

The Central Presbyterian.

WHOLE NO. 1,141.

RICHMOND, VA., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1887.

VOL. 22--NO. 48.

Central Presbyterian.

OFFICE:
No. 1015 Main street, opposite the Post Office.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

One year, \$3 00
If paid in advance, (or within three months), 2 50
Ministers of the gospel, 2 00

The date following your name on the direction label informs you to what month and year your subscription is paid. If this date is not changed within two weeks after payment is made, please notify us. Please examine the date, and if in arrears, remit the amount due.

When the address of a paper is to be changed be careful to send the old as well as the new address.

NO PAPER STOPPED UNLESS ORDERS ARE GIVEN TO DO SO, AND ALL ARREARAGES PAID. Full post-office address required with the order. Send all remittances by draft, check, P. O. money-order or registered letter.

Obituaries charged at five cents a line. The party sending can make the estimate by counting eight words to a line. Payment in advance. Advertising rates furnished on application to the office.

Communications and letters on business should be addressed to CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN, Box 37, Richmond, Va.

Richardson & Southall,
Editors and Proprietors.

Entered at the Post-Office at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Cardinal Gibbons as an Exegete.

The reception lately given to Cardinal Gibbons upon his arrival in Baltimore was an unusually magnificent spectacle. Written speeches were made to him as he and his escort descended from the train, in one of which he was declared to be the first citizen of Maryland, and the second citizen of the Union! A procession of more than 8,000 persons, composed mainly of all the Catholic organizations in the city, accompanied him from the station, through the crowded streets, to the Cathedral, where, after the prescribed religious services had been performed, Monsignor McColgan, on the part of the clergy, delivered an address of welcome, replete with affectionate veneration, to which His Eminence, the Cardinal, made a response of dignified, meagre simplicity.

He gave due commendation to his clergy for the faithful discharge of their functions during his absence, and concluded with this sentence, which, in its connection, is remarkable:

"And in you, too, beloved brethren of the laity, I find verified the words of the Holy Scripture—as the clergy are, so shall the people be."

Now, where did Cardinal Gibbons find the Scripture as quoted by him?

In Isaiah xxiv: 1, 2, 3, it is written:

Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof.

And it shall be, as with the people, so with the priest; as with the servant, so with his master; as with the maid, so with her mistress; as with the buyer, so with the seller; as with the lender, so with the borrower; as with the taker of usury, so with the giver of usury to him.

The land shall be utterly spoiled; for the Lord hath spoken this word.

In Hosea iv: 9, we also find:

And there shall be, like people, like priest: and I will punish (Heb. visit upon) them for their ways, and reward their doings.

Besides these two, I know of no other passage in Scripture, which Cardinal Gibbons may be supposed to be quoting, as illustrating the connection between clergy and laity as happily verified by the two orders of his charge.

The inaccuracy of the Cardinal's quotation is obvious. He has put the clergy as the first term of comparison, while the Scripture puts them (priests) in the second, thus the sequence is reversed, and the signification is altered. This carelessness (to use the mildest word) is hardly creditable in a hierarch.

It is, however, of more importance to note that he has given to the words an application entirely different from, if not antagonistic to, that pertaining to them in Scripture.

Isaiah is foretelling the overthrow of Tyre, and the judgments of God upon the land, and upon all classes of the people. In like manner, Hosea is declaring God's judgments against the sins of the people and of the priests.

Cardinal Gibbons avails himself of these words to compliment his priests and his people. This appropriation of words of condemnation for the purpose of commendation was, in a supreme exponent of Scripture, if not something more, at least a remarkable blunder. It might also raise uncomfortable suggestions in the minds of those of his hearers whose acquaintance with those particular passages of Scripture changed to be more accurate than that of His Eminence.

S. L. C.

Felix put off this matter to a more convenient season, but we do not find that a more convenient season ever came; for the devil cheats us of all our time by cheating us of the present time.

For the Central Presbyterian.

Rev. E. T. Baird, D. D.

CHRISTIANSBURG, VA., June 8, '87.

The Board of Trustees of Montgomery Female College at their annual meeting June 7th, 1887 unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1st. The Rev. E. T. Baird, D. D., Ph.D., by a mysterious dispensation of Providence, has been removed by death from this sphere of great influence and usefulness.

2d. During this his first session as the head of this institution he had already demonstrated that his pre eminent talent, his accurate scholarship, his natural and acquired polish as a man and a gentleman, his warmth of heart, and above all, his Christian consecration in this field as in others, in which he had spent a long life, would prove a blessing to the institution, the community, the commonwealth. We therefore sorrowfully and heartily join in the wide spread grief and disappointment occasioned by his death.

3d. We tender to his family our warmest sympathies, and to the institution and its friends our promise of hearty co-operation and support in all efforts to secure its continued success.

4th. That a copy of these resolutions be furnished to Dr. Baird's family, and to the press for publication. E. C. Gordon, Chairman.

JOHN GARDNER, Secretary.

The Defence of the Sabbath.

Extract from the address of Rev. Dr. John Hall delivered before the Law and Order Society of Philadelphia at its late annual meeting.

We stand up for this day of rest because it dates back to the origin of the race and comes from the hand of our Creator. "Oh, yes," says somebody, "now he is going to the Old Testament; have we not had enough of that? We are here in the 19th Century and under the New Testament." I do not want you to think meanly, dear friends, of the Old Testament. It is not obsolete. Take all the great institutions that you have, and you will find that the elements of them are in that Old Testament and presented in such a way as to prepare us for receiving and intelligently accepting them.

The family, the State, the Nation, marriage, the rights of property, the Church, the Officers of the Church, these and very many other institutions of the like kind that we have among us have their germs in the Old Testament, and that man mistakes his Bible gravely who supposes he can understand the New if he ignores the Old.

"God rested the seventh day." "Why?" says somebody, "was he weary, was he tired?" The strongest human minds do not rest only because they are tired. What is contemplation? What is reflection? What makes the strongest men reflective? What is reflection? Bending the mind back upon the past. So he rested for an example to you and me and for the framing of an institution that would be good for his creatures, not the intelligent only, but the unintelligent creation that he had called into being. He rested on that day from all his work, and there are a good many things in the history of the human race outside of the Mosaic narrative that go to corroborate the impression we have touching that matter.

What a curious thing it is that the number 7, for example, should be so generally a significant number as it has become. I could understand the number 5 becoming a typical number; we have five fingers, ten fingers, five toes, ten toes, but as to the number 7 there is nothing of that suggestive nature about it. We have the Seven Ages and the Seven Heavens and the Seven Wise Men and the Seven Wonders of the world. We have a great number of these sevens spread by tradition all over the race wherever it has gone, just as we have the week. Tradition gives unconscious but mighty corroborative arguments in favor of that simple narrative that we have in the opening book of Genesis. Nor are we left to those strong probabilities. Somebody may say, "Ah, that resting and that suggestion of a day of rest for me—that is due altogether to Moses, and is not to be found anywhere until you come to Sinai, and the ages after Sinai." History does not bear that out. Scholars will tell you about the Nineveh Calendar, and if you take such men as Sayce and Le Normande and the greatest and most accurate antiquarians, they will tell you, on the authority of that Nineveh Calendar, that 600 years before the days of Moses the week was a well understood institution, and the very name that the Syrians had for the day of rest was "Sabbatu," the very word that we get in and from our Hebrew Scriptures.

We stand for this day, then, because it is coeval with the history of the race, and it comes to us with the stamp and appointment of our Creator. Then we come down a little further and we get to what men know as the Decalogue, and all that are here recollect the words which we learned, many of us, from the lips of our mothers or our fathers, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord, thy God." Now, of course, you know very well that efforts have been made to break the force of that re-

membrance. No wonder that men made these efforts. Tell me to remember a thing and that implies that it has been present to me before. "Remember the Sabbath," implies, it has been argued truly, that it has been before the mind already. Attempts have been made to break the force of that, but they have been made, I venture to say, absolutely in vain, and that they are in vain is made the clearer when you take into account the concluding part of that one of the Commandments, "For in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth," and so on. What would be the meaning, what the sense, what the fitness, and what the propriety, of giving this reason annexed if it were not a thing already understood and in relation to which it was proper to say strictly, "Remember" this old institution, "Remember this day to keep it holy?"

One may say, "Ah, but the Decalogue was a comparatively new thing and it made a set of moral rules for a dispensation that was to pass away." All Christendom rejects that theory. All Christendom stands for the Decalogue. All Christendom accepts the Decalogue as something permanent in its nature, and no man believes that it for the first time made sin. It did not need the Sixth Commandment to make Cain a murderer; it did not need the Fifth Commandment to make Him a dishonor of his father. These commandments did not create virtues and vices. They defined them, they stated them, they put them in such a way that the human judgment might be able to distinguish clearly between the right and the wrong, between what God demands and what God will condemn.

Then we come to the third consideration, namely, the Resurrection of our blessed Saviour. A three-fold cord is not easily broken; here we have creation, divine legislation, our Lord's Resurrection, giving a new turn altogether to the attitude in which men are to stand towards God and bringing the face into a fullness of light that was not enjoyed before. Now here it is that I want you especially to give me attention and to exercise your judgments upon the statements I want to make to you. "But," says some one in speaking of this matter, "our Lord Jesus Christ, the founder of our Christian system, does not tell people anywhere that they are to give over keeping the day that they have been keeping and that they are to take another." Now I want you to keep in mind that that is but a secondary consideration in the matter. Where the day shall come, whether at the beginning of the week or at the end of the week, is a secondary matter. The great thing is that there should be a seventh portion of the time given to rest. That is the great thing. Where it comes is a matter of detail, as we shall show by and by.

Now touching that statement—"the Lord himself here on earth did not make the change of the day." Think for a moment; most of those to whom I speak are in the habit of going to church and joining in the services and hearing the precious Word. You can comprehend then what is put before you. Our blessed Lord did not in person found any of the institutions that we have now. He for good and sufficient reasons left that to be done by those who came after him. He trained his Apostles, he invested them with authority, he promised them touching the Holy Spirit, he departed, and that Spirit came when he had departed, and they, carrying out his will and under the influence of his Divine Spirit framed the institutions that we have now. Christ Jesus never built a church edifice, Christ Jesus never gathered a Christian congregation, Christ Jesus never presided in a Christian meeting, Christ Jesus never established the institutions; he sowed the seed and he gave the promise of the Spirit to his apostles, and he endowed them with the power, so that men in his name and by his authority gave to the world the institutions in which we rejoice as Christian institutions, and all that was done according to a fixed and definite plan which theologians can explain to you if you take the trouble to look into their arguments upon that subject.

Then the question is, What did these men endowed with the Spirit and doing the things that would glorify him that he might glorify the Father, do? Now I recall to your knowledge what you already have seen in your Bibles. On the first day of the week these men were in the habit of meeting together, meeting together to remember and rejoice in the Resurrection, meeting together to worship God and receive instruction, meeting together as the followers of the risen Saviour. It was not what they were used to. Those of them that were Hebrews did indeed for long continue to keep the Hebrew Sabbath, and to keep it concurrently with the observance of the first day of the week, and as long as that remained simply a matter of venerable usage the Apostles had nothing to say against it; but when an attempt was made to perpetuate these features of Judaism as against Christianity, then, as you can see in your Bibles, they spoke

out against those things. They, on the other hand, did not keep as a day holy the day of their Lord's entombment, the day when he was lying in the grave, the day when they were in the deepest sadness and sorrow. They did not keep that, but they kept the day when he rose, when their sadness disappeared, when their burden was lifted from their shoulders, and when they met again to rejoice, as they got understanding of his character, in a risen Redeemer who had conquered death and the grave.

It is rather a curious thing, a coincidence probably, that we have in the narrative to which I allude five times the meeting on the first day of the week mentioned in the New Testament story. Five times exactly in the narrative of Genesis we have an allusion to the week. A curious coincidence, it will be said, between the two things, and yet not so strange, probably, after all. The finished work of the Creator was marked by the day of Rest, and the finished work of the new Creator, who came to redeem and make all things new, was worthily commemorated in the same fashion, and the usage started with absolute uniformity on the part of the early Church, on the part of the Apostles as a whole, on the part of Paul himself in relation to "the collection" and other things; all these indicated that the clear, definite and established usage by men who had the gift of the Spirit, and who were to put in shape what Christ taught them, as the germs of truth—their uniform usage was to keep that day, the first day of the week, which is now to us the Christian Sabbath. If, therefore, an argument is needed upon that matter, it is possible for us to set up an argument to which there is no adequate and conclusive rejoinder.

Committee of Publication.

The following is the report of the standing committee of Publication as it was amended and finally adopted by the General Assembly at its late meeting:

We find, on examination of this work, great reason for gratitude to our Lord and encouragement to our Church. The debt of \$85,000, that threatened, ten years ago, to destroy this agency for good, is now either entirely paid or provided for. During this time, \$23,311 of interest has been paid—total paid, \$108,000. After this triumph over debt and doubt and difficulties, there remains "an excess of assets over liabilities" of more than \$64,000. While all this has been accomplished, the work of the Committee in publishing books, keeping a depository, promoting colportage, and giving books and tracts to needy schools and individuals, has gone steadily forward.

Another gratifying fact is, not a single overture was presented this year on the subject, while last year there were five. In view of these facts, it is—

Resolved, 1st. That this General Assembly expresses its high appreciation of the valuable and effective services of its Secretary, Rev. Jas. K. Hazen, D. D., and of its Executive Committee.

2nd. That the Executive Committee be authorized and instructed to inaugurate and prosecute the work of colportage as their resources may permit, and in such fields within our bounds as the providence of God may indicate.

3d. That our churches and Sunday-schools be urged to purchase their supplies of literature from our own Committee, since it is a part of their own business, and can be had from it as cheaply as elsewhere.

Contracting Debts.

The following from a late number of the Presbyterian will apply to Committees and other agencies as well as to Boards:

"There is one subject, however, which concerns all the Boards in which the Assembly can be imperative in the name of the Church. It is that the debt-contracting power of the Boards shall be restricted. We have had quite as much of this as the Church will or ought to stand. Large indebtedness is bad policy, and in a sense, bad morals, and will, if continued, bring only disaster. It will blight the tender life of benevolence, it will create indifference, despair and final neglect, if not hostility. There is no need for it—no divine command to go into debt; on the other hand, recorded warnings against both the bad principle and its practices; it is not faith, but presumption. It is utter disregard of all safe business principles, and offends the moral sense and the best business sense of every man who has acquired wealth, and has any disposition to give it to the cause of Christ.

There is no fact of common sense more apparent than that it is easier to get one hundred dollars for something to be done, than to howl and weep and utter dark sayings about the calamities to come on the Church if certain debts contracted, without business caution, are not paid. The Lord loves cheerful givers, but how can they be cheerful in giving to pay the debts resulting from a policy against their best convictions. Heresy is not much worse on the average to a church

than debt. Whatever in this world is necessary to be done for Christ can be paid for, he has the wealth, and all that is needed is for his servants to find it, and it will not cost as much labor and expense to get it before as afterwards. If Home and Foreign Missionaries are ready to go into their respective fields, and there is no money to send them, let the fact go out to the churches, send the names of the men and women, let us have personality added to duty to make it lively, and no man or woman fit for the work need or will stand a day idle."

For the Central Presbyterian.

To the Churches of the Presbytery of Lexington.

At the spring meeting of the Presbytery it was ascertained that our contributions to the cause of Education had fallen short of the amount appropriated to our candidates over two hundred dollars. In view of this fact the Presbytery directed that the churches be asked, by a special contribution, to make up this deficiency. We are all unwilling that the weaker Presbyteries should help us support our candidates for the ministry. Let every church do what it can, and forward promptly to G. W. McRae, treasurer, Memphis, Tenn.

COMMITTEE OF EDUCATION OF LEXINGTON PRESBYTERY.

The Presbyterian Quarterly.

EDITORS:

G. B. Strickler, D. D., E. H. Barnett, D. D.
Manager: George Summey, Chester, S. C.

July, 1887.

1. Berkely's Idealism, by John L. Girardeau, D. D., LL.D.
2. The Andover Renaissance, by Samuel M. Smith.
3. The Restoration of the Jews, by A. W. Miller, D. D.
4. The Ground of Certitude in Religious Belief, by B. M. Palmer, D. D., LL.D.
5. Creation as a Doctrine of Science, by Geo. D. Armstrong, D. D., LL.D.
6. Notes, by Dr. C. R. Vaughan, Thomas A. Hoyt, C. R. Hemphill and others. The Southern Assembly; The Northern Assembly; The Induction of Ruling Elders into office; The Episcopal Unity Proposition; The Church and the Prohibition Movement.
7. Criticisms and Reviews, by J. L. Girardeau, R. A. Webb, W. W. Moore and others.
8. Recent Publications.
9. Current Thought.

Atlanta, Ga.: Constitution Publishing Company. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., 38 W. 23rd St.

\$3 per year; 80 cents per single number. Address all communications, exchanges, books, mss., etc., to the Manager.

Those desiring the first number, if not yet subscribers, would do well to order before June 27th.

FOREIGN CHURCH NEWS.

—The disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Wales is likely to be a live issue in the next parliamentary election. The rebellion of the Welsh against paying tithes has come to overt acts, and there is quite as much need of a crimes bill for that ancient principality as for Ireland.

—The Year-Book of the Church of England for 1887 registers the names of nearly 14,000 clergymen. In eighty per cent. of the parishes there are 1,182,000 communicants. There are 3,000,665 free and 1,000,497 paid sittings. The voluntary offerings of the year for various religious purposes amounted to \$20,000,000, and more than \$5,000,000 were given to the educational department.

—Dr. E. Pressensé, the well-known evangelical writer, who is also a Senator of France, writing on Freethinkers, or as we say, the Rationalists—of France, says all attempts to organize Freethinkers into associations having a common life, have miserably failed, both in Paris and in the provinces. "The whole thing has become ridiculous, and people will have nothing to do with it." Owing to the influence of Premier Goblet, the Chamber of Deputies has just confirmed the grant to the Protestant theological faculties, the suppression of which had been demanded by the Commission of the Budget, and it has rejected the unreasonable propositions to force the separation of Church and State by the complete and immediate suppression of the Budget of Public Worship. The leaven in France may be a small lump. It is working, though, and will "till the whole mass is leavened."—Christian at Work

—A popular vicar in South London has hit upon an ingenious method of raising a tower on his church in celebration of the Queen's Jubilee. He, the vicar, is A., and founds a fund with his own donation of three-pence. No single donor is to be permitted to subscribe a larger sum. But there are three conditions: A. binds himself to secure four B's, who will not only contribute three pence each, but will guarantee to find four C's, who will subscribe three-pence each, and will each find four D's and so on up to the G's, who will find the H's and there the process stops. An easy sum in arithmetical progression shows that over £200, or \$1,000 will be thus subscribed. The parish is large and populous, and as this process will be carried on in four districts simultaneously, over \$4,000 will be raised for the tower.—Id.

—There has been for some few years past a sort of courtship going on between the English Presbyterians and the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists. The latter held their Synod some two weeks ago in Liverpool, when the Rev. Mr. Swanson, moderator of the English Presbyterian Synod, attended, not as a deputy, but as a corresponding member. Mr. Swanson was greatly in demand at the different meetings. Between the two denominations there is every probability of incorporation at no distant day as the churches have many features in common, both in doctrine and discipline.

Communion in sufferings helps to work compassion toward them that do suffer.

Central Presbyterian.

WEDNESDAY, June 15 1887.

Our Will and His.

BY REV. ROBERT P. KERR.

(This little poem was written several years ago, and is republished by request.)

There lives in many an eager burning soul,
A hope intense which words cannot express,
Which disappointment deep cannot repress,
He lives for, prays for, as his highest goal.

Sometimes in ecstasy of grand success,
His life's momentum rushing madly on,
The end for which all other ends are won,
With sweet fruition seems about to bless.

Upon the Alpine top of victory's height,
He stands and gazes off into the deep,
Where in the distance dim men's destinies
sleep,
And strains his eyes to catch a gleam of light.

But weary days procrastinate the day,
When he shall lay his hand upon the prize;
And toilsome journeys ever meet his eyes,
Where he can only wait, and hope, and pray.

O God! Shall my sweet hope be ne'er possessed,
Shall I not press my treasure to my heart,
With love and peace that never can depart,
And my tired spirit find its prayed-for rest?

The answer comes from Heaven: "My son, my will
Is thou shouldst first the pain and anguish feel,
To know the peace which only these reveal,
Sad heart, tired heart, beloved heart, be still."

And so tired head and hands and heart repose,
Not on the throne of splendid victory gained,
But now, with every wish by Him restrained,
Upon the trust, that what is best He knows.

For the Central Presbyterian.

Reply to Dr. McIlwaine.

NEW PROVIDENCE MANSE,
June 2d, 1887.

To the Rev. Richard McIlwaine, D. D.:

Rev. and Dear Sir,—Your letter to me in the columns of the *Central Presbyterian* reached me while attending the sessions of the Assembly in St. Louis. I reply to it at the earliest opportunity. Permit me to express my regret that you should have ever written such a letter. This feeling I share in common with many friends of your own and of your venerable father. Whatever may be the zeal and energy of your convictions in favor of organic union with the Northern Church, there was no necessity for your giving such a specimen of the very spirit you condemn in Dr. Dabney. More of passion, prejudice and narrowness of view could hardly be expressed in any paper over which any degree of restraint, from courtesy, from the memory of ancient friendship and the precepts of the gospel, was allowed. Your past relations to Dr. Dabney—your indebtedness to his eager help of a favorite pupil in every step of your professional advancement—and your obligations to treat with respect a man of pre-eminent abilities and staunch adherence to principle, who, if known at all, is known for his unflinching devotion and persistent labors for the Church you love—these considerations should have restrained the imputations of "narrowness," "bigotry," "incapacity of progress," and a scarcely disguised reflection on his integrity in presenting the plea of peril to our property under the rule in the Walnut Street Church case. You reflect obliquely upon the "good sense and piety" of "Dr. Dabney and his following," as you are pleased to term those who are agreed with him in his views of organic union, when you appeal to those qualities in the Church at large to resist the measures growing out of the want of them in the said doctor and his retainers. All this unwarranted severity recoils upon yourself; it does you more harm than any one else. If it is to be taken as a fair specimen of the animus of those who are pressing union with the Northern Church at the risk of ruin to their own, you may rest assured it will do more mischief to the cause you advocate than to the cause you oppose. The people of our Church have much more charity for even an excess of zeal for our ecclesiastical independence than for a similar excess of zeal to surrender it. In seeking this end you claim to be animated by fresh and progressive views, by a spirit of liberal policy, and by an intelligence emancipated from all regards to the past. You impute it as a fault to Dr. Dabney that he seems "to glory in his unchanged and unchangeable views." You assume it as an honor due to yourself that your views have changed and are open to still further change. You "pity" the "men whose views never change." Without comment on the spirit implied in these remarks, you will permit me to say that the abandonment of old views will be a credit, or the opposite, according to the nature of the truths which are abandoned. The man who abandons old truths just because they happen to be unpopular, and takes up with new views because there is a promise of meat in them, is a man who deserves something different from pity. Past facts are incapable of change, and if rightly viewed at first, no lapse of time can ever make that original apprehension of them untrue or improper. A great crime never ceases to be a crime and a just foundation for a condemnatory judgment. It seems that Dr. Dabney is so unfortunate and worthy of pity, that he still regards the war and all who were responsible for bringing it on just

as he and the whole body of the Southern people regarded it twenty-seven years ago. He is so unfortunate as to judge the men responsible for the war, and for all the infamies of its conduct, as still responsible for it. It is likely the Judge of all the Earth will do the same. It is very possible that all who have changed their views, and, in the happy liberty of free and progressive thought, have advanced to new views of the facts, have advanced to error and left the truth behind. Those who have plumed themselves upon their progressive spirit, and look with scorn upon the unprogressive men who still call a spade that which was a spade in 1860, and still feel an injustice which excited a just indignation twenty-five years ago—are by no means entitled to the assumption of wisdom and nobility of spirit which they make. There has been too much of this sort of folly. It is fast becoming a test of character with many in our section to repudiate all defence of the Southern cause before, during and after the war. Any vindication is regarded as out of place and out of time.

Dr. McIlwaine regards it as a reproach to Dr. Dabney that his views of these events and their agents are unchanged. On the contrary, we honor him for it. Instead of being as his former favorite pupil now regards him, a narrow, pitiless Bourbon clinging to a condemnable past, he is just the reverse. He is simply holding to facts in the past. We know him well, and a nobler spirit does not beat in any human breast. Pre-eminent in abilities—as versed in the arts of business as in the accomplishments of a scholar—the profoundest thinker and the most practical of counsellors—his moral qualities range along the same high level with his extraordinary talents. A tender husband, a devoted father, the truest and most unselfish friend that ever clasped hands with friend, an humble Christian and a loyal servant of his Lord—he is utterly misapprehended by all who cannot appreciate the integrity of his views and the unflinching courage with which he avows them. In his vivid intellect, the past lives as it cannot live in feeble and less sensitive hearts; and when he expresses his unchanged views of past evil deeds which are absolutely unchangeable, he is construed by those who are quicker to feel than think as disqualified by a hopeless Bourbonism from all ability to counsel the Church to which he has given his peerless labor for a long life—for which he has sacrificed his very eye-sight and is now sinking into blindness.

I will not characterize the spirit which strikes at the very life of his claims to gratitude and respect. But I will say that the Southern people are neither blind nor unjust; and they will shield the good name of a brave and faithful servant when assailed because he still asserts the justice of a cause which once attracted justly the unlimited devotion of a just and free people.

Allow so much to the vindication of Dr. Dabney's undiminished claims to respect in spite of Dr. McIlwaine's assault. He may not be found always within the limits of conventional prudence, as defined in the minds of men of less vivid convictions and less fearless in asserting unpopular or rasping truth; but he is always found standing on the territory of courage and fidelity to every fact and principle which the truth displays, and requires him to maintain.

2. Permit me to express my surprise that you should have construed Dr. Dabney's allusion to repeated defections in the Presbyterian Church during its past history as indicating "that he has lost faith in Presbyterianism and is fast verging towards Independence or some other form of Church government." You call this extraordinary construction, "the necessary impression produced by the reasoning of Dr. Dabney." We will venture to assert that no other reader of the article but Dr. McIlwaine ever dreamed of such a meaning in it. No one could have so construed it if his mind had not been filled with angry passion and reached desperately after some weapon to assail it. Dr. Dabney simply states facts in the history of Presbyterianism, and is supposed by doing it to have aimed at its destruction. Did Dr. McIlwaine never see a fault in one whom he loved? Did his mention of the failure indicate hatred to the loved one whom he honestly blamed? The allegation of hostility and betrayal of his Church to Dr. Dabney because he tells the truth about the frailties of human nature, though Presbyterian in an ecclesiastical name and relation, is absolutely infatuated. The facts of history amply vindicate his assertion both as to the fact of defection from the truth and the saving of it by secession from the Church. Instance after instance in proof is on record, and if Dr. McIlwaine had remembered the lessons in history which he received from Dr. Dabney at the Seminary, he would have spared us the torrent of invective under the first division of his letter.

The Presbyterian churches founded by the apostles speedily lapsed into prelacy, and the Waldensian Church, retiring into the recesses of the Alps, saved the principles of Presbyterianism.

The Church of Geneva, founded by Calvin, gradually lapsed into Rationalism, until such men as Merle D'Aubigne and Ganssen seceded and saved Evangelical Presbyterianism.

The Church of Holland corrupted itself, and again the cause of truth was saved by the secession of the Evangelical True Church of Holland.

This has been substantially repeated within the last twelve months in the same country. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland was again and again sinking under the leaden weight of Moderatism and Patronage, when the cause was saved by the secession of Gillispe, the Erskines, and afterwards of Dr. Chalmers and the Free Church.

The Presbyterian Church of England dallied with Socinianism, and because her rulers all practiced the very fraternity and fusionism which Dr. McIlwaine now recommends, she absolutely died out of the land. The history of Presbyterianism in England is one of the most remarkable in the history of the Church of God.

The Reformed Church of France abandoned a part of its principles, and the sainted Frederic Monod and his brethren saved Presbyterianism for France by withdrawing.

When Semi-Pelagianism and Congregationalism were tainting the American Presbyterian Church, our fathers again saved the Church by separation in 1837.

Are these instances sufficient to show Dr. McIlwaine that Dr. Dabney might have advocated the positive division of our Church rather than unite with the Northern Church, and done it with an honest view of saving instead of destroying it. What has he said more than the Confession of Faith has said? "The purest Churches on earth are subject both to mixture and error, and some have so degenerated as to become no Churches of Christ, but Synagogues of Satan." Does the Confession of Faith become the enemy of Presbyterianism when it makes that statement? Why, then, should Dr. Dabney be so considered when he repeats it? In simple truth, the main point of his assault, as Dr. McIlwaine himself defines it, is so utterly fallacious that it beggars description. Dr. Dabney abandoning Presbyterianism and verging towards some other form of Church government, because he believes in the historical facts, that Presbyterian churches have lapsed into error, and that they may possibly do it again! Dr. Dabney assailing Presbyterian principles because he believes that sinful human beings, though organized on Presbyterian rules, are liable to fall into error!

3. I cannot follow you fully through the various points of your extraordinary argument for organic union, and of your still more remarkable assault on the good name of Dr. Dabney. I shall dwell briefly on the points of amalgamation with the negroes. You have no fear of social amalgamation as growing out of an organic union with the negro race in the same ecclesiastical organization. You may be very wise in your statesmanlike provision of no evil to spring from this cause. But when I confront you with the judgment of John Randolph of Roanoke, you will excuse me if I give a higher value to the sagacity of that sagacious and most profound statesman than to your judgment in the case. (Home Reminiscences of John Randolph, p. 189.) Yet further, Dr. Robert Dabney himself is a more profound student and master of civil polity than the bulk of what are called professional statesmen. Witness his paper on the New South. His judgment is identical with Mr. Randolph's. The truth is so plain we do not see how any one can fail to see it. The mixture of black and white ladies in an Aid Society, a supper or soiree to raise money, the free intermingling with young colored gentlemen in such semi-social and ecclesiastical scenes, will not be long in developing results. An organic mixture of the races in the same Church organization, work, and society, will soon break down the barriers of social life and of blood. To one who exults in the popular philosophy of freedom and equality, this will appear a not undesirable result. To one who remembers that race distinctions are the result of a divine ordination, based, as all such ordinations are, on a profound and far-sighted wisdom, all policies leading to an attempted obliteration of these distinctions must appear presumptuous and foolish in the extreme. The principle of an independent Church for the two races is not only fully consistent with the unity of the Kingdom, but the logical outcome of the distinctions impressed by the hand of God and guarded by antipathies and sympathies which cannot be safely disregarded in any of the civil or ecclesiastical relations between the races so distinguished. Dr. McIlwaine may see no danger of negro amalgamation in an organic ecclesiastical union with a Church in which the negro is recognized as an organic unit. But we prefer the wiser guidance of common sense, and the wisdom of such students of man and law as Robert Dabney and Randolph of Roanoke.

In reply to your harsh insinuation that Dr. Dabney employed the argument from the rule in the Walnut Street church as a mere bug-bear to frighten the Church, when he knew there was no force in the statement, I have only to say that this insinuation is simply an insult as gratuitous as it is unfounded. If Dr. McIlwaine had taken the pains which Dr. Dabney had taken, to inform himself, he would have known that not only such Church lawyers as Dabney and Stuart Robinson, but some of the ablest jurists, declare that the effect of that decision, when applied, will be precisely what the Texan Professor has predicted. In spite of Dr. McIlwaine's assurance of safety, we are fully satisfied that it would be a species of lunacy for the Southern people to place themselves in a position where all questions arising out of their ecclesi-

astical and affiliated social relations must be determined by a body of Northern men, enforcing their decisions by the peril of all the Church property of the Southern people. The Northern Church is to-day holding property unjustly wrested from our people by this fatal and foolish rule of adjudication. Give them the power, and they will master the whole of it.

Dr. McIlwaine announces it as a point of duty binding on us all to seek union with those of like faith and order, and then formally announces the intention of himself and his friends to do it. This peremptory notice is well served. He may rest assured it will be promptly met. The purpose is implied to rule or ruin the Southern Church. We shall endeavor to protect it from both. The spirit of the advocates of organic union in the St. Louis Assembly was wholly different from this spirit of domination in the President of Hampden Sidney College. They avowed they did not seek organic union at the expense of the Southern Church, nor would they tolerate it. It is a matter as certain as any future thing can be, that if pressed it will ruin us. Let our people wait until they are informed upon all matters involved in the issue, and then act with a decision which will at once put an end to this dangerous question and secure in their own hands, without peril of interference by Northern men, the determination of all questions which may affect our rights of property and our relations to the negro race.

Lastly, Permit me, Dr. McIlwaine, to close this discussion by a brief examination of the great false issue raised by you and by hundreds of others in the political and ecclesiastical spheres. You tell us "the war is over." You tell us this issue of organic union ought not to be determined by "the passions of war." You do not seem to be aware that your insinuation that opposition to this measure of fusion is grounded wholly in political and war feeling—is solemnly repudiated by those who differ with you on the question. The difference is grounded on four lines, each distinctively and exclusively religious and ecclesiastical. The constant, parrot-like iteration of the phrase, "the war is over," and "the passions of war" ought no longer to influence the Southern people, and especially Southern Christians, requires a few brief words, which ought to put an end to the emptiness of repeating them. You are sagacious enough to discover that the war is over, but apparently not sagacious enough to discover that the effects of the war are not over: they continue to exist on a scale and degree of misery among an impoverished people which seems to be utterly ignored by the fervent, well-to-do disciples of peace and reconciliation. The Southern people are obedient citizens of the Federal government; not one thought of disturbing its administration ever enters their minds. But while they know the war is over, they also know in ten thousand suggestions of poverty and personal want that the effects of the war are not over. As long as these effects remain, it would be no matter of surprise to a thoughtful and considerate mind if the passions of the war should also linger with its effects. If they do, no just man will account them as the results of incurable malignity; but the natural though mournful results of the necessary effects of war. It is time some measure of charity—nay of justice should be displayed to those who in silent fortitude are doing their stern duties, yet with some remnant of natural human feeling in the midst of their trials. There is no malignity or unreasonable tenacity of unholy feeling in the hearts of Southern people, in the Church or out of it. They have shown a mastery of just passion absolutely sublime—a power of self-control which has won the admiration of such magnanimous enemies as Grant and Beecher. If there had been no genuine and just passion to be controlled, there could have been no occasion for this grand self-mastery. Here is the true distinction by which alone the people of the conquered South can preserve themselves from degradation—not by the denial of the natural and just emotions which spring inevitably from the effects of their subjugation, but by controlling them within the bounds of duty and prudence. To suppress the emotions is to violate nature and degrade the character, to master the emotions and obey the laws is the discipline of a true heroism. That eagerness to repudiate and disown the noble past of our history does involve a degradation which excites the indignation of men like Robert Dabney, and their eagerness to prevent it is the effect of their solicitude to preserve the honor and manliness of their people. To call this a malignant spirit of untameable hatred to the United States government is as mistaken as it is unjust: it is a blunder as well as a crime. This perpetual exhortation about Christians dropping the "passions of the war," compels the inquiry, "What were and are the passions of the war?" and the answer to that question will show that the implied censure in the phrase is altogether based upon a partial and incomplete view of the feelings roused by the awful conditions of civil strife. All wars develop more or less of evil passion; but they also develop many of the noblest impulses of which the human heart is capable. Substitute the word *emotions* for *passions*—a word studiously used in its bad sense. Then the inquiry is suggested, "Is it right for Christians, and for all right-feeling people, to be prompted by right emotions?" Every truly informed man

knows that right emotion forms a part of the motive of every right act done in earth or heaven. Now, what were the emotions which prompted Christian men in the South in 1861? A solemn grief for the issue inexorably forced on them by the aggressions of others, extending through more than forty years of persistent attack. Awful searchings of heart on their knees before God, as they prayed for light to see their dreadful duty, and for strength to perform it. A high and holy purpose of self-sacrifice for their hearths and homes, for the altars of their God, and the rights of their children. It was such emotion as lead a Lee, after a whole night spent with his sainted wife in agonizing prayer, to carry his stainless sword to the defence of his own State. It was such emotion as lead a Jackson so often from the holy place of sweet prayer to the edge of battle, and thence at length to heaven. It was that emotion which sanctified and ennobled the hearts of the myriads of Christian martyrs for duty, whose graves dot every Confederate battle-field.

Such were the "passions of the war." These righteous sentiments have sustained the hearts of Southern Christians under infinite obloquy and trial. To surrender them will be to yield our manhood to moral ruin. There is no inconsistency between the fearless assertion of the rightfulness of our cause, universally asserted twenty-five years ago, on the basis of facts which can never change, and the faithful discharge of the duties of our present position. Any other view makes our degradation as a people the condition of our obedience to the public law. There is no necessity whatever for such a condition, or such a result.

Permit me to say, in conclusion, Dr. McIlwaine, that there is no excuse for mixing up a personal assault with the grave issue now before the Southern Presbyterian Church. We are in the most dangerous crisis of our history. Organic union means the division and ruin of our Church. Those who are opposed to it hope to save our independence, and at the same time to prevent division among ourselves and to preserve kindly relations with our Northern brethren.

These are the three points in our policy—we do not despair of gaining them all. When the whole case is presented to the public judgment, we do not despair of gaining every point we shall aim to secure. Meantime, let the body of the Church wait for light; and if sound reasons in the propriety, the prudence, and the necessity of the case cannot be displayed for the continued independence of the Southern Church, it will be time enough then to consider the terms of surrender. Yours truly,

C. R. VAUGHAN.

For the Central Presbyterian.

A Charge.

The "charge" delivered to the congregation of the Laurens Presbyterian church, South Carolina, by the Rev. M. C. Britt, at the installation of Rev. E. O. Frierson as pastor, May 8th, 1887.

My Brethren,—You have just entered, by your own consent, into what may be regarded in one aspect of it, as a solemn covenant. Let your minds be directed to such thoughts as shall tend to promote its faithful observance.

1. Consider its high and holy ends.—They are not temporal but eternal, not earthly but heavenly. The pastor was one of the ascension gifts of the Lord Jesus Christ when he led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men, designed for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, 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 fulness of Christ. Its purposes therefore are identical with those for which the incarnate Saviour laid down his life. Receive it then with grateful hearts, as one of his best gifts, and truest evidences of his love.

2. Consider the nature of the duties which are embraced in it. They are not such as devolve simply upon the pastor, but these are equally those which belong to the people. The pastor in the discharge of his duties is entitled to the cordial co-operation of the people of his charge. "It is their duty to see that he is so sustained as to be free from distracting worldly cares. They should cherish towards him all suitable respect; be bound to him in ardent affection; be tender of his reputation; assistant to him in their counsels; wait upon his ministry with punctuality and attention; commend him and his labors, by prayer, to the blessing of the God of all grace, and in every possible manner endeavor to be fellow-helpers with him in saving souls, and advancing the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Thus while the pastoral office requires on the part of him who is honored with it, all faithfulness, diligence, care, and circumspection, it demands on the part of the people all proper support, encouragement, and obedience in the Lord, towards him who is set over them." These mutual duties are enjoined by the Apostle when he exhorts: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief;" and again: "We beseech you to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake."

3. Consider, also, that the success of