly. Near the close of the session, in the hope to conciliate the minority, who had given some intimations of their willingness to be so conciliated, that Assembly adopted the following resolution: "While the Assembly has approved the Report of the Joint Committee on Reunion, it expresses its preference for a change in the first item in the basis leaving out the following words, viz. : 'It being understood that the Confession is received in its historical—that is, the Calvinis-

tic or Reformed sense. It is also understood that various methods of viewing, stating, explaining and illustrating the doctrines of the Confession, which do not impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system, are to be freely allowed in the united church as they have hitherto been allowed in the separate churches." The Assembly believes that by omitting these clauses the basis will be more simple and more expressive of mutual confidence; and the Permanent Clerk is directed to telegraph this proposed amendment to the Assembly at Harrisburg, and if *that Assembly shall concur in the*

- Amendment it shall become of effect as the action of this Assembly also. The Assembly also appoints the Rev. C. C. Beatty, D. D., the Rev. V. D. Reed, D. D., and ruling elders Robert Carter and Henry Day, a Committee to proceed to Harrisburg and personally to lay this action before the other Assembly." This Committee immediately put in execution the trust assigned to them, and, on their arrival at Harrisburg, were very cordially received, and, by their presence and warm expressions of fraternal love, did much to advance the interest of reunion. But the Assembly at Harrisburg was now very near its close. Many of its members had already obtained leave of absence, and on investigation it was found that there was no longer the requisite constitutional quorum for reconsidering the action which had been taken. A free conference on the subject, however, seemed to warrant the belief that the Assembly would have been willing to concur in the proposal, if their brethren of the other Assembly would add the *tenth article* to the portions to be omitted. The Committee returned to Albany and reported the result of their mission, and there the matter was left when the Assemblies severally adjourned.

The plan recommended by the Joint Committee and adopted by both Assemblies was now the overture, and the *only one* regularly before the presbyteries. If, however, having acted upon that, any of them had chosen to express their approval of the proposed amendments, subject to the concurrence of the two Assemblies, no embarrassment would have arisen. But, unfortunately for the immediate success of the effort for reunion, other councils prevailed. The presbyteries of the New School acted upon the regular overture and approved it by a very large majority, but the presbyteries of the Old School voted, some for the overture, some for the amended plan proposed but not adopted by their Assembly, and still others ignored both for the basis of "the standards pure and

simple;" and by far the largest number effectively rejected the only measure legally before them. In this state of affairs, seeing that that measure was defeated, not intentionally on the part of most of the presbyteries, but by confusion of action, the Reunion Committee, on the part of the New School, which had been continued by that Assembly while that of the other Assembly had been dissolved, hoping still to bring about an agreement, and deeming it within the limits of their authority to attempt to do so, met in the city of New York in the month of January, 1868, and adopted the following paper:

ADDRESS OF THE REUNION COMMITTEE TO THE PRESBYTERIES.

In pursuance of a resolution of the General Assembly, at its meeting at Harrisburgh, Pa., May, 1868, continuing the Committee on Reunion for the purpose of "furnishing such information as they may deem best to the churches, in order to secure intelligent action on the subject of reunion," the said Committee met in the city of New York, on the 20th day of January, 1869.

It appeared from the best evidence that could be obtained, that while a large proportion of the New School presbyteries, acting on the overture sent down by both General Assemblies, had given their approval of the same, most of the Old School presbyteries had given their approval only to an amended basis, for which their Assembly had expressed a preference, in case the Assembly at Harrisburgh should concur; that is, to the basis of the overture with the omission in the first article, of the following words: "It being understood, etc., or, as some of them have expressed their action, the basis of the Standards pure and simple."

It thus appeared that, while on both sides there has been a very general approval of reunion itself, a difference of action has prevailed which, as the case now stands, is likely to defeat what we believe is the earnest purpose of a very large majority of the members of both branches of our Church, to wit: the accomplishment of reunion at the meeting of the next General Assemblies.

That the other Assembly did not intend to make any alteration in the *principles* of the plan submitted by the Joint Committee, is clear from the fact that, having adopted that plan by a large majority, the amendment was proposed only as a matter of "preference," subject to the concurrence of our General Assembly; and the reason given for the preference is, that, so amended, "the basis would be more simple and more expressive of mutual confidence." It appears from the statement of the Committee sent by the Assembly at Albany to report their action to the Assembly at Harrisburgh, that they were influenced in part also by the hope of reconciling opposing elements in their own body, and so securing in favor of reunion greater unanimity.

Believing that the Presbyteries connected with us, and our branch of the Church generally, are disposed to make any concessions to their brethren of the other body not inconsistent with principle, and that express guarantees, both in regard to doctrine and polity, may be safely dispensed with, now that free discussion of the subject has brought about so good an understanding, this Committee deem it their duty, in accordance with the purpose of their continuance, to call the attention of the presbyteries to the present posture of the case; and, without assuming any authority, would recommend that, at a regular meeting

preceding the next General Assembly, they express their assent to the amendment referred to, with the *additional* one (which to us appears to carry with it all the reasons that apply to the other, and is regarded by some as quite necessary in case the other is adopted), viz.: the omission of the whole of the Tenth Article. We can not but trust that our Old School brethren will concede this additional omission, since it is but the application of the same principle to the *polity* of the Church which they have applied to its *doctrine*; and, while it will serve to harmonize differing preferences among us, as theirs does among them, will be equally with theirs expressive of the same "mutual confidence."

Should the requisite number of Presbyteries in both the bodies, agree to both these modifications, the two Assemblies may find themselves in a position to consummate the reunion at the approaching meeting, and thus avoid the delay of another year, which is much to be deprecated, in order to frame and send down a new overture. It must, however, be well understood, that, by agreeing to the omissions in question, the Presbyteries do not relinquish nor deny the right to all reasonable liberty in the statement of views, and the interpretations of the Standards, as generally expressed in the First Article as it now stands; and also that the interpretation of their own language by the Joint Committee in the preamble and conclusion of their Report, May, 1868, is to be accepted as the true interpretation.

With these views, and in order to prepare the way for definite and uniform action on the part of the Presbyteries, the Committee beg leave to submit the following form, not to supersede but to follow their previous action, in case they have already approved of the terms of the overture:

"This Presbytery, having already approved of the basis of Reunion overtured by the last General Assembly, do now, in order to a final and harmonious adjustment of the whole case, consent to the amending of the Basis, by the omission

"*First*: Of that part of the First Article of the Basis that begins with the words 'It being understood,' &c., and ends with the words 'In the separate churches.' And

"*Second*: Of the whole of the Tenth Article of the Basis.

WM. ADAMS, Chairman."

This address was sent to all the presbyteries in connection with our own branch of the church, and published in the religious papers, for the information of all parties concerned. Unfortunately, again, and as if some fatality must attend every such endeavor, no sooner had the adoption of the address been made known through the press, than the Central Presbytery of Philadelphia, with the best of intentions, we are bound to believe, but without the slightest consultation with the Committee or any of the members of our church, adopted and issued a circular to the presbyteries of the Old School, advising them to abandon the whole plan overtured by the Assemblies, and vote for the union on the basis of the Standards, without explanations or agreements, leaving all the delicate questions on which the Reunion Committee had labored for nearly three years to be settled as best they might, after the union should be consummated. The result

was as might naturally have been expected. While the presbyteries on the one side voted for the Committee's measure of attempted conciliation, those on the other were as much confused in their action as before, and again there was no agreement.

It was in this posture of affairs that the two Assemblies met in the city of New York, May 17, 1869. It can hardly be thought strange that in the New School portion of the church a considerable degree of coldness had begun to manifest itself. Not a few of them began to feel that they had been trifled with. With the utmost confidence in the good will and sincerity of purpose of the friends of Reunion in the other church, they could not see why they should still pursue their efforts to conciliate a small minority in their own body, who had been opposed to reunion from the beginning, to the extent of ignoring the opinions and policy of its friends in the New School body, who had battled with them side by side for many years, and of neglecting to take them into their counsels. This was the case especially with some of the laymen. Two eminent jurists, members of the Assembly, expressed as much during the course of its meetings. One of them, who had been a member of the Reunion Committee from the first, and had declared himself warmly for reunion as early as 1864 at the Assembly of the Old School at Newark, declined for the first time to concur with the Committee when they put forth the January letter, thinking it unwise and beneath our dignity to make any further attempts in such circumstances.

It may serve to explain the embarrassments under which our Old School brethren labored, and account for the frequent shifting of their ground, if we allude here to the very obvious want of confidence, which prevailed in some quarters among them in the sagacity or firmness of their own portion of the Reunion Committee, and perhaps, also, in the frankness and fairness of those of the other side. No mistake, we think, could have been more unfounded. The Committee from that branch of the church, though chargeable with no censurable partisanship, were, we think, quite as sharp to discern and eager to maintain the views and wishes of the body they represented as were their colleagues of the other side. Indeed, the whole proceedings of the Committee were characterized by such fraternal frankness, and such earnest desire to secure such agreements as would harmonize and satisfy the whole church, and produce a real and lasting union, as that the bare suggestion of overreaching or being overreached seems, to those who know the facts, almost ridiculous. And it is cer-

tainly a very strong testimony to the wisdom of their action, that in the final revision of the plan, by a new committee, composed on that side entirely of new men, every one of the provisions to which the former had agreed, even those which had been most severely criticized, are retained substantially without alteration.

However that may be, the fact is that on the convening of the Assemblies, the overtures framed by the Committee were found to have been virtually rejected, and the prospect of an immediate reunion seemed to many at that moment very unpromising. But the Lord had the case in his own hands, and the spirit of love and concord was not dead in the hearts of his servants. The meeting for prayer at the Brick Church the evening previous to the opening of the two Assemblies, though designed and announced as strictly for devotional purposes, served to manifest what was uppermost in the thoughts of the members, and helped to kindle the flame.

In the New School Assembly, at the Church of the Covenant, the opening sermon by the retiring moderator was from the words of our Lord, John xvii, 21: "That they all may be one." And very soon after the organization of the two Assemblies, a committee of conference, consisting of five ministers and five ruling elders from each Assembly, was appointed, who at once gave very close and earnest attention to their duty, and on the seventh day of the session brought in their report, signed individually by every member of both sides, clerical and lay; which is as follows:

The Committee of Conference appointed by the two General Assemblies, have attended to the duties assigned to them; and after a very free interchange of views, with prayer to Almighty God for his guidance, are unanimous [great applause] in recommending to the Assemblies for their consideration and, if they see fit, their adoption, the accompanying three papers, to wit:

1. Plan of Reunion of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;
2. Concurrent Declarations of the General Assemblies of 1869; and
3. Recommendation of a Day of Prayer.

WILLIAM ADAMS, Chairman.

OLD SCHOOL.
G. W. Musgrave,
A. G. Hall,
L. H. Atwater,
Willis Lord,
H. R. Wilson,
Robert Carter,
C. D. Drake,
Wm. M. Francis,
John C. Grier.

NEW SCHOOL.
J. F. Stearns,
R. W. Patterson,
S. W. Fisher,
James B. Shaw,
W. Strong,
Daniel Haines,
William E. Dodge,
J. S. Farrand,
John L. Knight.
HENRY DAY, Secretary.

I.—PLAN OF REUNION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Believing that the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom would be promoted by the healing of our divisions, and that the two bodies bearing the same names, having the same Constitution, and each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body [applause] according to the principles of the Confession common to both, can not be justified by any but the most imperative reasons in maintaining separate and, in some respects, rival organizations; we are now clearly of the opinion that the reunion of those bodies ought, as soon as the necessary steps can be taken, to be accomplished, upon the basis hereinafter set forth.

1. The Presbyterian Churches in the United States of America, namely, that whose General Assembly convened in the Brick Church in the city of New York, on the 20th day of May, 1869, and that whose General Assembly met in the Church of the Covenant in the said city on the same day, shall be reunited as one Church, under the name and style of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, possessing all the legal and corporate rights and powers pertaining to the Church previous to the division in 1838, and all the legal and corporate rights and powers which the separate churches now possess.

2. The reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity.

3. Each of the said Assemblies shall submit the foregoing basis to its presbyteries, which shall be required to meet on or before the 15th day of October, 1869, to express their approval or disapproval of the same, by a categorical answer to the following question:

Do you approve of the reunion of the two bodies now claiming the name and rights of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, on the following basis, namely: "The reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity?"

Each Presbytery shall, before the first day of November, 1869, forward to the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly with which it is connected, a statement of its vote on the said Basis of Reunion.

4. The said General Assemblies now sitting shall, after finishing their business, adjourn, to meet in the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on the second Wednesday of November, 1869, at 11 o'clock, a. m.

If the two General Assemblies shall then find and declare that the above-named Basis of Reunion has been approved by two-thirds of the Presbyteries connected with each branch of the church, then the same shall be of binding force, and the two Assemblies shall take action accordingly.

5. The said General Assemblies shall then and there make provision for the meeting of the General Assembly of the united church on the third

Thursday of May, 1870. The Moderators of the two present Assemblies shall jointly preside at the said Assembly of 1870 until another Moderator is chosen. The Moderator of the Assembly now sitting at the Brick Church aforesaid shall, if present, put all votes and decide questions of order; and the Moderator of the other Assembly shall, if present, preach the opening sermon; and the Stated Clerks of the present Assemblies shall act as Stated Clerks of the Assembly of the united church until a Stated Clerk or Clerks shall have been chosen thereby; and no Commissioner shall have a right to vote or deliberate in said Assembly until his name shall have been enrolled by the said Clerks, and his commission examined and filed among the papers of the Assembly.

6. Each Presbytery of the separate churches shall be entitled to the same representation in the Assembly of the united church in 1870 as it is entitled to in the Assembly with which it is now connected.

II.—CONCURRENT DECLARATIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLIES OF 1869.

As there are matters pertaining to the interests of the Church when it shall have become reunited, which will manifestly require adjustment on the coming together of two bodies which have so long acted separately, and concerning some of which matters it is highly desirable that there should be a previous good understanding, the two Assemblies agree to adopt the following declarations, not as articles of compact or covenant, but as in their judgment proper and equitable arrangements [applause], to wit:

1. All the ministers and churches embraced in the two bodies should be admitted to the same standing in the united body, which they may have held in their respective connections, up to the consummation of the union.

2. Imperfectly organized churches are counseled and expected to become thoroughly Presbyterian, as early within the period of five years as may be permitted by the highest interests to be consulted; and no other such churches shall be hereafter received.

3. The boundaries of the several Presbyteries and Synods should be adjusted by the General Assembly of the united church.

4. The official records of the two branches of the church for the period of separation should be preserved and held as making up the one history of the church; and no rule or precedent which does not stand approved by both the bodies, should be of any authority until reestablished in the united body, except in so far as such rule or precedent may affect the rights of property founded thereon.

5. The corporate rights now held by the two General Assemblies, and by their Boards and Committees, should, as far as practicable, be consolidated, and applied for their several objects, as defined by law.

6. There should be one set of Committees or Boards for Home and Foreign Missions and the other religious enterprises of the church; which the churches should be encouraged to sustain, though free to cast their contributions into other channels if they desire to do so.

7. As soon as practicable after the union shall have been effected, the General Assembly should reconstruct and consolidate the several Permanent Committees and Boards which now belong to the two Assemblies, so as to represent, as far as possible with impartiality, the views and wishes of the two bodies constituting the united church.

8. The publications of the Board of Publication and of the Publication Committee should continue to be issued as at present, leaving it to the Board of Publication of the united church to revise these issues and per-

fect a catalogue for the united church so as to exclude invidious references to past controversies.

9. In order to a uniform system of ecclesiastical supervision, those Theological Seminaries that are now under Assembly control may, if their Boards of Direction so elect, be transferred to the watch and care of one or more of the adjacent Synods; and the other Seminaries are advised to introduce, as far as may be, into their Constitutions, the principle of Synodical or Assembly supervision; in which case they shall be entitled to an official recognition and approbation on the part of the General Assembly.

10. It should be regarded as the duty of all our judicatories, ministers, and people in the united church, to study the things which make for peace, and to guard against all needless and offensive references to the causes that have divided us; and in order to avoid the revival of past issues by the continuance of any usage in either branch of the church, that has grown out of former conflicts, it is earnestly recommended to the lower judicatories of the church that they conform their practice in relation to all such usages, as far as is consistent with their convictions of duty, to the general custom of the church prior to the controversies that resulted in the separation.

III.—RECOMMENDATION OF A DAY OF PRAYER.

That the counsels of Infinite Wisdom may guide our decisions, and the blessing of the Great Head of the Church rest upon the result of our efforts for reunion, it is earnestly recommended to the churches throughout both branches of the Presbyterian Church, that they observe the second Sabbath in September, 1869, as a day of fervent and united prayer to Almighty God, that he would grant unto us all "the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord," and in the new relations now contemplated, enable us to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace."

It had been thought by many that the Assembly was fully competent to consummate the union by their own act, without any further overture to the presbyteries. But in the Old School thirty presbyteries, or more, had remonstrated in advance against the measure, and in the New there was great aversion to what might operate as an enlargement of the powers of the General Assembly. It was thought best, therefore, though at the cost of delay and expense, to wait for a new overture and an adjourned meeting of that body.

The plan as now presented has some very decided advantage over either of its predecessors. It preserves all that was ever regarded as of much value in the old ones, and by carefully distinguishing things that differ avoids the recurrence of misapprehension and confusion.

The Report, it will be observed, consists of three separate papers. The *first*, entitled "Plan of Reunion," etc., is, with the exception of one article, entirely a new draft. Its first article distinguishes by their appropriate designations the two bodies to be united, defines the name and style of the new

body and determines its rights and powers. The *second*, which is the doctrinal article, is precisely the same as in both the former ones, except the omission of the explanatory clauses. The third prescribes the duty of the presbyteries in the case and recites the overture to which alone they are to send back a *categorical* answer. The *fourth* provides for an adjourned meeting of the two Assemblies, and determines the majority required in the action of the presbyteries in order to a declaration of the Assembly that the Reunion is effected. The reduction of this majority from one-fourth to one-third seemed but reasonable, that it might not be in the power of one-quarter of the presbyteries in either body—one-eighth of the whole, and those perhaps among the smallest, either by opposition or neglect to act, to defeat the will of the entire church. The *fifth* makes provision for a meeting of the General Assembly of the united church and settles the respective duties of the two retiring moderators, and states the conditions of membership. The *sixth* states the ratio of representation.

The *second paper* consists of a preamble and ten articles taken almost verbally from the Plan of 1868. The *first* article of that Plan is of course omitted, having been inserted in the first paper. The *twelfth* and *thirteenth* fall out for a similar reason. The *tenth* is omitted. All the rest, with the single exception of the word *should* substituted for the word *shall*, the better to define their intent, stand just as they did in that document. The disposal of the Plan of Union, churches, of the rules and precedents of the separate bodies, the Boards and permanent Committees, the Publications of two churches, and the Theological Seminaries, has not undergone the slightest alteration. There is, however, one very important difference in this paper. Both its preamble and its title clearly define the intent and force of the provisions contained in it. It is true they were never intended as a part of the basis. Both the Plan of 1868, and that of 1867, explicitly declare that "*the Reunion shall be effected on the Basis of our common standards.*"

The rest were only terms, explanations, agreements, mutual understandings. But they were confounded with the Basis in the minds of many. Now they are not only distinguished but *separated* and their force and bearing so clearly defined that there can be no mistake. By withholding them from the action of the presbyteries, the risk is avoided of their being regarded as in the nature of constitutional rules. They are adopted for the sake of a good understanding, as, in the judg-

ment of the two Assemblies, proper and equitable arrangements, though they have had virtually the sanction of the presbyteries of both the churches, and therefore are not altered even in phraseology, they bear the title simple of "concurrent declarations" of these two General Assemblies. They are not articles of compact. They carry with them the *obligation* of GOOD FAITH among Christian gentlemen, and nothing more.

The *third paper*, as its title indicates, is simply a recommendation of a day of prayer.

There is also a preamble prefixed to the first paper taken from the original preamble, but considerably abridged. Matters no longer liable to question required no repetition. One new clause, however, has been inserted, viz., the words: "each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body according to the Confession." The omission of the qualifying amendments to the first article had carried away the contested clauses: "as it is accepted by the two bodies," "as it is now maintained in the two bodies," "as they have hitherto been allowed in the separate churches." But this clause answers the end originally contemplated in them, by a frank and full acknowledgment of the equal standing of both the churches in respect to their orthodoxy. And while it proved eminently acceptable to the New School, it was the only one which, on the reading of the Report in the Old, was greeted with a spontaneous "applause."

It was a happy circumstance that the two Assemblies met in the same city of New York within a few minutes walk of each other. The brethren of both Schools could thus meet face to face and heart to heart, and see for themselves how much their differences amounted to. Morning after morning they met in the same houses of worship, and joined in the same prayers, exhortations, and songs. A large social gathering and entertainment, provided by friends in New York, at Apollo Hall, gave opportunity for the freest interchange of views and sentiments in a social way. Delegations had been exchanged between the two Assemblies, and the eloquent and warm-hearted addresses of Drs. Beatty and Musgrave in the New School, and Dr. Adams and Hon. Wm. E. Dodge in the Old, had kindled to a high degree the enthusiasm of both.

At 10½ o'clock on Thursday, the seventh of the session, the Report was read in both Assemblies simultaneously.

In that of the Old School, Dr. Musgrave, chairman of the Committee, on their part explained the character of the three papers. He "was rejoiced," he said, "that in the preamble,

each recognized the other as sound in the faith founded on the Confession. Hence the united body will never tolerate heresy. They had understood each other, also, on the question of liberty. The impression had been made that the Old School would tolerate no difference of opinion, but insist on the *ipsissima verba* doctrine. There always have been shades of opinion in the old church. May the day never come when one man shall think for all. There must be allowed reasonable liberty of opinion." Dr. Atwater, a member of the committee, and, in times past, understood to be a strong opponent of reunion, said "he felt that the time was now come for union. There was ground for misgiving. He hoped and prayed and labored for the best. He knew the teaching in the seminaries at New York and Auburn to be orthodox. They had a formative influence on the church." Dr. Spring objected only to the postponement. He thought the Assembly had full power to finish the business. At the time of the disruption *he protested against it*, and it was his great desire to die a member of the unbroken Presbyterian church. Henry Day, Esq., a member of the Committee, spoke upon the legal bearings of the report. Every interest is protected as fully as human sagacity could provide. But if all the property is to be lost, let it go, and let us have the union. The warm hearts of these Presbyterians would supply ten times as much." The Rev. Alexander McLean said "Dr. Hodge asked last year 'Where will be the Old School Presbyterian church?' A new generation has arisen. We are able to judge of the doctrines of the church, and out of these two churches will arise a purer and more glorious church. When the Holy Spirit is poured out these two bodies will be melted into one." A few spoke feebly in opposition, or criticised and excepted to certain portions of the plan. But it was of no use. The vote was taken and the result was yeas 270, nays 9.

In the Assembly of the New School there was a strong disposition to take the question at once. But a desire was expressed on the part of some to have an opportunity to speak, and the decision was deferred till the afternoon session. The Committee explained the different parts of the Report, several members took the opportunity to explain their past views and present position, and the appointed hour having arrived the Assembly occupied one minute in silent prayer, and then the Moderator announced the question. The whole Assembly rose in affirmation of the Report, and the Moderator announced its unanimous adoption. And the Assembly join in singing from

Dr. Watts' version three verses of the 102d Psalm. With thrilling force the grand old words of that inspiring song rolled upward from that vast assembly of strong, earnest, resolute Christian men, standing there in a solid body:

"Let Zion and her sons rejoice;
Behold the promised hour,
Her God hath heard her mourning voice
And comes to exalt his power.

The Lord will raise Jerusalem
And stand in glory there;
Nations rejoice before his name
And kings attend with fear.

This shall be known when we are dead
And left our long record,
That nations yet unborn may read
And trust and praise the Lord."

The Rev. Dr. Skinner, senior professor in the Union Theological Seminary in New York, led the Assembly in a fervent prayer, and forthwith a committee was dispatched consisting of Dr. Adams and Hon. Wm. Strong, LL. D., to announce the decision in the other Assembly.

The question now goes down by overtures from the two Assemblies to their presbyteries respectively; and on the approval of the Basis by two-thirds of each of those bodies the union will be sanctioned. We do not anticipate any considerable opposition. Appearances indicate that there will be almost an entire unanimity, and great is the rejoicing throughout the length and breadth of the long sundered, but now to become, we trust, hearty and effectively one, PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

In conclusion we would, as New School men, express our hearty thanks to our brethren, the friends of Reunion in the other branch of the church, for their uniting zeal and vigilant effort in the prosecution of this desirable result. Our zeal would have flagged more than once in the discouragements encountered, had it not been reinforced by their determined perseverance. Nor have we a word to say in the way of censure of those who have acted in opposition to the measure. They have no doubt acted conscientiously, and, so far as they have acted, frankly and directly. We rather thank them for the opportunity which their arguments and objections have given us to set the real, and we think eminent, merits of the cause in a clearer light. Whatever may have been their objections—whether a sympathy with the truth, a desire to maintain what they would call a "witnessing church," a strong, natural attachment to their own separate body, expressed in

the words, "our dear Old School Church," or "our dear New School Church," or a preference for a small compact body over a large, noisy, many-sided, forth-pushing one, or a fear lest the union of organization would not be a union of heart, or that such union would not prove as effectual as competition—they had a right to their opinions, and most of them, we have little doubt, will yield gracefully to the will of the majority.

In all this course of events, and the happy results we anticipate, we recognize with profound gratitude the gracious guidance and interposition of the Providence and Spirit of God. Beyond our fears, beyond even our hopes, he has removed the obstacles, softened our prejudices, brought us to see eye to eye, and brought about a degree of conscious unity and affection which, when we consider the past, as strange as it is, is gratifying to the Christian heart.

It is not likely that we have yet surmounted all the difficulties of our position. Questions of great delicacy which no "Concurrent Declarations" could provide for before-hand, will yet come up for decision. And we shall need on both sides the greatest charity, forbearance and mutual conciliation. In particular those who think themselves the special guardians of orthodoxy will have to be very considerate in their application of their principles, and those who are zealous for liberty of thought and language will have to be very wise and moderate in their use of it. We stand upon the Confession of Faith by the most solemnly renewed pledges to each other, and wherein our views differ from those of our brethren, we are bound to express our differences that they will not through any fault of ours be mistaken by them for departures from our common standards. Boldness of thought and expression may be a virtue. But it must not be allowed unnecessarily to hinder charity. If the special guardians of the doctrines are to remember the prophetic censure upon them, "That make a man an offender for a word," equally must those of the liberties of the church remember the admonition of St. Paul: "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak."

The great object for which we are coming together is not the pride of greatness, either in numbers, talents or resources; it is not the pleasure, great as that may be, of enjoying the goodly fellowship of so large a body of brethren and friends; it is service to Christ, efficiency of action in his cause, the combination of our abilities, resources and counsels in enter-

prises for the glory of God and the good of man, for the advancement of the real interests of humanity, of our country and of the church. If we would be happy in our union, we must be efficient in our work. We trust the two General Assemblies who are to meet for the consummation of this union in the month of November next, will not leave the city of Pittsburg till they have concerted and are prepared to advise some definite measures for at least a practical beginning of this beneficial coöperation.

We thank God that we are now able to look forward with so much confidence to a new era of honor and usefulness for a beloved church. The rending and the breaking down, we trust are ended. "The time to cast away stones," even the precious stones of the sanctuary, is gone, we hope, never to return. "The time to gather stones together," "the time to build up" in this our land and in the world the holy temple of the Lord, "the time to sew," to close up the unseemly rents in the beautiful robes of Christ's mystic bride, are at length come. May God give us grace not to be wanting, since, in his favoring providence, we have "come to the kingdom for such a time as this."

ART. IX.—NOTES ON RECENT BOOKS.

CHURCH HISTORY AND HOMILETICS.

History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne. By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY, M. A. In two volumes. D. Appleton & Co. 8vo. pp. 498, 423. To characterize this work rightly, would require a variety of terms expressive of approval and disapproval. Some things we greatly dislike. They are either impertinent, inconsistent, or unwarranted. But there are large portions of the work which are well conceived and forcibly and eloquently expressed.

The theme is an important one. The history of the moral life of a nation or of the race, must ever be a most attractive and profitable subject of investigation to thoughtful minds, and few periods of the past have more claims upon our attention than the early centuries of Christian history and the period of the Reformation. Mr. Lecky has selected the first of these, and while on some points—mainly of minor importance—his generalizations are drawn from imperfect data, or lack the proper and full evidence to support them, yet more usually he indulges, we might almost say revels, in a multiplicity of historical illustrations, which seem at least to abundantly sustain his positions.

His opening chapter, which is quite extended, is more metaphysical than historical. It presents the character, claims, bearings and relative merits of the two schools of morals, the Intuitive and the Utilitarian. To the former of these Mr. Lecky decidedly and emphatically inclines. Indeed, his professed devotion to truth for its own sake, irrespective of its bearing upon human interests or sacred institutions, commits him beforehand to the cause which he defends. His reasoning, for the most part, is forcible and unexceptionable, while the school of Bentham and his sympathizers, including Mill, Buckle,