THE PROCESS,

TESTIMONY AND OPENING ARGUMENT

OF THE PROSECUTION,

VOTE AND FINAL MINUTE,

IN THE

JUDICIAL TRIAL OF REV. W. C. McCUNE

BY

THE PRESBYTERY OF CINCINNATI,

FROM MARCH 5 TO MARCH 27, 1877.

CINCINNATI:
ROBERT CLARKE & CO., PRINTERS.
1877.

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE testimony and the argument in the following pages, in the judicial case of the Presbyterian Church *versus* Rev. W. C. McCune, are published herewith at the earnest solicitation of many Presbyterians, and for the information of those who are interested in the study of the trial. It is only necessary here to mention the following things:

1. That the testimony of the prosecution has never yet appeared—as the testimony for the defense has appeared—in any of the daily or weekly issues of the press, whether secular or religious.

2. That from the beginning to the end of the trial, the testimony for the prosecution remained intact, complete in its integrity, undamaged, and admitted by the defendant. It is to this day undisputed and unchallenged testimony, and it remains for every reader to judge whether it supports the specifications and the charges.

3. The vote of the Presbytery upon each specification and upon both the charges is appended, under each, respectively.

4. With the testimony thus uninvalidated and unbroken, the Presbytery, by a verdict of 29 to 8, declared the charges *not sustained.*

5. Of the specifications, the Presbytery, at the same time, voted that the specifications 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, and 11, under Charge I were *not sustained* by the proofs; and that 6, 7, 8, and 10 were *sustained.* Also, under Charge II, the specification 2 was *sustained*, and specification 1 was *not sustained.*

6. The final minute of the Presbytery, which is printed at the close of the argument, reports specification 10, under Charge I, as *not sustained*, whereas said specification was *sustained* by a vote

of 21 to 17, the law of the assembly being, that to "sustain in part" (9), and to "sustain" (12), are always to be counted together.

7. The Presbytery has decided that nothing taught or done by Mr. McCune, in any or all of the proofs of the case, was in contravention of his ordination vows, nor impaired the integrity of our system of doctrine, nor was disloyal to the Church, nor, if generally persisted in by our ministers, would subvert the Presbyterian denomination.

8. The opening argument of the prosecution is given to the public at the request of many members of our Church, and others not members of the Church.

THOMAS H. SKINNER.

CINCINNATI, *April* 10, 1877.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CHARGES.

The Prosecuting Committee appointed by Presbytery, October 4, 1876, to take in hand and digest all the papers and documents relating to the case of the Rev. W. C. McCune, and prepare and conduct judicial process upon the same, herewith submit the charges.

They deem it proper to state that they have given diligent attention to the labor assigned them. During the progress of their labors they have been deeply impressed with the gravity of the case, not alone in relation to the defendant, but also to the Presbytery itself and to the whole Presbyterian Church. In all cases of prosecution where "Common Fame" is the accuser, "the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America" is the "prosecutor," appearing in defense of its peace, purity, and unity by its "Committee of Prosecution" acting in its name, and duly appointed by a court of legitimate jurisdiction, before whom the cause is to be originally tried. The Presbytery, jealous of its solemn attitude and function as a court of impartial adjudication, and detaching itself from the Committee of Prosecution, thus refusing to assume the attributes of both prosecutor and judge in the premises, acts purely in a judicial character, and intrusts the whole conduct and course of the case to the Committee of Prosecution. Such is the provision of our General Rule XLII. Rule XLI was expressly originated in the year 1819 to be applied to references, complaint and appeal cases before the

General Assembly (Digest, 214), and afterward extended in 1822 to cover all such cases in the lower judicatories as well, but not applicable to the institution of original process, as is shown by Rule XLII, enacted at the same time. By this Rule the Presbytery's Committee of Prosecution is, *ipso facto*, disfranchised from the bench of judgment by the Presbytery's own act, and thrown upon their own responsibility for the management of the whole case. Under a sense of this responsibility thus laid upon them, the prosecution, as representing the Presbyterian Church, its constitution and laws, have felt that nothing should be done which the Presbyterian Church forbids, and all should be done that the Presbyterian Church requires, and also that, in the Spirit of the Gospel and the "Book," every advantage possible to be accorded to the defendant, consistent with justice, should be scrupulously ascertained and liberally bestowed, though going beyond what strict justice itself might claim. The offense charged, therefore, is presented as one in its general nature, precisely as made by "General Rumor" itself, viz: Disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church, assuming a two-fold form, precisely as it assumed in the same "Rumor," the first relating to the doctrines, principles, and views of the defendant, this being Charge I; the second relating to the practical course of the defendant, this being Charge II. The description of the offense, moreover, has followed the language of the Presbytery's resolution of April 13, 1876, at Glendale, and the Title of the "Special Report" of Presbytery's Investigating Committee, accepted at Mt. Auburn, September 13, 1876. The Specifications under the first charge are eleven in number; under the second charge, two. The Committee confined themselves entirely to a plain, direct, and unambiguous statement of what the matter of fact in the papers and writings of the defendant will, in their judgment, jus-

tify. Still further, in order to give the defendant the utmost possible advantage, as well as reduce the case and save the time of Presbytery, they have agreed to present the whole case of the prosecution in one paper at this time. To this end they have not restricted themselves to a simple *reference* to the objectionable language in the writings of the defendant, merely noting the page and sentences or paragraphs, but have furnished to the defendant the language itself, upon which they rely to support the several Specifications. They have given the name and page of the document, and the date as to year, month, and day, thus basing the several allegations upon the words of the defendant himself, these being again supported in part by other testimony, including the testimony of the Presbytery's Committee of Investigation in their special report. If there is seeming redundancy, it is not because the evidence is exhausted, but only that no injustice may be done the defendant, and that Presbytery itself may be satisfied on this point, inasmuch as the testimony is the essence of all judicial cases. In the same interest of advantage to the defendant, the Committee have annexed to each Specification the several *references* to the Standards of the Church with which they deem the views and course of the defendant to be in conflict. Thus the defendant is furnished in advance with the whole testimony of the prosecution and all the law points in the case. Every advantage the Committee could give has been given; every right carefully guarded; every benefit readily accorded. The Specifications are appended to support the Charges, the Proofs are added to support the Specifications, and the references to the Standards are subjoined to support the fact that the matter charged is an offense against the Presbyterian Church. The prosecution have no personal witnesses to cite. The evidence is entirely documentary. The testi-

mony and the law are given with the Charges. The Committee desire to add that they have made application to the officers of the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church for access to their official records relating to the organization of the Church, but said officers have declined to accede to their request.

With this explanation, and the statement that the Prosecuting Committee, after careful examination and deliberation, have come to a united judgment upon the presentation of the charges, specifications, testimony, and law of the case, we respectfully submit the case to the Presbytery, and ask that it may be prosecuted according to the constitution of the Presbyterian Church.

THOMAS H. SKINNER,
E. D. LEDYARD,
S. J. THOMPSON,
Committee of Prosecution.

CINCINNATI, *December* 18, 1876.

JUDICIAL PROCESS.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

versus

THE REV. W. C. McCUNE,

IN THE COURT OF THE PRESBYTERY OF CINCINNATI.

Action brought by Common Fame, for Disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church.

Process instituted by Presbytery.

Rev. Messrs. THOMAS H. SKINNER AND E. D. LEDYARD AND Elder S. J. THOMPSON, Prosecuting Committee.

Offense: Disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church.

CHARGE I.

That the Rev. W. C. McCune, being a minister of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, has, for years past, in contravention of his vows of loyalty to the distinctive faith and order of the Presbyterian Church, as also in opposition to the terms of the doctrinal and ecclesiastical Basis of union adopted, unanimously, by the Presbytery of Cincinnati (O. S.), at Avondale, September 8, 1869, Mr. McCune being present and voting for the same, and adopted by the whole Presbyterian Church (O. S. and N. S.), and in joint convention November 12, 1869, declared as of binding force, openly proclaimed and persistently advocated doctrines, principles, and views, not only at war with the standards of the Presbyterian Church, but, if generally accepted,

totally subversive of its constitution and of the very existence of the Presbyterian denomination itself.

This Charge rests upon the following specifications, to wit:

SPECIFICATION I.

Law of Organization.

As to the Divine Law of Organization for the Christian Church.—In this, that the divine Law of Organization for the Christian Church, in all time, is found in Romans xv. 7, and not only forbids the existence of different evangelical denominations, as such, and any exclusion of Christian members or ministers in one denomination from full fellowship in another, but requires oneness of visible external organization, and immediate preparation for the reorganization of the Presbyterian and whole Christian Church on a New Testament basis; moreover, according to this law, the Church may cut off from its communion no one who is not, first of all, assumed, or proved, to be unregenerate.

PROOF 1.—Christian Unity, December 6, 1873, p. 5: "We claim that many express precepts of the New Testament require organic Christian Union. 1. The precept in Romans xv. 7: 'Receive ye one another, even as Christ also received us to the glory of God,' requires ministers and members everywhere to receive *all* into church relations, whom they acknowledge Christ has received." Again, Christian Standard, November 13, 1875, p. 362: "The great law of Christian Union is tersely and comprehensively expressed, Romans xv. 7: 'Wherefore receive ye one another, etc.'" Again, repeated in the Standard, November 20, 1875, p. 370. Again, Declaration from Linwood and Mt. Lookout, p. 4: "We are also convinced that we find the law requiring visible Christian Union in Romans xv. 7, as well as in other scriptures: 'Wherefore receive ye one another as Christ also received us to the glory of God.' We likewise believe that the precept applies *in the case of ministers*, as well as in the case of members, and that no one who gives scriptural evidence that he is a minister of the Lord

Jesus Christ should be *excluded* from membership in any Presbytery, Conference, or association of ministers whatsoever, by any denominational law." Again, Christian Unity, January 31, 1874, p. 4: "The New Testament *forbids* denominational divisions, and *requires* visible union." Again, Christian Unity, January 3, 1874, p. 4: "Christ prayed for such oneness as *necessarily* involves visible unity." Again, Christian Unity, November 15, 1873, p. 4: "God, in his providence, urgently calls upon all Christ's disciples to make *immediate prayerful preparation for a united New Testament organization of the Church in every place.*" Again, Christian Unity, August 1, 1875, p. 5: "And were it not for the active and prejudiced resistance made by *sectarian managers and place-men*, and for the effort always necessary and generally painful, to *pass from an old organization that is unauthorized and extra-scriptural to a new one on a New Testament basis*, there is a great host of living Christian hearts, now separated by mere human sectarian walls, that would gladly unite to-morrow on the basis of the *unity of the spirit with forbearance in love.*"

Proof 2.—Christian Unity, March 14, 1874, p. 4: "The Apostles received all Christians into the fellowship of the Church. They *never excluded a disorderly person* in order that he *might organize another denomination.*" Again: "Report on Christian Union, read in the Presbyterian Synod of Cincinnati, October 22, 1870, and ordered to be printed," W. C. McCune, Chairman of Committee, p. 14: "It may indeed be needful that he should be made the subject of some brotherly forms of discipline, of admonition, of reproof, or even of temporary suspension, but *he may not be finally excommunicated and forced to establish another denomination of his own, in order to attain membership in the visible Church of Christ.*" Again, p. 12: "Paul gave directions to exclude incestuous persons from the communion of the Church, *but not with the view to the establishment of another denomination in which incest should be ruleable and respectable.*" Again, Organic Union, p. 74: "He (Dr. P.) assumes that the 'brother' in the text (2d Thess. iii. 6), was a Christian brother, and that *as a Christian brother* he was to be

excluded from the Church; and the inference is that it can not be the law of the Church that the *mere evidence* that a man is a *Christian* brother does not entitle him to membership." Again, p. 74: "It would be *necessary to show* that the Apostles in *some* case had *actually excommunicated* a man who gave evidence that he was *a true believer*. But there is no such case on record. There is no proof whatever that the 'brother' mentioned in the precept above was a brother Christian."

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 45 (2), 307 (*b*), 674 (iii, 1, 2), 675 (5, 6), 676 (7), 677 (10), 678; 44 (ii, v, vi), 48 (i), 49 (vi), 50 (*b*), 54 (11, 12), 57 (14), 63 (2), 92 (ii, 2), 91 (2), 120 (i), 147 (5), 169 (8, *c*), 191 (iv), 620 (7). Also the whole Form of Government and Book of Discipline in their structure, captions, and provisions, and all the decisions of the approved Digest bearing upon the reception or exclusion of ministers and members, particularly the references in Digest Index, p. 709, under "Excommunication;" Title, Censure, and Digest, pp. 679 to 681, 704 (2), 85 (4), 73; also Princeton Review, January, 1876, p. 39.

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Not sustained.—Caton, Rossiter, Cortelyou, Cushman, Ritchie, Camp, Dudley, Beecher, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Chester, Hawley, Jones, White, Morris, Hills, Schwenck, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—25.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, Babbitt, West, Wright, Winness, Gamble—8.

Sustained in part.—Kumler, Morey, Monfort, Evans—4.]

SPECIFICATION II.

Anti-denomination.

As to the essential sinfulness of the Presbyterian and all other existing evangelical denominations as such.—In this, that the Presbyterian and all other evangelical denominations, as

such, *i. e.*, in their peculiar character as distinct organizations, apart from their common Christianity, and framed by denominational law to maintain and enforce their peculiar and distinctive creed as to doctrine and polity, are essentially sinful, are not churches, and have no scriptural right to exist.

PROOF 1.—Organic Union, p. 123: "A denomination has *no right to exist* as a distinct organization, unless she is organized *according to the divine law of organization.*" Again, Christian Unity, November 15, 1873, p. 4: "We shall aim to show the *anti-scriptural*, wasteful, and enfeebling nature of existing denominational divisions, and to persuade Christians, eventually, to *organize, instead, but one church* in one place." Again, Christian Unity, January 31, 1874, p. 8: "Denominational divisions in the church are *wholly destitute of scriptural authority.*" Page 4: "We have a clear, profound conviction that denominational divisions are *unscriptural.*"

PROOF 2.—Cincinnati Commercial, February 11, 1876: "I am opposed to *denominationalism*, or, to use a more expressive term, I am utterly opposed to all *sectarianism*, and I am just as much opposed to *Presbyterian* sectarianism as any other. Denominational Christian Churches are characterized by two things: first, their *Christianity;* secondly, their *sectarianism.* On account of the first, I maintain they *have a right to exist.* The second thing, their sectarianism, is *sinful, unscriptural*, and has *no right to exist.*" "Sectarianism is a hurtful excrescence."

PROOF 3.—Commercial, February 11, 1876: "Dr. Skinner's second statement, that I claim I am opposed 'only to *supernumerary churches*, in small towns or villages' is wholly untrue. I never said so. I am opposed to dividing of the Church into *denominations* out of which they grow." "I condemn sectarianism as *essentially sinful* and do not rejoice in it." "I do not believe that the Presbyterian Churches are Christian Union organizations. I believe they *ought* to be. I believe that as the Presbyterian Church receives all, as *members*, whom she believes Christ receives, so she should receive all as *ministers*, whom she believes

Christ receives. I believe that any minister, on application, should be received as a member of Presbytery, and who gives to Presbytery satisfactory scriptural evidence that Christ has received him, as His minister. *The Presbyterian Church requires more than this.*" Again, Declaration, p. 4: "We further maintain that, if Christians, living in any place, unite themselves together as a Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, receiving *all* as *ministers*, and as *members*, who give scriptural evidence that Christ has received them, such a Church is *not a sect*, in any sense whatever. A *sect* is an organization that *cuts off*, or *excludes*, from its fellowship those whom Christ confessedly receives. But the Church that *welcomes all* who give credible evidence that they belong to Christ, *can not be a sect.*"

PROOF 4.—Christian Standard, February 26, 1876, p. 66: "The leading Protestant denominations all have their peculiarities, which they hold not merely as individual belief, but which they profess to *enforce* as denominational law." . . . "It is evident that the *sin* of sectarianism does not consist in the open, candid statement of what their sectarian organic laws are, but on the *actual enactment and enforcement* of these sectarian laws." "It frequently occurs that churches that frankly avow their peculiarities, *in a creed*, in the lapse of time cease to *enforce* them. *The Presbyterian Church has ceased to enforce Infant Baptism.*" Again, Christian Standard, March 4, 1876, p. 74: "The mischief does not lie in the open, manly publication of sectarian terms of fellowship, but in the actual *holding and enforcing of them.*"

PROOF 5.—Commercial, May 10, 1876: "It follows that the Presbyterian, Lutheran and Methodist denominations, taken as a whole, do not either of them constitute a *Church*, using the word in the singular number, but it would be heartily conceded that the *congregations* of believers of which these denominations are composed, is, *each one*, a Church." Again, Christian Standard, September 18, 1875, p. 298: "It is well known that I publicly maintain that the Presbyterian Church does *not* occupy Christian Union ground, and that I seek to persuade her to occupy that

ground, just as I would the Disciples." Again, Gazette, January 12, 1876: "I regard her (the Presbyterian Church) with no popish veneration. I do not consider her standards infallible. I deem it lawful to propose *revision*. . . . I regard it as perfectly ruleable in the Presbyterian Church to propose *changes in her standards in the interest of Christian Union*, to memorialize the General Assembly *to this end*, and to seek to *imbue the whole denomination* with the doctrines of the New Testament on the subject of Christian Union."

PROOF 6.—Organic Union, p. 11: "The Romish Church teaches all the children in her schools that the true Church is organically one, and that she is one while the Protestant Church is divided; she is therefore the true church. *And we too admit that the true Church should be thus united.*"

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 44 (ii, v, vi), 45 (2), 50 (*b*), 54 (11, 12), 57 (14), 91 (2), 120 (i), 147 (5), 191 (iv), 620 (7), 623 (3, 4).

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Not sustained.—Caton, Rossiter, Cortelyou, Cushman, Ritchie, Camp, Beecher, Kumler, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Chester, Hawley, Morey, White, Morris, Hills, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—24.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, West—4.

Sustained in part.—Babbitt, Dudley, Wright, Winness, Jones, Monfort, Gamble, Dallas—8.]

SPECIFICATION III.

Creeds.

As to the sinfulness of Framing and Requiring Assent to Human Creeds.—In this, that everything distinctive in creeds should be given up, or struck out, and no human inference or deduction from divine truth be allowed; that the Bible itself is an all-sufficient and the only proper creed for

all time; that the construction of an extended creed, beyond the Scripture statement of a *few* leading doctrines, the most, otherwise discordant, will accept, is a usurpation of the divine prerogative, and the enforcement of distinctive tenets upon the official ministry an oppression of the conscience.

PROOF 1.—Organic Union, pp. 48, 49: "As they (the Apostles) demanded of applicants for membership a *saving* faith in Christ, which necessarily included all other saving graces, and *thereby excluded all fatal heresies*, when this demand was actually met, so this demand, made now and met now, will now in like manner *exclude all fatal heresy*. If a brief and simple creed, embracing *a few of the leading fundamental* doctrines of the Bible, was sufficient then, so it is sufficient now. If it most wisely guarded *against perversions of Scripture* then, so it will now. If it most *effectually excluded heresy* then, so it will now. It is evident that an argument to prove the necessity for *enlarging* the creed, based on present perversions of Scripture, and the prevalence of error, is as weak as it is popish." Again, same page: "Unblushing assumption of prerogative in the Protestant Church." Again, p. 115: "Could not the Church of Rome be built on this foundation? Wherein does this principle differ from the rotten basis on which she stands?" Again, pp. 37, 38: "If he (Dr. P.) meant simply to affirm that the *whole Church of the living God, including all, of every name*, who give satisfactory scriptural evidence that they are born of the Spirit and all *true disciples of Christ*, would have the right to put in her creed *her* interpretation of *every truth* of the Bible, concerning which they could *unanimously* agree, this creed would be a *Catholic creed*, neither would it *oppress any Christian's conscience*, nor *exclude* any true disciple from the Church, or from the Lord's table." Again, p. 47: "No true Protestant needs to be convinced of the *falsity* of every argument which is framed to prove that it has become necessary to *enlarge* the creed of the primitive church." Again, Cincinnati Gazette, January 12, 1876: "Christian Union does not require the *surrender* of any peculiarities,

either of faith or practice. It simply requires that mere *peculiarities* be *not enforced, contrary to conscience*, as a matter of sectarian law." Again, Christian Unity, Jan. 17, 1874: "Did the Apostolic Church demand assent to the *Presbyterian Confession of Faith?* And if he admits it did not, should we follow apostolic example?" Again, Christian Standard, September 18, 1875: "I maintain that no creed, written or unwritten, should contain *anything that is human*. It should not contain any *human inference or deduction* of any kind whatever. *Everything human in creeds I oppose.*" Again, Christian Standard, February 26, 1876, p. 66: "We affirm that the Bible is the *only proper creed*, and that it is a *sufficient creed* for every church on earth." Again, Christian Standard, August 7, 1875, p. 252: "We affirm most heartily and positively that it (the Bible) is a *sufficient* creed, and the *only true creed*, for all true Christians, and all *ministers*, and all churches." Again, Christian Standard, March 4, 1876, p. 74: "A human creed, in whole or in part, is always objectionable; but is a purely gospel creed objectionable? A sectarian creed is *always mischievous* and *sinful*, but is a genuine New Testament creed to be condemned?"

Proof 2.—"Address to all the Christian Ministers and Churches in North America, with Basis of Union," October, 1874, Cincinnati, Rooms of Young Men's Christian Association, p. 5: "In regard to the *ordination* and *examination of ministers*, the Basis teaches that *no other tests* should be applied than the common faith which Christians have held everywhere, and in all ages of the world, as a common heritage." Again, p. 6: "As to all vexed questions at issue among evangelical believers, concerning *man's relation to God's sovereignty, forms of making religious profession, modes of worship, subjects of baptism, methods of organization, kinds and functions of church officers*, we believe they *should all be committed* to the broad and free domain of Christian liberty, until God shall, in his infinite goodness, vouchsafe to his church *greater light.*" Signed by Mr. McCune and others. Again, p. 17: "Neither do we require any assent to any denominational peculiarity, as a condition

of fellowship." Again, "Address to all," etc., p. 17: "We distinctly disclaim all intention to require an assent to *any human modification of these Scriptures*, or *any human inferences therefrom*, and we affirm it to be our purpose *only* to require an *assent* to God's own truth, *expressed in God's own language*, as it has been commonly received by all Christ's ministers and people in all times, and in all places." Again, Linwood and Mt. Lookout Basis, etc., "Preliminary Statements," November, 1875, p. 5: "We deem it wise and practicable, and at the same time both unsectarian and evangelical, to select *the truths held in common* by evangelical ministers, as *proper tests of soundness in the faith* on the part of those who ask our recognition as ministers of Christ. The *Basis of the world's evangelical alliance* is a statement of this *common faith*." Again, p. 9: "*The Evangelical Ministerial Association of Cincinnati* has also, on two occasions, made a statement of *this common faith* of all evangelical ministers."

PROOF 3.—Christian Unity, March 28, 1876: "Mr. Frost's proposition. (1.) Agree to adopt and practice *whatever we mutually agree that the Bible teaches.* (2.) Agree to give up and strike out of our respective creeds whatever causes division, and *which we ourselves do not regard as essential* to the truth. (3.) Agree to give up and strike out of our respective creeds *whatever causes divisions among us*, and for which we can not give a plain precept or example in the Word of God." Answer by Mr. McCune. "The first and third of these principles seem to us to be *sound and good*, as far as they go. But we would very much prefer to state the third principle thus, *Agree to strike out of our creeds, as a matter of law, everything which those whom we acknowledge as fellow Christians can not see to be law in Scripture.* That would meet the case and secure union. To the second principle we object most decidedly"—"on account of its vagueness." Again, Christian Unity, Aug. 1, 1875, p. 1, "The plan of organization of the Texas Convention, April 30, 1875, at Somerville." The third principle, (3.) "*That churches of Christ ought to have no authoritative creed or discipline but the Holy Scriptures.*" Note by the Rev. Mr.

Melish, co-editor with Mr. McCune. "This plan of organization, it will be noted, is very substantially *like our own*, etc. We therefore claim these good brethren to be *one with us*, genuine lovers of organic Christian unity, on the right platform," etc., etc.

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 45 (2), pp. 54–57, 81–86, 147 (5), 191 (iv), 304 (8), Baird's Digest, 638, Conf. of Faith, chap. i, sec. vi.

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Not sustained.—Caton, Rossiter, Cortelyou, Cushman, Ritchie, Camp, Dudley, Beecher, Kumler, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Chester, Hawley, Morey, White, Monfort, Morris, Hills, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—28.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, West, Wright, Potter. —5.

Sustained in part.—Leonard, Babbitt, Winness, Jones, Gamble—5.]

SPECIFICATION IV.

Vows of Ordination.

"*As to Ordination Vows.*—In this, that Presbyterian ministers, under the obligation of solemn ordination vows, may change the old views of doctrine and polity they approved and pledged themselves to maintain, at the time of their ordination, and preach, publish, and advocate their new views, claiming, meanwhile, that those who object to this should themselves leave the Presbytery, while the advocates of the new views may remain in the body for the sake of good standing, without renouncing their departures from the standards.

PROOF 1.—Christian Standard, September 18, 1875: "The Presbyterian Church only asks men at their ordination, what their present views are, and never pledges them *not to change* their views."

Proof 2.—Gazette, August 27, 1875: "You (Dr. Monfort) seem to suggest that, inasmuch as I am an advocate of organic Christian Union, there is something dishonorable, if not sinful, in my continuance as a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati. If the advocacy of Union is an 'iniquity to be punished by the judges,' we '*are at a loss to understand*' what right you have to be a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati!" "You could possibly remedy the matter, in so far as you are personally concerned (and I trust that you are the only one that feels aggrieved), by asking yourself for a letter of dismissal, and by uniting with some body of ministers in which there are no Christian Union men, if any such body can now be found." "I wish my name to remain on the roll of the Presbytery, *as an indorsement of my standing* as a Christian minister." "It is useless to make any intimations to me on this subject. I propose that my name shall stand on the roll of Presbytery as long as I remain in Cincinnati or vicinity!"

Proof 3.—Organic Union, p. 136: "To ask a man *not* to *advocate* what *he* conscientiously believes to be God's truth, is to ask him to obey men rather than God."

Proof 4.—Commercial, October 17, 1876: "It is proposed that I shall give assurance in writing that I will not further the principles which I am clearly convinced are the truth of God. My inexpressibly solemn obligation, as a minister of Christ, to preach His truth as I believe it in my heart, I am to be required to *renounce*. Presbytery is to be placed in God's stead over me. She is to be 'seated in the Temple of God,' and to show herself that she is God over my conscience."

Proof 5.—Organic Union, p. 150: "The writer of these pages can never consent to preach the gospel, in any denomination, upon condition that he shall not advocate *certain principles*, which he believes in his heart are the truths of the gospel. He believes that the *great principles* upon which the Organic Union of the Church must be consummated, are just as important as the salvation of precious souls—as the conversion of the world, for the world will never believe till the Chruch is one."

PROOF 6.—Mr. McCune's statement of Christian Union principles, given to Presbytery's Committee of Investigation, and read in Presbytery at Mount Auburn, September 13, 1876. Collateral of the Committee's Report, No. 4, p. 6: "I have publicly advocated, and *propose to advocate*, the following principles on the subject of Christian Union. I make verbatim extracts from a report read in the Synod of Cincinnati in 1870, which was published at that time by the authority of the Synod and widely circulated." See Report, from p. 7 to p. 12, inclusive, and inserted by Mr. McCune in the Collateral above specified; especially this: "We speak not of voluntary usage, of prevailing customs, or of mere recommendations, for *these* things never produce denominational divisions. We speak of *organic enactments*, of *denominational laws;* for it is *these* and these *only*, that divide the Church. *These* are the apples of discord and the wedges of division in the *Christian Church. It is these peculiar, distinctive denominational laws* which give visible form and sharp outline, and repellant and perpetuating power to divisions."

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 399 (vii, 2, 3), 410, 411, (2, 3, 6); 45 (2), 48 (2), 49 (vi), 54 (11, 12), 55 (13 *b*), 57 (14), 191 (iv), 144 (8), 218 (v), 231 (2, 3); Baird's Digest, 662 (88); Moore's Digest, 540 (v); 541 (vi); 548 48 (ii), 223; Baird's Digest, 649 (72), 651 (3, 4); Moore's Digest, 221, 222; Baird's Digest, 664.

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Not Sustained.—Caton, Rossiter, Cortelyou, Cushman, Babbitt, Camp, Dudley, Wright, Beecher, Kumler, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Chester, Hawley, Morey, Jones, White, Monfort, Potter, Morris, Hill, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—31.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, West, Gamble—4.

Sustained in part.—Leonard, Ritchie, Winness—3.]

SPECIFICATION V.

Plurality of Official Membership.

As to Plurality of Official Membership.—In this, that Presbyterian and other evangelical ministers may belong at the same time to two different ecclesiastical denominations, antagonistic in their principles, and subscribe allegiance to both.

PROOF 1.—Commercial, February 11, 1876: "I do not believe that the Presbyterian Churches are Christian Union organizations. I believe they *ought* to be."

PROOF 2.—"Address to all Christian ministers and Churches in North America, with a Basis of Union, p. 6: 'In this Basis, which we submit to your serious and prayerful attention, we have suggested what we believe must be the *initial* step, viz: to *receive* every Christian *into our fellowship*, and *every Christian minister* who teaches the *common faith* of the gospel; trusting in Divine Providence, that, if we take this step, God will vouchsafe us light and wisdom for the next.' 'Brethren, this is an attempt to induce Christians to unite *on the basis of their agreements*, as the experience of centuries has shown that they can not unite on their disagreements.' 'We ask every minister, who approves it, to say so, and to accept a cordial invitation to attend the *Christan Union Convention* which is to meet at Suffolk, Virginia, on the first Wednesday of May, 1875, at 10 o'clock, A. M. Signed by W. C. McCune and others. Again, 'Address,' etc., p. 19: 'All ministers and Churches adopting this Basis will be *recognized and enrolled* as Union Christian ministers and Churches, *to be known as* the 'Union Christian Churches of America.'"

PROOF 3.—"Address," etc., p. 19: "*Any minister* who has adopted this Basis, but *does not deem it expedient to sever existing denominational relations, shall, at his own request, be enrolled, notwithstanding.* Churches desiring to take action concerning this Basis are requested to give public notice of a meeting for that purpose. When the Church is con-

vened, it is suggested that the Basis be read, and that then a vote be taken on the two following questions: *First*, 'Do you approve the Union Christian Basis?' *Second*, 'Do you adopt the Union Christian Basis?' All Churches, either approving or adopting this Basis, are requested to send one or more *delegates* to attend a general Convention of the Union Christian Churches, at Suffolk, Va., on the first Wednesday of May, 1875. All *ministers* adopting this Basis, *including those who may not have severed heretofore existing denominational relations*, are also invited to attend the Convention, to take counsel concerning the promotion of Christian Union, and the conversion of the world." "Unanimously adopted and signed, October 24, 1874, at the Rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association, Cincinnati, Ohio." Signed by W. C. McCune, Thomas J. Melish, and others. Again, Christian Unity, August 1, 1875, p. 2: "We do not ask either *ministers or Churches to change their denominational relations.* Therefore, we are not laboring to build up a new sect." Editorial of Thomas J. Melish, co-editor with Mr. McCune of "The Christian Unity."

PROOF 4.—"Basis of Fellowship of the Union Christian Church of Linwood and Mount Lookout," Hamilton Co., Ohio, Cincinnati, November, 1875, including "*Declaration*," pp. 3–6; Preliminary Statements, pp. 6–11; "Basis of Fellowship," and "Regulations of Expediency," pp. 11–16. Page 5: "*We*, giving to each other evidence that we are Christ's disciples, *propose*, by the help of God, to *organize* a '*Union Christian Church*,' in accordance with the precepts and examples of the New Testament." Page 6: "We will, on scriptural evidence, cordially receive *all* Christians into the fellowship of this Church." "We will receive, *as ministers*, *all* who give us scriptural evidence that they are in fact ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ." "Neither do we deem it practicable to *inquire of a candidate for the ministry* concerning the sense in which he receives every verse of scripture from the beginning of the Bible to the end of it." Page 10: "Having invited Christian ministers, of *good repute for soundness in the faith, to aid us and counsel with us*,

we deem it sufficient to select from the Bible, for the occasion, the great truths of the gospel concerning which evangelical ministers are agreed, both as to their fundamental character and as to their true sense, *or* that we should use some clear and competent statement of the common faith already prayerfully and deliberately made, such as the Basis of the World's Evangelical Alliance, as the subject of conference *with any whom we are about to send out into the world to preach the everlasting gospel.*" Page 14: "We deem it expedient to elect certain of our number for one or more years, to whom we will especially commit the spiritual oversight of this Church, in conjunction with the pastor (the Rev. Mr. McCune)." "A request of a majority *of the members voting*, at a meeting duly called for that purpose, that an officer shall resign, *must be granted.*" Basis and Regulations, "unanimously adopted at Linwood, November 7, and Mt. Lookout, November 8, 1875."

PROOF 5.—Gazette, January 12, 1876: "Dr. Skinner seems to make a painfully elaborate effort to prove, by some rather confusing quotations, that the Church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout is responsible for the publication of the *Declaration and Preliminary Statements* which accompany the *Basis of Fellowship* of the Union Christian Church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout. Certainly; who ever thought otherwise? His ulterior object seems to be *to make me also responsible.* I will gladly relieve him of any further trouble in this direction. I hereby declare that I *heartily approve* of the Declaration and Preliminary Statements accompanying the Basis of Fellowship of the Union Christian Church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout, and respectfully *commend them* to the attention of the Christian public."

PROOF 6.—Christian Unity, August 1, 1875: "The Christian Unity begins (again) its career with fixed purposes and aims. It will earnestly contend that, in examining *candidates for the ministry*, all tests shall be laid aside except such as develop the faith common to the evangelical family of Christians, etc. Again, Prospectus of the Christian Unity ("monthly"), date near August, 1875: "When earnest practical men propose to obey the Christian Union precepts

of the New Testament, *by organizing an actual visible oneness*, Mr. Thrall joins those who are themselves sectarian and are not ashamed to be in the cry: O, you Christian union men are about to establish a new sect, etc." Again, Christian Unity, August 1, 1875, p. 2: "We propose to hold an *annual convention*, in different parts of the United States in the month of May, to which we invite *all ministers* who approve *our Basis* to come, and *all Churches* who accept it to send *delegates*." Again, Christian Unity, August 1, 1875, p. 5: "If the union movement is to prove a sucess, *we must organize, band ourselves together as ministers and Churches*, advocating with freedom and earnestness *our peculiar principles*. That was meant in New York in October, 1873, at Cincinnati in October, 1874, and at Suffolk in 1875. Let the work of organization go on." By Rev. W. B. Wellons, co-editor with Mr. McCune. Again, Christian Unity, August 1, 1875, p. 1. The plan of the Texas Convention, at Somerville, April 30, 1875. The third of its principles is: (3.) "That Churches of Christ ought to have no authoritative creed or discipline but the Holy Scriptures." "This plan of organization it will be noted is very substantially *like our own*, etc. We, therefore, claim these good brethren to be *one with us*, genuine lovers of organic Christian unity on the right platform, etc."

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 494 (*e*), 625 (iii, 2, 3, 4), 626 (*b*), 620 (7), 169 (8).

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain the specification. The vote was:

Not sustained.—Caton, Cortelyou, Leonard, Cushman, Ritchie, Babbitt, Camp, Dudley, Wright, Beecher, Kumler, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Winness, Chester, Hawley, Morey, Jones, White, Monfort, Potter, Morris, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—32.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, West, Gamble—4.

Sustained in part.—Rossiter, Hills—2.]

SPECIFICATION VI.

Terms of Ministerial Fellowship.

As to the Terms of Ministerial Fellowship.—In this, that no Presbytery has a right by any terms of fellowship to exclude from its ecclesiastical brotherhood, or constituent official membership, any evangelical minister of any other evangelical denomination, but that such minister is, *ipso facto*, entitled to a pastorate in any Presbyterian Church, to a seat in any Presbytery in Christendom, to the exercise of jurisdiction and control in our highest courts, eligible to the chair of instruction in Presbyterian colleges and seminaries, and should be protected in the right of private judgment and free speech.

PROOF 1.—Declaration, p. 4: "*No one* who gives scriptural evidence that he is a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ should be *excluded* from membership in any Presbytery, Conference, or association of ministers whatever, by any denominational law." Again, Gazette, August 27, 1875: "I believe that *any* Christian minister has a right to membership in any Conference, Association, or Presbytery in Christendom; and when the right is conceded, visible Christian Union can be attained, the Saviour's prayer answered, and the world saved." Again, Christian Unity, February 28, 1874, p. 4: "If a Baptist sincerely and intelligently invites me into his pulpit as a minister of Christ, what right has he *to vote me out of his Association?* If a Methodist invites me into his pulpit, what consistency is there *in voting me out of his Conference?* If a Presbyterian invites a Methodist, as an ambassador of the Lord Jesus Christ, to preach, in view of the infinite responsibilities of preaching, *how can he refuse him ministerial fellowship* in his Presbytery? Has Christ one standard for gospel ministers and Presbytery another?" Again, Christian Unity, May 2, 1874, p. 4: "Dr. Monfort will say I believe Mr. Baumes is one of Christ's ministers, but I can never vote to fellowship him as a minister in this Presbytery. I admit he is Christ's

minister, but *my conscience* will not permit me to receive him as a minister in this Presbytery of ministers, organized according to Christ's authority. Beautiful consistency! Delightful fellowship!"

Proof 2.—Mr. McCune in "The Church Union" of September 12, 1874, p. 4: "*Every* minister who can give satisfactory evidence that he is one of Christ's ministers, should be received as such in *every* Presbytery, Conference, and association of ministers, as a member in good and regular standing, *entitled to every privilege and eligible to every position which such membership implies.*"

Proof 3.—"Basis of Fellowship of the *Union Christian Church* of Linwood and Mt. Lookout," November, 1875, p. 13: "We will concede the right of private judgment and liberty of speech alike to all whom we do receive." Again, Organic Union, p. 136: "To ask a man *not to advocate* what *he* conscientiously believes to be God's own truth, is to ask him to obey men rather than God; and if he complies, he places erring sinful man on the throne of the Lord God omnipotent." Christian Standard, April 22, 1876, p. 130: "I do claim the right of private judgment for all men absolutely, without exception." * * * "And further, *any views* a Christian entertains *before* he comes into the Church he has a right *to hold and advocate after he comes in.*"

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 399 (vii, 2, 3, 4), 410, 411, (2, 3, 4), 44 (ii), 45 (2), 48 (ii), 49 (vi), 54 (11), 55 (1, 2), 57 (14), 63 (2), 85 (4), 91 (2), 92 (ii, 2), 148 (8), 620 (7), 169 (8), 191 (iv), 218 (v). Cases of Harker, Balch, Davis, Craighead, Barnes.

Note.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, Ritchie, Babbitt, Camp, Dudley, West, Wright, Maxwell, James, Winness, Jones, Monfort, Potter, Gamble, Conn—17.

Sustained in part.—Caton, Cortelyou, Cushman, Beecher, Kumler, Chidlaw, Chester, Morey, White, Morris, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett —17.

Not sustained.—Rossiter, Hawley, Hills, McGechan—4.]

SPECIFICATION VII.

Infant Church Membership Denied.

As to the Constituent Membership of the New Testament Church.—In this, that the doctrine of infant church-membership, grounded in the covenant of God with believers, in behalf of their offspring, is to be repudiated as a High-church theory, and that the true definition of the New Testament Church is that it consists of Christians only, believers only—not their children—an assembly or company of the regenerate alone.

PROOF 1.—Cincinnati Commercial, May 9, 1876: "The Presbyterian theory concerning a local Church is expressed in the Presbyterian Form of Government, Chapter II, Section 2: 'The *universal Church* consists of all those persons in every nation, *together with their children*, who make a profession of the holy religion of Christ and of submission to his laws.' In Section 4 we have the definition of a local or particular Church, as follows: 'A particular Church consists of a number of professing Christians, *with their offspring*, voluntarily associated together for divine worship and godly living, agreeably to the Holy Scriptures, and submitting to a certain form of government.' By 'professing Christians' in this definition, we presume, is meant those who make a credible profession of faith in Christ, of repentance, of obedience, of being born again, of being new creatures in Christ Jesus; in a word, those who give evidence that they are *Christians*. But what is meant by the declaration that the '*offspring*' of professing Christians are included in the Church is not so clear." * * "We believe it may be truly affirmed in fact, and in actual practice, Presbyterians have not corrupted their churches by the admission to practical and efficient membership of a multitude of unbelieving, unconverted children, *although such a theory may still linger among certain High-churchmen.* Neither does *the denial of membership to children* conflict

with the doctrine of *infant baptism*, unless the sacramentarian dogma is admitted that baptism is the 'door into the church,' which not one single text of Scripture affirms." Again, further on: "It is essential to a local Christian Church that it should be composed of Christians, so far as we are able to judge. Some would add, 'and also includes their children,' but this is *not a part of the common faith.*" "*A Christian Church is a Church of Christians, an assembly of believers, a company of regenerate souls.*"

PROOF 2.—Christian Standard, April 22, 1876: "*I utterly repudiate the doctrine of infant church-membership.*" Again, Commercial, October 17, 1876: "It has been said by those hostile to this great principle of Church Union, thus formulated, that it would *exclude all baptised children from church-membership*, who can not give satisfactory scriptural evidence that they are Christians. *I unhesitatingly admit that this is true.*"

PROOF 3.—Christian Standard, February 26, 1876: "*The Presbyterian Church has ceased to enforce infant baptism.*"

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 107 (ii, iv), 108 (2, *a*, *b*, *d*), 497, (vi), 671 (ix, i), 705. Conf. of Faith, xxv (ii), xxviii (iv). Larger Cat., *Q*. 62, 166. Shorter Catechism, *Q*. 95. Conf. of Faith, xxv (v), xxix (viii).

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs *did* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, Ritchie, Babbitt, Camp, West, Wright, Beecher, Kumler, Winness, Morey, White, Monfort, Potter, Hills, Gamble, Evans, Dallas, Conn—20.

Sustained in part.—Rossiter, Cortelyou, Cushman, Dudley, James, Hawley, Jones, Morris, Schwenk, Kennett—10.

Not sustained.—Caton, Maxwell, Chidlaw, Chester, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Mansfield—8.]

SPECIFICATION VIII.

Admission of Unbaptised Persons.

As to the Admission of Unbaptised Persons to Church Membership.—In this, that unbaptised persons who deny, or scruple to admit, the necessary and perpetual obligation of water-baptism, as instituted by Christ, and the Ordinance of Baptism itself as a covenant sign and seal, and initiatory rite of entrance, for believing adults, into the Christian Church, may, notwithstanding, be admitted to church membership; and that the one condition and requirement for entrance into the visible church is credible evidence of faith in Christ.

PROOF 1.—Christian Standard, April 22, 1876: "I would *vote to receive* any one who can give satisfactory evidence that he is a true Christian, and cheerfully grant him forbearance as a fellow member in the church, *although he has the views of the 'Friends' concerning water-baptism.*" Again, Commercial, October 17, 1876: "It has been further stated that this principle (Christian Union) would admit a 'Friend' who could give satisfactory scriptural evidence that he was a Christian, but who could not conscientiously be baptised with water. *I admit this also.*"

PROOF 2.—Report of Presbytery's Investigating Committee; Collateral No. 4, pp. 15, 16: "It has been said, in effect, that this doctrine can not be true, because, if it is, it would admit to church fellowship *every member* of the societies, commonly called Quakers, who can give scriptural evidence that they have been savingly renewed by the Holy Ghost, and who make a credible profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, *and who at the same time deny the perpetual obligation of water-baptism.* I cordially admit that members of the society of 'Friends' *can* give this evidence, and that this great principle of church fellowship *would concede to them all the fellowship they will accept.*"

PROOF 3.—Christian Standard, April 22, 1876, p. 130:

"The '*Quaker gun*' never alarmed me. And I have all the time maintained, just as I do now, that faith in Christ is the only New Testament requirement for *membership*." "In the exceptional case of a Christian who does not believe in water-baptism at all, his faith in Christ entitles him to membership nevertheless." Again, Christian Standard, Nov. 13, 1875, p. 362: "We maintain that faith in Christ is not merely the great condition, but the *only* condition."

Again, Christian Standard, p. 362: "We add, that when we say that faith in Christ is the 'one essential condition of entrance,' we mean that is the *only* condition."

How contrary to the standards of our Church the above is, see Conf. of Faith, xxviii (i, ii). Larger Catechism, *Q.* 165, 166, 176. Moore's Digest, 677 (10) (iv); 678, 129 (4); 430 (5), 671 (ix, i), 674 (iii, 1, 2), 675 (5, 6), 676 (7).

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs *did* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, Ritchie, Camp, West, Wright, Beecher, Kumler, Chidlaw, James, Winness, Morey, White, Monfort, Potter, Hill, Gamble, Evans, Schwenk, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—23.

Sustained in part.—Caton, Rossiter, Costelyou, Cushman, Babbitt, Dudley, Hawley, Jones, Morris, Dallas—10.

Not sustained.—Maxwell, Chester, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman—5.]

SPECIFICATION IX.

Saving Faith, What Is It?

As to saving *Faith in Christ and in the Word of God.*—In this, that a person may have true and saving faith in Christ, and in God's Word, without believing either that Christ was true man or that the Word of God is truly infallible, and that true and saving faith, *ipso facto*, excludes all fatal heresy.

PROOF 1.—Christian Unity, January 31, 1874, p. 4: "We believe that a man may be a Christian and *not believe in the infallibility of the Bible*, although 'almost' all Christians

do believe the Bible to be infallible." "We believe that a man may be a Christian and not believe in the *proper humanity of Christ*, although 'almost' all Christians do believe that Jesus was *true man* as well as God."

PROOF 2.—Organic Union, pp. 48, 49: "As they, the Apostles, demanded of applicants for membership *a saving faith* in Christ, which necessarily included all other saving graces, and *thereby excluded all fatal heresies*, when this demand was actually met, so this demand, made now, and met now, will now in like manner *exclude all fatal heresy*." Again, Christian Unity, January 31, 1874: "Regenerate souls are *all orthodox*."

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Conf. of Faith, chap. xiv (i, ii), chap. i (v, x), Shorter Catechism, *Q.* 86; Conf. of Faith, chap. viii (ii); Larger Catechism, *Q.* 36, 37, 39.

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Not sustained.—Caton, Rossiter, Cortelyou, Cushman, Babbitt, Camp, Dudley, Wright, Beecher, Kumler, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Chester, Hawley, Morey, Jones, White, Monfort, Morris, Hills, Evans, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—29.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, West—3.

Sustained in part.—Leonard, Ritchie, Winness, Potter, Gamble, Schwenk—6.]

SPECIFICATION X.

Time of Advocating His Views.

As to *Persistance* in *Advocacy of the foregoing Doctrines, Principles, and Views.*—In this, that for many years last past, the Rev. W. C. McCune, being a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, has regularly persisted, as lecturer, editor and pastor, to openly proclaim, publish and advocate, the aforesaid Christian Union doctrines, principles and views; that since the appointment of the Presbytery's Committee of Investigation, he has continued to do the same in the public secular press, May 9, 1876, before the

Presbytery's Investigating Committee, June 26, 1876, and openly in Presbytery itself, October 4, 1876, and again in the secular press, October 17, 1876, subsequent to the appointment of the Prosecuting Committee; having announced his purpose to pursue in future, as in the past, the the advocacy of the same principles of Christian Union.

PROOF.—Commercial, February 11, 1876: "I have been perfectly candid and outspoken on this subject, for *many years*." "I do not believe the Presbyterian Churches are Christian Union organizations. I believe they ought to be." "If the Presbytery is not willing to allow me *the liberty I have enjoyed unquestioned till Dr. Skinner made his attack*, that is a matter for her to determine." Again, Commercial, February 15, 1876: "*I am advocating no sentiments, now, that I have not openly proclaimed for ten years back.*" Again, Commercial, May 9, 1876: Article in full, read before "The Evangelical Ministerial Association" of Cincinnati. Again, Collateral No. 4 of the Report of the Presbytery's Investigating Committee, June 26, 1876. Again, Commercial's Report of Presbytery's Proceedings, October 5, 1876. Again, Commercial, Mr. McCune's Protest, October 17, 1876. Again, Collateral No. 4, pp. 20, 21: "I have written largely for the press, secular and religious, as an editor and contributor, *in the last twenty years*." Again, p. 6: "I have publicly advocated and *propose* to *advocate* the following principles on the subject of Christian Union, etc."

How contrary to the standards of our Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 48 (2), 54 (3), 55 (2), 304 (8), 57 (14); Cases of Harker, Balch, Davis, Craighead, and Barnes.

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs *did* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, Cushman, Babbitt, Camp, Dudley, West, Wright, Winness, Potter, Hill—12.

Sustained in part.—Caton, Rossiter, Ritchie, Kumler, James, Hawley, Morey, Jones, White—9.

Not sustained.—Cortelyou, Beecher, Maxwell, Chidlaw, Chester, Monfort, Morris, Gamble, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—17.]

SPECIFICATION XI.

Common Fame.

As to the Common Fame in reference to the Whole Charge.—In this, that in addition to evidence involved in the foregoing proofs, attached to the specifications, many newspapers have published articles concerning it, and the Presbytery of Cincinnati appointed a Committee of Investigation, April 13, 1876, "to confer with Mr. McCune and examine into certain rumors touching his loyalty to the Presbyterian Church, and report to the Presbytery." Said Committee having so conferred and examined, and so reported at Mt. Auburn, September 13, 1876.

PROOF 1.—Herald and Presbyter, November 8, 1873; August 18, 1875; January 5, 1876; March 22, 1876. Christian Observer, December 22, 1875; January 19, 1876; January 26, 1876. Journal and Messenger, January 19, 1876; January 26, 1876. Christian Standard, many articles from July 1875 to April, 1876. The Presbyterian Weekly, January 20, 1876; February 3, 1876. Christian Union, January 26, 1876. Cincinnati Gazette, August 27, 1875; December 17, 1875; December 30, 1875; January 11, 12, 21, 24, 25, 1876. Cincinnati Commercial, February 8, 9, 10, 11, 1876; February 5, 1876. Christian News, February, 1876. The Interior, February 10, 17, 26, 1876; March, 2, 16, 1876. Central Presbyterian, February 9, 1876, quoting the United Presbyterian, North-western Christian Advocate, February, 1876. New York Evangelist, March 9, 1876. The Presbyterian, January 19 and 22, 1876; February 12, 1876.

PROOF 2.—Action of the Cincinnati Presbytery, at Glendale, April 13, 1876: "Whereas, for *some time past*, there

have been *current rumors* in regard to the views and course of Rev. W. C. McCune, a member of this Presbytery, involving the question of his *loyalty* to the order of the Presbyterian Church, and whereas, there seems to be some difference of opinion in regard to the subject;

"Therefore, *Resolved*, that a Committee of three ministers and two ruling elders be appointed to have a full conference with Mr. McCune, and to inquire into all the facts bearing on the case and report to Presbytery at the next stated meeting."

PROOF 3.—Special report of the Investigating Committee of Presbytery, published in Gazette, September 14, 1876: Mr. McCune's scheme "denies, in effect, the right of every Evangelical Church to testify in favor of any peculiar doctrine of its system, whether Arminian or Calvinistic, Baptist or Pædo-Baptist, Prelatical, Presbyterial, or Congregational. It allows no system of doctrines, no order of worship, no form of government, for it claims union upon what is common to Evangelical Churches, and these churches have in these respects nothing common. They may be said to agree in requiring faith and regeneration, as evidences of conversion, but they may differ widely, and do differ in regard to the nature of faith and the work of the Holy Ghost. The system makes a call to the ministry the only bond of ministerial fellowship in Organic Church Union, while Evangelical Churches differ on the question, what is a call to the ministry. It misinterprets the Savior's prayer that his people 'may be one' as fulfilled only by Organic Church Union. Mr. McCune, with his usual frankness, acknowledges that under his system, which requires that all churches should receive to membership all whom they believe Christ has received, he would admit orthodox Friends who deny the outward rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This does not accord with our standards, which teach that baptism admits the party baptized into the visible church; that it is a great sin to neglect or contemn this ordinance, and that this ordinance is intended to put a visible difference between those that belong to the church and the rest of the world. To us it seems

very plain, that a church without sacraments can not be regarded as a part of the visible church, although true Christians in it may be part of the 'household of faith,' and may have fellowship with any branch of the visible church in prayer and in Christian work. Our assembly has decided that a person having scruples in regard to infant baptism may nevertheless be received to membership in our Church; but this forbearance can not be extended to any one in regard to his own baptism. There are many things that a disciple may learn in regard to duty after his reception into the Church, but his own baptism is essential to his reception and the completion of it, if he has not been baptized in infancy. Any system of Christian Union which contravenes these principles and ignores the command of Christ, 'Go teach all nations, baptizing them,' etc., if held and practiced by our office bearers, must be damaging to the purity and unity of the Church. If we understand Mr. McCune's paper, his views are also erroneous in regard to the relations of the baptized children of believing parents. He professes to believe in infant baptism, but he denies infant membership. The baptism of infants gives them, as he holds, no advantage over the unbaptized in their relation to the Church. He does not admit that they are even minors in the Commonwealth of Israel. This we regard as erroneous, and as bringing infant baptism into disrepute. According to this system, Orthodox Friends may be admitted to the visible Church without baptism, while infants may be baptized and yet have no connection with the Church. Either view is a denial that baptism admits the party baptized into the visible Church, and any one who holds these views can not be expected to teach that it is a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance."

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 499 (iv, v). See also Resolution of Presbytery of Glendale, appointing Committee of Investigation in the case of Mr. McCune, April 13, 1876. Special Report of Investigating Committee, Mt. Auburn, September 13, 1876.

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Not sustained.—Caton, Rossiter, Cortelyou, Cushman, Ritchie, Babbitt, Camp, Dudley, Wright, Beecher, Kumler, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Winness, Chester, Hawley, Morey, Jones, White, Monfort, Morris, Gamble, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—32.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, West, Potter—5.

Sustained in part.—Hills—1.]

Note as to the Charge.

Presbytery voted that none of the specifications which they *did* sustain, and none of the proofs under any of the specifications which they did *not* sustain, proved the truth of the matter of this Charge I. The vote was:

Not sustained.—Caton, Cortelyou, Cushman, Ritchie, Babbitt, Camp, Dudley, Beecher, Kumler, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Chester, Hawley, Morey, Jones, White, Monfort, Morris, Hills, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn.—29.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, West, Wright, Winness, Potter, Gamble—8.

Offense: Disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church.

CHARGE II.

That the Rev. W. C. McCune, being a minister of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, has, in contravention of his vows of loyalty to the distinctive government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church, and for the publicly avowed purpose of carrying into practical effect the doctrines, principles, and views specified under Charge I, been instrumental in advising, promoting, and encouraging

the new anti-denominational association of the "Union Christian Churches of America;" and, also, the new anti-denominational organization at Linwood and Mount Lookout, founded on these doctrines, principles, and views, his course herein being, if generally allowed, totally subversive of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church, and of its very existence as a distinctive denomination.

This Charge rests upon the following specifications, to wit:

SPECIFICATION I.

General Association.

As to the "Union Christian Churches of America."—In this, that the Rev. W. C. McCune, during certain years last past, has advocated and promoted the new anti-denominational association of independent "Union Christian Churches of America," by editing the "Christian Unity" in Cincinnati, by lecturing at large upon the subject of organic union, by issuing an "Address to all the Christian ministers and churches in North America with a Basis of Union," by joining himself to this Association, calling upon all in sympathy with the new movement to adopt the basis, enroll themselves in the new association, send delegates to attend its annual conventions, and to advocate the peculiar principles of organic union.

PROOF 1.—The first editorial of the Christian Unity, published by Rev. W. C. McCune, Vol. I, No. 1, Cincinnati, November 8, 1873. Also, the three first editorials of the Christian Unity (resumed), published by its three joint editors, Revs. W. B. Wellons, D. D., Thos. J. Melish, and W. C. McCune, at Suffolk, Va., and Cincinnati, Ohio, August 1, 1875.

PROOF 2.—See, under Charge I, Specification V, the quotations in Proofs 2, 3, 6.

PROOF 3.—Christian Unity, December, 1873, p. 4: "The editor of this paper has for eighteen or twenty years proposed, that when it should seem evident that a fit time had come, he would devote himself to the advocacy of the vis-

ible unity of all true Christians. And he has always supposed that the most efficient instrumentalities for furthering Christian Union were public oral addresses and the press. And when he began, on the eighth of November, to issue this paper, he at the same time began to deliver lectures on the subject of Christian Unity. And now, by request, he will give a brief account of this part of his work. He has spoken at Butler, and Boston, and Newport, in Kentucky; and in Goshen and South Salem, and at Parrot's Schoolhouse, and Linden, and in Springfield and Urbana, at Buck Creek Church, and in New Richmond and Hillsboro', in Ohio; and on last Saturday evening he spoke at Madison, near Middletown; on Sabbath morning in the Presbyterian Church in Middletown, of which Rev. J. W. Clokey is pastor; on Sabbath afternoon in a school-house near the village of Astoria; on Sabbath evening in Jacksonburg, in the church of which Rev. J. Emerick is pastor; and on Monday evening in the Baptist Church in Middletown, of which Rev. Mr. Booth is pastor. In all, he has spoken in eighteen different places."

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 304 (8), 44 (ii, v), 411 (3, 4, 6), 399 (vii, 3), 57, 54 (3), 55 (12, 2 and 13 *b*), 93 (10), 95 (32, 1), 96. Baird's Digest, 626, 630, 631, 638, 648, 651, 686, 692. Moore's Digest, 122, 123. Baird's Digest, 704.

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs did *not* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Not sustained.—Caton, Ritchie, Camp, Dudley, Beecher, Kumler, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Chester, Hawley, Morey, Jones, White, Monfort, Morris, Evans, Schwenk, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Dallas, Mansfield, Kennett, Conn—25.

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Babbitt, West, Winness, Potter—6.

Sustained in part.—Rossiter, Cortelyou, Leonard, Cushman, Wright, Hill, Gamble—7.]

SPECIFICATION II.

Linwood and Mt. Lookout.

As to the Organization of the Linwood and Mount Lookout Church.—In this, that the Rev. W. C. McCune actively co-operated in organizing, and desired to organize, and agreed with others to organize before and during November, 1875, for the avowed purpose of putting into practice his Organic Union principles, the new organization at Linwood and Mt. Lookout, preparing and commending to the public the Declaration and Preliminary Statements accompanying its Basis of Fellowship, thus promoting a new society which receives all Christians, whether dismissed or undismissed, and all evangelical ministers without exception, provides for the examination of candidates for the ministry, and for sending forth ministers to preach the gospel; and has joined himself hereto, accepting a call and becoming its first pastor, being examined in theology and installed by an irresponsible, because undelegated, Council, and all this without leave of, or dismission from his Presbytery, and against advice to the contrary, and is, at present, pastor of said society.

PROOF 1.—As to the organization of Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church—Declaration, Basis, Candidates, Ministry —see, under Charge I, Specification V, the quotations in Proofs 2, 4, 5.

PROOF 2.—Joined himself to this Society. Commercial, February 8, 1876: "I pass on to direct attention to the fact that Dr. Skinner's article abounds in naked assertions. He says: 'The L. and Mt. L. Society has no ordained officers of any kind whatever,' etc. Does he deny that *I am an officer*, then, or does he deny my ordination? Which?"

PROOF 3.—Time of Organization. Basis of Fellowship, p. 13. The distinctive title, "Union Christian Church at Linwood and Mount Lookout." Again, Collateral No. 2, of Presbytery's Investigating Committee's Report: "The Church was organized November 8 and 10, 1875." Again,

Herald and Presbyter, January 5, 1876: "The Church was established or organized at Linwood, November 7, and at Mt. Lookout November 8." Again, The Presbyterian, February 26, 1876: "This organization was completed November 24, 1875. The Rev. Mr. McCune, *now* its pastor, was present at the meeting, but did not act *officially*. 'He acted merely in the capacity of a Christian, desiring *that such organization might be effected*, his position as a minister only *giving him somewhat greater prominence in the matter than any other of the brethren*.' Thus testifies one of the members of the Church." Again, Gazette, January 24, 1876: "I accepted the invitation to preach at Linwood and Mount Lookout *a year* before the Union Church was organized, but it was *mutually agreed* that we should look toward the organization of a Union Church." Again, see, under Charge I, Specification V, the Proof 5. Again, Collateral No. 4, p. 3: "I did approve of the movement, and after they had sent for me to preach for them, I *counseled and co-operated* with those who did organize this Church."

PROOF 4.—The Presbyterian, February 26, 1876: "It has been charged that this Church, at its organization, received persons as members who were still members of other Churches and without letters. The fact is, that several of these persons were Baptists or Episcopalians. It was taken for granted that, in their case, to apply for letters would be useless. A few were Presbyterians. These persons should doubtless have pursued a more orderly course. Their coming with the rest on profession was an irregularity." * * "It has been charged that Mr. McCune was a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati at the time of his installation over this Church, and that he had never asked the permission of his Presbytery to form these new relations. Such is the fact, and here is another irregularity."

PROOF 5.—Accepting a call and being installed. Collateral No. 3, p. 2: "In the second place, the Church further requested the Council to *instal* as its pastor the Rev. W. C. McCune, who had been *unanimously called to that office*." Again, Collateral No. 4, pp. 1, 2: "I have *accepted the pastorate* of the Union Christian Church at Linwood and

Mount Lookout." Again, Collateral No. 4, p. 4: "*I have violated no Presbyterian law whatever in accepting my present pastorate*, nor in anything I have done pertaining to the Union Christian Church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout. If there is any Presbyterian law requiring a minister to first gain the consent of his Presbytery before accepting a pastorate *outside of Presbyterian jurisdiction*, I have no knowledge of it." Again, The Presbyterian, February 12, 1876: "Has a Presbyterian minister a right to accept a pastorate outside Presbyterian jurisdiction? Any petty question about the formality of first asking leave may interest hair-splitting ecclesiastical lawyers, whose vocation it is to tithe mint, anise, and cummin. If Presbytery says the *thing done is right*, I will be content. If she says I should have first asked leave, *I will plead ignorance and indifference*." "And has he a right to advocate such Union, as I do? This might have been a fair question *eight or ten years ago*, in my case, but it is certainly *too late now*."

PROOF 6.—The Council, Examination, and Installation, Collateral No. 3, p. 1: "The Council was composed of ten ministers, connected with four evangelical denominations. Letters of sympathy were received from several others, who for various reasons were unable to be present. Those in attendance were *not delegated by any ecclesiastical bodies*, but came *simply as individuals* upon the invitation of the Church, in accordance with a familiar Congregational usage. They consequently did not assume, in any sense, to represent their respective denominations, but acted *entirely on their own responsibility as Christian men*." Again, Gazette, December 17, 1875: "After a full *examination* as to his doctrinal soundness, and his motive in undertaking the pastoral office in connection with this Church, it was

"*Resolved*, That we recognize in Rev. W. C. McCune an intelligent and thoughtful expositor of the Scriptures, and a reliable teacher on all vital points of doctrine," etc., etc.

"The installation of Rev. W. C. McCune took place at half-past seven o'clock, in Linwood Hall, before a large number of citizens of Linwood, according to the programme adopted at the Council in the afternoon."

PROOF 7.—Against advice. Letter of Rev. Thomas H. Skinner to Rev. W. C. McCune:

CINCINNATI, December 11, 1875.

Rev. W. C. MCCUNE:

My dear Brother—Your invitation to me, to take part with others in the recognition of the "Union Christian Church," at Linwood and Mt. Lookout, reached me this morning. I must decline its acceptance. My reasons for so doing I can not now state in detail; yet a few things I will say, which, I think, will sufficiently reveal my views. I am a Presbyterian minister, and owe my standing and protection to the Presbyterian organization. I received ordination, and have retained it, because I solemnly and publicly received and adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, approved of the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in these United States, and promised to be *zealous* and *faithful* in maintaining the purity and peace of said Church. I do not think that by taking part in the services to which I am invited, I would evince either zeal or fidelity in maintaining the *purity* and *peace* or the *unity* of the Church. The principles involved in your organization would, if I understand them, be destructive of the Presbyterian Church, were they successfully and generally carried out. Marching as I do under the banner of this Church, and sacredly pledged as I am to "*study* its peace, unity, and purity," I can not reconcile it with my conscience or sense of honor to put my imprimatur on your course while you are still a member of the Presbytery. Our General Assembly has declared that "it is not the prerogative of a minister of the gospel to organize Churches without the previous action of some Presbytery directing or permitting it;" the exceptions made having no reference to such a case as that of the Linwood Church. (Moore's Digest, p. 173.) Had I thought and felt as you have done on the subject of Church polity and creeds, before I acted in the organization of a Church in the bounds of the Presbytery and yet out of its jurisdiction, I would have dissolved my connection with the Presbytery, and so have

been released from my vows of fealty and service to the Presbyterian Church. I know you will pardon me this frank expression of my views.

Fraternally yours,

THOMAS H. SKINNER.

PROOF 8.—Pastor now. See Minutes of the General Assembly for 1876, p. 233. Also, Records of Presbytery of Cincinnati, Mt. Auburn, September 13, 1876.

How contrary to the standards of the Church the above is, see Moore's Digest, p. 173, 107 (1, *a*), 57 (14), 409 (ix), 416 (i, ii); 107 (1, *b*); 169 (8, *c*, *d*); 416 (i), 409 (ix); 417 (iii); 418 (iv), 149 (10, 12); 616 (i), 619 (4).

NOTE.

[Presbytery voted that the foregoing proofs *did* sustain this specification. The vote was:

Sustained.—Lichstenstein, Long, Leonard, West, Winness, Potter, Gamble—7.

Sustained in part.—Caton, Rossiter, Cortleyou, Cushman, Babbitt, Dudley, Wright, Maxwell, Chidlaw, James, Chester, Hawley, Jones, Hills, Schwenk, Dallas, Kennett, Conn—18.

Not sustained.—Ritchie, Camp, Beecher, Kumler, Morey, White, Monfort, Evans, Johnston, McGechan, Hyndman, Mansfield—12. Excused—Morris.]

In conclusion, as stated in the preceding Charges, the views and course of the Rev. W. C. McCune are in contravention, to wit:

1. Of his ministerial vows. Digest, p. 410, xii (2), (3), (4), (6); p. 399, vii (2), (3), (4). Installation of Rev. W. C. McCune, at Lincoln Park Church. See Records of Presbytery.

2. Of the terms of the doctrinal and ecclesiastical Basis of Union adopted by the Cincinnati Presbytery (O. S.), Avondale. See Records of Cincinnati Presbytery (O. S.), September 8, 1869. Digest, p. 91, ii, iii; p. 92, ii.

3. Of the Rev. W. C. McCune's vote adopting said Basis at said Presbytery. See Record of vote in Cincinnati Presbytery (O. S.), September 8, 1869.

4. Of the Basis of Union adopted by the whole Presbyterian Church, O. S. and N. S., and declared adopted in Joint Convention at Pittsburg, Pa., November, 12, 1869. See Digest, p. 95 (32), (33), p. 96 (33), (34).

Respectfully submitted by the Presbytery's Committee of Prosecution.

THOMAS H. SKINNER,
E. D. LEDYARD,
S. J. THOMPSON,
Committee.

Note as to the Charge.

Presbytery voted that neither the second specification, which it *did* sustain, nor any of the proofs under either of the specifications, the first of which it did *not* sustain, proved the truth of the matter of this Charge. The vote was the same as on the foregoing Charge, except that the Rev. Mr. Wright voted *not sustained*, and the Rev. Mr. Babbitt voted *sustained.*

SYNOPSIS OF THE CASE.

I. The two general Charges, or rather one Charge in two-fold form.

II. The Specifications under each Charge to support the same.

III. The Proofs under each Specification.

IV. The References to the Standards as contravened by Mr. McCune's teachings and course.

V. The reference to the ministerial Vows of Mr. McCune.

VI. The Reference to the adoption of the Basis of Reunion, by the Whole Presbyterian Church, the Presbytery of Cincinnati, and by Mr. McCune.

OPENING ARGUMENT

FOR THE PROSECUTION,

BY

REV. THOS. H. SKINNER.

ARGUMENT FOR THE PROSECUTION.

May it please the Court, Moderator, and Brethren of the Presbytery of Cincinnati:

The Presbyterian Church is a foundation not to be destroyed. "God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved." "The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwel- among them." Ps. 67: 17, 18. "Wherefore He saith, when He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men. And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; 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 fullness of Christ; that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but, speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, who is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." Eph. 4: 8, 11–17.

Upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, the Presbyterian Church has built her house. Her historic doctrine and order, written by a divine finger, and consecrated by the

breath of inspiration, baptized with martyr-blood, and tested in the flame, all are dear to us beyond any earthly treasure. He that toucheth it, toucheth the apple of our eye. We make no vain boast, crying, "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are we!" We embrace in the spirit of Christian charity all other evangelical denominations, differing from us on many points and in many ways. But what we do hold as distinctive and peculiar, we engrave on our hearts and unfold on our Presbyterian banner, not ashamed to maintain that it is the truth of God, nor backward to defend it against every assault, whether from friendly foes without, or feigned friends within.

Therefore, in the name of "The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," whose constitution and whose laws have been assailed, traduced, despised—whose honor has been wounded, name denied, and peace and unity and purity disturbed, does the prosecution, advanced, by your order, to its high responsibility, come into the court of this Presbytery to vindicate the doctrine and the rights of said church against the erroneous teaching and the revolutionary course of the defendant impleaded at your bar. This is "judicial process." The question is, *Have we a "right to exist?"*

The case before us is of no ordinary importance. Its gravity outweighs that of all other cases put together, throughout the whole period of the history of the Presbyterian Church. It involves, not only the truth of her fundamental doctrines, but the foundation also of her whole ecclesiastical edifice, with the structure itself built thereon. In other cases, the most that has been put in question by any of her sons has been some special phases of some special doctrines, or some particulars of polity. This, puts in question her very right to hold distinctive doctrines, her very right to build her Presbyterian house. The issues raised by the defendant, contemplate no less an outcome, in the future, than the overthrow of her whole superstructure, and the tearing up of her whole foundation as a distinctive denomination, and the re-organization of the Presbyterian and all other denominations after the pattern of the new-

born institute at Linwood and Mount Lookout. Her Presbyterian organization, government, discipline, creed, denominational enactments, her ordinances, terms of fellowship and ministry, her vows of ordination, covenant, and right to live—all are put in question. "The form of the house and the fashion thereof, and the goings-out thereof, and the comings-in thereof, and all the laws thereof—upon the top of the mountain, the whole limit thereof, roundabout"—the absolute "law of the house"—all is called in question. That apostolic pattern of the Church of Christ, which reforming hands have saved from travesties and *de*formations of fifteen hundred years, and summoned to a new exhibition at the call of the reforming angel, "Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein"—the gospel church, its ministry, its doctrines, ordinances, fellowship, and form—must now be substituted by a new pattern shown in Mount Lookout towering over Horeb, higher than the new Jerusalem! The symbols of Westminster, last and ripest fruit of eighteen hundred years of conflict, gathering to themselves the truth upon the doctrine and the order of the house of God, must be remanded to the dust of mediæval manuscripts, the dingy alcoves of some old monastery, or, like Ephesian books of sorcery, be committed to the fire to please the "spirit of the age," the tone and temper of "organic union."

To the advocacy of such liberalism as this, have we come within a semi-decade from the date of our reunion. Its toleration was impossible for thirty years last past in either branch. After long struggle to reach some authoritative declaration upon a subject of such vast importance to the Church, this Court is here convened at last judicially to say whether the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards, upon which the reunion was effected, shall endure, respected by our officers and people, or whether the Presbyterian denomination, as such, is a foundation to be destroyed for the sake of organic union. The Presbyterian Church asserts her scriptural authority, that is, her divine right to exist, precisely as she is to-day, under her distinctive standards as a separate denomination, protected

by her own denominational enactments and pledged to the enforcement of her doctrine and discipline. The defendant, a member of this Presbytery, asserts a counter-claim no less than this, that the Presbyterian denomination, as such, like all other evangelical denominations, built upon distinctive creeds, has no right whatever to exist, but should desist at once from the enforcement of her distinctive doctrines and her order, and plant herself upon organic union ground. Such is the issue plainly put, clear and unmistakable.

The charges and specifications presented by the prosecution are in your hands. They speak for themselves. The general charge, in twofold form, is disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church in contravention of ordination vows. The specifications support the charges. The proofs support the specifications. The law points are appended to evince the fact that what is charged is an offense against the peace, the unity, and the purity of the Presbyterian Church, and a violation of the ordination vows. The prosecution call for the reading of the specifications seriatim, leaving the general charge, in its twofold form, to be read at the close of the argument.

SPECIFICATION I.

Law of Organization.

I proceed to consider Specification first. Mr. McCune asserts "the divine law of organization," the law of organic, visible Christian union, is tersely and comprehensively stated in Rom. xv, 7: "Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ has received us, to the glory of God." Nothing is clearer than that this text relates wholly to personal Christian fellowship and spiritual communion among those who were already members of the church at Rome, but among whom internal dissensions or schisms in the body had arisen on account of meats and drinks, festivals and ceremonies. It is the conclusion of an argument on things *indifferent*, commenced in chapter xiv, 1: "Him that is weak in the faith (*i. e.* in moral conviction as to duty in the premises, for this is the meaning of '*pistis*' here) receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." The word translated "receive" (*proslambanesthe*), the same word used

Rom. xv, 7, occurs twelve times in the New Testament, and signifies (1) taking nourishment, and (2) personal companionship and friendship. The "weak brother" is a church member, already troubled with scruples of conscience, for this is the use of the term "*adelphos*" in the whole argument. "Take to your heart" and "treat kindly" your "weak brother,"—not weak in the personal trust or saving faith of his heart toward Christ, but weak in moral casuistry, or cases of conscience, destitute as to a true conviction of what is morally permissible or not permissible, under the law of Christ, to do or not to do. The question in debate was not as to the *organization* of the Christian church nor as to terms of *admission* to membership, though it is a legitimate inference that differences about things *indifferent* are not to be made grounds of exclusion or non-reception, nor as to *external visible oneness*, nor as to *denominations*, nor as to *church-union*, nor as to terms of *ministerial fellowship*, nor as to *ecclesiastical courts*. All this is not exegesis, but eisegesis—a pure gratuitous importation into the text. It was not a question as to the admission of members into the church, but wholly as to the fellowship of members already admitted—that is, the receiving "*one another*" to mutual personal Christian communion, and terminating strife, alienation, and profitless disputation concerning things indifferent. The "weak" were not to slander those who were "strong" in moral conviction of duty; the "strong" were not to despise the "weak." It was a question of fraternal relations purely, among brethren in the same house, not of organic union between members of different organizations. It was the adiaphoristic controversy of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, waged in the apostolic age—a controversy renewing itself in every period, more or less, in the church of Christ, as to things *indifferent; i. e.*, neither "*agatha*," nor "*kaka*," but "*adiaphora*," neither *per se* right nor *per se* wrong, but either right or wrong *per accidens*, or according to circumstances —a question the most difficult of all in Christian morals. Paul's argument is a final arbitration of the whole dispute. Every man must be fully persuaded in his own mind, for

"whatsoever is not of *conviction* is sin." We must abstain from action if we conscientiously entertain any *doubt* as to the rectitude of our course. Where no objective precept exists, the subjective persuasion of the believer is the rule of action, and on this each one stands or falls to his Master. "Wherefore," says the apostle, concluding the whole argument, "take to your hearts one another, as Christ also has taken us, to the glory of God." Lay aside all wrangling, and bitterness, and wrath, and slander, and contempt, Jew and Gentile, be reconciled to each other, in the unity of the spirit and bond of peace, even as Christ has reconciled us to himself, and God has been glorified.

By what right of interpretation, diverting the passage from its context and sense, does Mr. McCune apply to things *essential*, a precept the Holy Ghost applies only to things *indifferent*, or conclude that evangelical denominations, as such, are essentially sinful, and that the Presbyterian denomination, with the rest of them, has no scriptural right to exist? Rom. xv, 7, is his main and oft-repeated text. He finds in it what he calls a "divine, non-excluding law of organization." In the first place, it has no reference to "organization" whatever. In the next place, even if it had, the non-exclusion has reference to things merely *indifferent*, but no reference to things *essential* which belong to organization. The church may not exclude an applicant, who thinks he has a right, if he chooses, to eat meat or drink wine offered to idols; but it is a preposterous inference that she may not exclude an applicant who refuses to be bound by Christ's command as to baptism, the Lord's supper, and obedience to the discipline of the eldership, or who does not believe that Christ is truly man, or the Bible truly infallible. The sophisms of the interpretation are glaring. Mr. McCune confounds *internal relations* of personal Christian fellowship with *external organization*, *Christian* unity with *church* union, the *spiritual* with the *ecclesiastical*, the inner *substance* with the outward *form*, *unity* from within with *union* from without, *essential terms of admission* to membership, with *rules of conduct* for members already admitted concerning things indifferent, *unity* with

union, and the word of God in relation to things about which differences are no bar to membership with the word of God in relation to things about which differences are a bar to membership. Conscience as to meats offered to idols, wines, ceremonies, festivals, and social parties, is certainly a very different thing from conscience as to prelacy and independency, elders and no elders, creed and no creed, baptism and no baptism, the covenant of God with believers, terms of ministerial fellowship, and whether an unbaptized person may be admitted to church membership and come to the Lord's supper. Would Paul treat these last matters as things *indifferent*, and class them in the same category with the first? Would he tell us to drop our differences as to *essential* things for the sake of organic union, and act in reference to matters concerning which he has laid down the most authoritative and unbending rules and precepts, as though we were left here to subjective persuasion as the only law in the case? Truth is worth something, worth more than all outward church union; and the head of the Church, the builder of his own house, will split an indifferent external church union, making an idol of her boasted uniformity, into a thousand fragments, to find one that will be loyal to his truth. He has done it more than once, and will do it again. By what right does Mr. McCune ground the law of church organization in a text relating wholly to things *indifferent?* Are the order of the house of God, its structure, ordinances, government and discipline, its officers and constitution, matters of *indifference?* Are ministers of every kind, because deemed evangelical according to some minimum standard of texts nakedly quoted and differently interpreted, and adjudged to be called to the ministry, some by one text, some by another, all to be received into one common ecclesiastical court as ministers of Christ? As to private members, does a "*credible*" profession of faith in Christ bind the church to admit a professor who refuses to obey the command of Christ to be baptized? Is our expediency to set at naught Christ's authority? Or, again, is the church restrained from exclusion, except upon evidence of unregeneracy?

Or does she enjoy the right to admit in a case of disobedience to Christ's command? And yet such is the exegesis of Rom. xv, 7, by Mr. McCune.

The Presbyterian Church condemns the doctrine of Mr. McCune. She denies, outright and officially, his interpretation of Romans xv: 7, upon which he builds his theory. As to her reception of members, I shall discuss the question further on. As to the application of Romans xv: 7, to the reception of ministers, she says, Digest, p. 45 (2): although "we are willing to receive one another, as Christ has received us, to the glory of God, and admit *to fellowship in sacred ordinances* all such as we have grounds to believe Christ will at last admit to the kingdom of heaven, *yet we are undoubtedly obliged to take care that the faith once delivered to the saints be kept pure and uncorrupted among us, and so handed down to our posterity.*" So, again, she declares, while thus asserting her right to exclude from her ecclesiastical courts all ministers who can not hold the truth as she holds it, that "the terms of communion adopted in our church have ever been in accordance with the divine command that we should receive one another as Christ has received us. We fully recognize the authority of the command "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations." *The application of this command is entirely confined to private membership in the Church. It has no reference to the admission of men to offices in the house of God, or to the qualifications for admission into the office of the ministry.*" She asserts her perfect right "to declare the terms of admission into her communion, and the qualification of her ministers and members, as well as the whole system of internal government which Christ has appointed." Digest, p. 44 (2). She "enjoins on all her members and probationers for the ministry that they teach and preach according to the form of sound words in said confession and catechisms, and avoid and oppose all contrary errors thereto." Digest, p. 48 (1). She refuses to "license or ordain to the work of the ministry any candidate, until he give them competent satisfaction as to his learning and experimental acquaintance with religion, and skill in divinity and cases of conscience; and

declare his acceptance of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as the confession of his faith, and promise subjection to the Presbyterian plan of government in the Westminster Directory." Digest, p. 49 (6). She demands of all her officers, deacons, elders, and ministers, by most solemn ordination vows, that they "sincerely adopt" and "approve" her standards. Digest, pp. 346, 399, 411. She declares that her Confession of Faith is not only "necessary and expedient," but "absolutely requisite to the settled peace of the Church, and to the happy and orderly existence of Christian communion;" and subjects to discipline any in her communion who "traduce" it. Digest, p. 54 (11). Ministers who can not adopt her standards she will not receive. Digest, p. 57. Those who are hostile to creeds and confessions she rejects. Digest, p. 55. She requires those who change their doctrinal views to "peaceably withdraw." Digest, p. 48 (11). Ministers who come to her from other denominations, she enjoins "to teach in the manner required by our standards." Digest, p. 148. Those who "withdraw to other denominations" she commands to be "stricken from the roll." Digest, pp. 169, 620. "Churches" that refuse to be organized according to her principles of government, she will not receive. Digest, pp. 92 (2), 63 (2). She will unite, ecclesiastically, with none, except on the basis of her Westminster standards, and would only reunite her own divisions on the same basis, pure and simple. Digest, pp. 45, 48, 58, 61, 62, 71, 91. Her whole organic constitution she asserts to be "agreeable to Scripture and the practice of the primitive Christians." Digest, p. 120. And makes express provision that her courts shall enforce and observe "the Constitution of the Church." She "strictly enjoins on her presbyteries to "promote the diffusion and wider circulation of the Confession of Faith and Book of Discipline of the Presbyterian Church;" recommends her congregations to "supply the poor" with the same and the catechisms; and urges pastors to "induce every family in our connection to supply themselves with a copy of the Standards of our Church." Baird's Digest, p. 45. All this is what Mr. McCune calls "Presby-

terian sectarianism," a "hurtful excrescence," and to be condemned. The "common faith" of the Church of Christ she regards as something more than the minimum collation of a few texts, undefined by modern organic Unionists. She regards it as the consensus of the symbols of the Reformation. Digest, pp. 56, 71. Such is the honor she pours upon the martyr-won and glorious doctrinal banner of her faith and order.

In reference to the reception of private Church members, she presumes not to sit in judgment on the heart of any. She requires not only a credible profession of faith in and love to Christ, but also some proper knowledge of Christ, of the nature of the Lord's supper, and pledge of obedience not only to Christ but to those whom He has set to rule in His Church, and exercise discipline for their spiritual good. These are her terms of communion. Therefore, without judging the heart, or deciding that they are without faith in Christ, she refuses to admit professed Universalists. Digest, 674. She makes it a question of expediency, to be determined, in all cases, by the session, whether to receive those who object to the baptism of children, or those who are connected, in any way, with the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. Digest, pp. 674, 675. Those who pursue any secular avocation on the Sabbath are not to be admitted. Digest, p. 678. They who refuse to be themselves baptized, or to pledge submission to her discipline, she forbids an entrance. Digest, pp. 676, 677. In all these cases, without assuming to decide that those she declines to receive are without faith, and believing in some cases that faith may exist, she asserts her right to so decline, for reasons founded on the word of God. It is clear, therefore, that the Presbyterian Church does exclude from her membership certain individuals whose personal faith in Christ she does not assume to question, and certain ministers whose professed acceptance of a "few leading doctrines" she does not pretend to dispute. She declares, by her Supreme Court, that Romans xv: 7 does not forbid, as Mr. McCune asserts it does forbid, such exclusion from her own pale. She affirms that she is "entitled

to declare the terms of admission" into her ecclesiastical communion, and the "qualifications of her ministers and members," and that her terms of communion have always been "in accordance with the divine command that we should receive one another as Christ has received us"—that is in perfect accordance with Romans xv: 7. Mr. McCune tells her that her utterance is untrue. She declares that terms of Church-membership are one thing, and terms of salvation are another, and that every church has the right to declare its own terms, and that in some respects these may be different from each other. Mr. McCune denies this. She asserts that the force of the precept in Romans xv: 7 relates wholly to things indifferent—to the personal relations of private members—and that it has no reference to ministerial qualifications, to the reception or exclusion of ministers, or to things essential to organization, such as a Divinely-established order, sacraments, ordinances, or non-toleration of false doctrine. Mr. McCune tells us she is blind. He is in complete antagonism, as a Presbyterian minister, with the faith and order of his Church on this whole matter.

And as to the excommunication of church members, the Presbyterian Church does not base this excommunication upon the judgment that they are unregenerate. "Gross offenders who will not be reclaimed by the private or public admonitions of the Church are to be cut off," Christians or no Christians. Digest p. 513. They may in some cases be children of God whom only such punishment can be the means of reclaiming from the snare of Satan. They may be children of the wicked one. The Church does not decide. Enough, that, whether from ignorance, pride, perversity, temptation, or theories of church power, or hostile judgment, or contumacy, he who refuses to "hear the Church," or submit to her discipline, is to be as a "heathen man and a publican." The authority of Christ's house is to be maintained. The Church, without sitting in judgment on the heart of any, excludes from her communion those guilty of long and wilful absence, and violation of solemn covenant engagements. Digest, p. 494. For grossly heretical views

she excommunicates. Digest, p. 128. For unlawful divorce or marriage, and for breach of marriage vows by wilful absence, which she accounts a breach of the seventh commandment. Digest, p. 494 Larger Cat. *Q.* 139. Also for persistence in improper language (p. 569), for slander, fraud, theft, neglect of the Lord's supper—in short, for any "gross offense," continued against the admonition of the Church. Her discipline deals with *conduct* alone. It demands a conversation becoming the Gospel of Christ. The Presbyterian Church believes that a man may be a Christian and yet be guilty of "gross offenses," as were Abraham and Lot, Jacob and Samson, David and Peter. For such offenses, unrepented of, excommunication will ensue. Her purity depends upon it. She has no infallible term of admission, no infallible term of exclusion. A credible profession before men may be a false one before God. An excommunicated person may yet be regenerate, though delivered, for the time, to Satan. Her act of exclusion from membership does not depend on her judgment of the regeneracy or unregeneracy of the excluded. Search the standards from beginning to end. Not a clause can be found intimating any such doctrine as that of Mr. Mc Cune, but everything to the contrary. Nowhere does the Church teach that excommunication proceeds upon the assumption or proof that the offender is unregenerate. Nor does the Scripture, to which Mr. McCune appeals, state, in any case, that the excommunicate either was or was not a Christian. It calls him a "brother," that is, a church member, for that is the meaning of the term "*adelphos.*" There is no proof that he was not a Christian. "Disorderly walk" is no more a proof—*ipso facto*, of unregeneracy, than faultless conduct is a proof, *ipso facto*, of holiness. However clear may be the gross inconsistency between disorderly conduct and divine grace, yet it is a humiliating fact that some of God's children do lie, and slander, and deceive, and steal, and practice injustice, and commit grievous crimes, and persist for a long time in the same, and give occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme. While it is true that the court, in inflicting excommunication, does virtually review and reverse the

judgment already had upon the qualifications for membership of the applicant at the time of his reception, yet it is false to infer, either that the original decision to receive settled the question of his regeneracy, or that its reversal, by excommunication, settles the question of his unregeneracy. All that it does settle is that, as it was only upon a *credible profession of faith* (not credible evidence of regeneracy), he could be received, so it is for want of that credible profession he is, at last, excluded. He is excluded because of the existence of that which, had it appeared at first, would have prevented his immediate reception. It is "not necessary to show" that the apostles excluded real Christians, before the Church may exclude a disorderly member. Our Book recognizes no such doctrine. The theory of excommunication advocated by Mr. McCune is a legitimate outgrowth of his organic union principles. It is not the doctrine of the standards of our Church. Our courts judge conduct. God alone judges the heart.

I have presented the doctrine of Mr. McCune and the doctrine of the standards. Zenith and nadir are not more opposed. I have shown the falsity of his interpretation of Rom. xv:7, and the official denial of that interpretation by the General Assembly, twice over—a denial fortified by the whole frame-work of our polity, and wrought throughout the whole web of our history. On Mr. McCune's theory our standards ought to be burned up, our whole form of government, and book of discipline, their structure, captions, and provisions, and all our decisions built thereupon, destroyed, for all are utterly irreconcilable with his non-excluding "divine law of organization." When, therefore, he teaches such doctrine and propagates such views, and calls upon Presbyterians and all other evangelical Christians to rally for a reconstruction of the whole Church of Christ upon his Linwood and Mount Lookout basis, the prosecution affirms, in the name of the Presbyterian Church, that he advocates principles and views, not only at war with the standards of the Church, but which, if generally accepted, would totally subvert our constitution, and blot out the very existence of the Presbyterian denomination itself. His so-

called "divine law of organization" is simply a misinterpretation of the scripture.

SPECIFICATION II.

Anti-denomination.

I proceed to the second specification. In it Mr. McCune affirms the essential sinfulness of all evangelical denominations, as such, and this includes the Presbyterian denomination. None have any right to exist, because not formed on his "divine law of organization." "The Presbyterian Church requires more" than Mr. McCune's law requires, and, not being built upon this law, has no scriptural right to exist, as a denomination. The Christianity held in common with other denominations he does not assail. The distinctive peculiarities of Presbyterianism, in her doctrine and polity, all that differentiates her from other churches, and the teaching which she enforces upon her official ministry; in brief, her distinctive denominationalism, he condemns as "sectarianism," "essentially sinful," "an excrescence," "anti-scriptural," "unscriptural," "mischievous," and "destitute of scriptural authority." He is opposed, utterly, to denominations as such. They are "sinful." Of course, if this is the fact, the quicker they are done away with, the better.

The Presbyterian Church does not so believe. She regards her government, discipline, organization, creed, covenant, terms of admission and laws of fellowship as essentially righteous. The very things which distinguish her as a denomination, and constitute her peculiarities, she cherishes with becoming pride and gratitude to God, and claims her historic heirloom as evidence that, as a distinctive denomination, she is, in her peculiar doctrine and order, nearer the Word of God than any other denomination on earth. The proof of this is abundant as the pages of her standards, and multiplied as the leaves of her history. In her "system of union," portrayed in the principles preliminary to her form of government, and elsewhere, she recognizes the right of all evangelical denominations to exist, equally as her own, and upon the very same grounds, grounds of conscience, charity, forbearance, peace and unity, grounds of expedi-

ency and propriety. She calls them "orthodox churches of Christ," "societies," "particular societies," "associations of particular churches," "denominations," "protestant denominations," and affirms their right to exist, and to declare their own terms of communion. Digest, pp. 44, 51, 147. She acknowledges room for honest differences of opinion as to "truths and forms." Pp. 44, 50. She insists upon denominational confessions and creeds, as "absolutely requisite to the settled peace of the Church, and to the happy and orderly existence of Christian Communion." P. 54. She excludes from her own denomination "all Ministers and Churches who can not relinquish their peculiarities with a good conscience," and will not tolerate their antagonisms in her own bosom. P. 57. She says: "We are Presbyterians, and we firmly believe the Presbyterian system of doctrine, discipline, and church government to be *nearer to the Word of God* than that of any other sect or denomination." Baird's Digest, p. 38. She has made her confession and discipline a basis, and the only basis, of her re-united existence. Moore's Digest, p. 91 [2]. She declares her distinctive organization is "agreeable to Scripture and the practice of primitive Christians," and in full consistency with this belief she yet "embraces in the spirit of charity all who differ from her in opinion and practice on these subjects." P. 120 [1]. This toleration of the rights and institutions of others, so far from prompting her to self-dissolution for the sake of organic union, leads her to engrave in her standards the perpetual provision that her courts shall "take effectual care" that her peculiar constitution shall be preserved and enforced. P. 141 [IV]. Nor will she allow any minister belonging to another denomination to retain official membership in her own. P. 620. I need not quote further. The Presbyterian Church may be either deplorably blind, or bigoted, or criminal in Mr. McCune's eyes, for her estimate of her own importance, and the exercise of Christian charity towards all other evangelical denominations; but sin and holiness are not more opposed than are the contradictory positions of Mr. McCune and his Church. It is not possible that any loyal Presbyterian could indulge the lan-

guage of Mr. McCune, or sincerely adopt and approve the Westminster standards. Nor is it possible that any Presbyterian minister, having the honor, peace, unity and purity of the Presbyterian Church at heart, more than his own theories or purposes, could be so far forgetful of his solemn ordination vows, as to countenance, encourage, palliate, defend, or even tolerate, the continued propagation of a standing libel upon his own Church, proclaiming to the world the "essential sinfulness" of its denominational character, and denying to it, as well as to all other evangelical denominations, even the right of existence.

Mr. McCune's anti-denominational law rests upon a doctrine in irreconcileable conflict with the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church and the Scriptures as to the "Body of Christ." He not only misinterprets God's Word as to things indifferent; he likewise misinterprets it as to things essential. He blunders into the papal artifice of identifying the "Body of Christ" with the "visible Church," or the whole company of professing Christians. The Church on earth, he tells us, is an external and unitous organization of regenerate souls. The "Communion of Saints" is, therefore, an ecclesiastical communion. Membership in the visible Church is membership in the "Body of Christ." The separation of the visible Church into denominations is the rending of the "Body of Christ," and a sinful breach of the "Communion of Saints." Hence his anti-denominationalism. Hence his declaration that denominations, as such, are "essentially sinful" and have no right to exist. Hence his new "divine law of organization" and "non-exclusion" of any Christian minister or member from any particular denomination. Hence his practical denial of what our standards expressly affirm, viz: that each society has the right to declare its own terms of ministerial fellowship. Hence the glaring fallacy in the opening sentence of the Linwood "Declaration," and all through the "Address" to the Churches of North America, confounding the "One Body" with the Visible Church, denouncing denominations as a disruption of the Body and a dividing of Christ. Hence the unendurable sentiment that so long as denominations exist our

Savior's intercessory prayer is not fully realised, as though the doctrine of union to Christ and the Communion of Saints depended for its perfection upon external oneness of Church organization. Hence the external oneness he so zealously advocates. It is Rome's theory and Rome's unity.

But the Church visible is not the "Body of Christ;" nor is external church communion the "Communion of Saints;" nor is external oneness the unity of the "One Body" described by Paul; nor is Church Union Christian Unity. Our Standards discriminate, clearly, the Communion of Saints from Church Communion. The latter is the external fellowship of the visible Church in ordinances and ecclesiastical membership, restricted by the right of every particular Church to declare its own terms of communion; the former is the inward, spiritual, and unlimited fellowship of the whole "Body of Christ" in earth and in Heaven in the life, sufferings, death, resurrection, grace, and glory, of its adorable Head. It is spiritual. "I in them, and Thou in me!" "That they may be one as we are." It rests upon the indissoluble spiritual conjunction of the living members with the living Head, each member in inseparable communion with every other, no matter how outwardly separated by time, place, or name, all common members of the one spiritual "Body of Christ." Form of Gov., chap. I (II). Conf. of Faith, chap. XXVI. Larger Cat. *Q.* 69, 82, 83, 86. The external symbol or pledge of this "Communion of Saints" is not any common external church-membership, but the sacramental scene and solemnity of the Lord's Supper. Conf. of Faith, chap. XXIX (I). Nowhere in our Standards is the "One Body," or the "Body of Christ" applied to the visible Church. Nowhere is external oneness of organization classed among the privileges or marks of either the visible or invisible Church. Nowhere is the Communion of Saints confounded with external organic union. Nowhere is outward oneness of organization, this side of eternal glory, implied as a necessary demand or involved result of this "Communion of Saints." Everywhere the doctrine runs through all descriptions and definitions that the Communion of Saints,

founded on the spiritual oneness for which our Saviour prayed—a prayer ever fulfilled from the hour it was poured at Gethsemane's gate—is as consistent with the existence of five hundred denominations as with one. Nowhere is it possible to draw the conclusion that evangelical denominations, as such, are a breach of Christian unity, whatever they may be of an outward, all-absorbing external Romanistic Babel of Indifferentism and Church Union. Who does not know that "Rome's Organic Union," so called, is a carnal caricature and Satanic aping of the Spiritual union between Christ the "Head" and the mystical "Body?" Upon such a theory of union, anti-denominationalism rests. It is Rome's argument, and in Proof 6, Mr. McCune admits it. The external and spiritual are confounded. The logic is that the outward church must be visibly one because the invisible church is spiritually one. The theory leads inevitably to an external visible Head, the Pope. The Reformers denied the theory, and lifted to notice the clear distinction in God's Word between the visible church and the "Body of Christ." The doctrine of Mr. McCune is a denial of this fundamental truth, and a consequent denial of the Scripture right of the Reformed denominations to exist. He charges that they violate the external oneness and Communion of Saints. Protestantism never fathered such a mediæval monstrosity or jumble of confusion as this, and then sought to justify its separation from Rome. Reformed Symbolism could not embody it, and justify the separation from Lutheranism. Much less could the Westminster Standards assert the doctrine and justify the distinctive, peculiar, and Divine right of the Presbyterian Church to exist. It is not the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church that evangelical denominations, as such, are esssentially sinful. It is not the doctrine of the Scriptures. It is anti-Protestant and pro-Roman. Mr. McCune has yet to learn that the guilt of Schism and Sectarianism rested not upon the Reformers, but upon Rome; on the English Establishment, and not upon the two thousand ejected nonconformist ministers; on the Scotch Establishment, and not on the Free Church movement. He has yet to learn

what all History teaches, that God raises up denominations for his own glory and the good of His Church, and, that, in every case of importance, the outward Babel of Organic Union has been broken up for the sake of the Peace and Truth of God, of more value than any externalism down from the Signal Mound on Shinar's plain struck by lightning, to the last theological Institute for "Candidates" and "Ministers" at Linwood and Mt. Lookout.

"The Church," says Dr. Bannerman in his admirable work, "is described as the 'Body of Christ,' all the members of which are united to Him as the Head of life, influence, and grace to them; *a description not applicable to any body of professing Christians, made up of any or all communions*, but only to be realized in that great multitude which no man has seen or numbered, who make up the invisible Church of the Redeemer, and whose names are written in Heaven." "To apply interchangeably, and as if properly convertible, what is spoken in Scripture of the invisible Church, to the visible, and *vice versa*, is a frequent and favorite resource of Romanist Controversialists." Church of Christ, Vol. I, pp. 8, 39. It is precisely what Mr. McCune has done. It is the basis of his anti-denominationalism. It rests on an utterly false view of the nature of the Church. "Romanists teach," says Dr. Hodge, "that the Church is essentially an external organized community, as the commonwealth of Israel." "Protestants teach, in exact accordance with the doctrine of Christ and His apostles, (1) that the Church, as such, is not an external organization, and (2) that all true believers, in whom the Spirit of God dwells, are members of that Church which is the 'Body of Christ.'" Syst. Theol. Vol. I, pp. 131, 135.

This is the view of our Standards. They deny that the "Body of Christ," the "One Body" means the visible Church, and so deny Mr. McCune's second fundamental interpretation of Scripture. They deny that the oneness of the "Body of Christ" is external oneness, and so contradict Mr. McCune's doctrine that denominations are a crime against the "One Body," the "Body of Christ," and a crime against the "Communion of Saints." Denying

this, they deny that denominations are "essentially sinful," and affirming the Divine right or Scriptural authority for the existence of the Presbyterian denomination, as such. They take the same ground, in reference to Mr. McCune's third fundmental misinterpretation, viz., that of our Savior's intercessary prayer as necessitating external oneness, and also in reference to his fourth misinterpretation of the Scripture referring to the "schisms and divisions" in the Corinthian Church which he interprets as external separations to be avoided, whereas they were internal disorders in the spiritual "Body of Christ," personal alienations of believers, divisions of mind, party preferences and strifes, "Schism *in* the Body." The Sectarianism Paul deplored was not a charitable denominationalism. It was a party spirit in the "One Body," a sinful breach of spiritual fellowship, not of Church membership. It was not two peaceful denominations, working nobly for the master, and bearing with each other's conscientious differences, he rebuked, but one organic denomination, depreciating the truth of Christ, wasting its energies in strife and alienations about Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and Christ, and marring its own spiritual life, unity, and communion by sinful contention. Well has Dr. Errett, the gifted editor of the Standard, said, in his controversy with Mr. McCune: "It is easy to say hard things about *Sectarianism*, and to profess great abhorrence of it. But the farther men get from Christ, the more liberal can they afford to be in giving away His *Truth*, and in the popular sense of the word *Charity*, the men of the largest charity are the men who hold at the very cheapest rate the truth that Jesus taught." Standard, December 18, 1875.

Mr. McCune exclaims, both hands uplifted, against the "sin" of "enforcing" upon the official ministry a distinctive denominational creed. He smites it as a crime against the Communion of Saints. Presbyterian Sectarianism, as he calls it, he hates. I have already quoted the constitutional provisions of the Presbyterian Church requiring the enforcement of her Standards upon all her office-bearers, ministers, elders, and deacons. I need not quote them

again. Enactment of denominational laws, and enforcement of denominational creeds, he accounts an oppression of the conscience. Whose conscience does it oppress? Not his who sincerely approves it. It is a protest against his own ordination vows, a declaration that he is not in fact, what he professed himself to be, and that he does not sincerely adopt and approve our Standards. He denies the right of the Presbyterian Church to present to him the alternatives of either teaching the distinctive doctrines of her system, or leaving her communion. The issue is plain and unmistakable. It is the proclamation of independency while yet remaining in the bosom of the Church. He has given us abundant illustration of it. For "ten years" he has denied her right to exist, or enforce her creed. He protested against the appointment of a Committee of Investigation. He protested against the exercise of episcopal power. He protested against the institution of judicial process. He declared, at first, he would not receive the judicial charges from the prosecution. He is opposed to the enforcement of our denominational law. He denounces it as a "sin." He tells us he proposes to teach in future the doctrines he has taught in the past. And to fortify his claim to exercise himself in this imperial way, he, formally, announces to all whom it may concern that "*the Presbyterian Church has ceased to enforce Infant Baptism.*" He longs and labors for the day when she will cease to enforce all her distinctive tenets. He would like to see them either dropped off or hung up as a dried curiosity in some library, or metamorphosed by revision into the likeness of the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Manual, with a "Basis of Fellowship" for a Creed, and some "Regulations of Expediency" for a Polity.

Moderator, the doctrine of non-enforcement is not the doctrine of our Standards, whatever our lax practice may be. It is the doctrine of covenant-breaking, anarchy, and revolution, the doctrine of the tyranny of liberalism, and the despotism of arbitrary power, trampling every constitutional right of the individual under foot, and every guarantee for the defense of the truth and order of the House of

God, and for the protection of personal character of ministers and members. It is the doctrine of disobedience to vows. It is treason to the Presbyterian Church. It is nullification. It abolishes the Constitution to meet a contingency, build up an interest, or further a scheme. It keeps no faith with brethren. Promises are pretences. Compacts are nullities. Majorities are riders. Engagements, sealed by prayer, are mockeries. It invokes the repudiation of discipline—offers a premium on policy adverse to truth, and bids for a human expediency adverse to Divine righteousness. It means liberty to do and to teach as one pleases, under the euphonious nomenclature of "forbearance in love"—license to circulate assaults upon Presbyterian doctrine and polity—toleration to print manuals of organic union, and to organize at Linwood and Mt. Lookout. Need I ask, is it possible for a Presbyterian minister sincerely to approve the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church, and be zealous and faithful in studying her peace, unity, and purity, and yet advocate the non-enforcement of her distinctive doctrine and order? Is this loyalty?

Once more, Mr. McCune asserts, not only that the Presbyterian denomination has no right to exist, but denies her right, as such, to be called a "Church." His plea that this is the Congregational view amounts to nothing. This may appear to some a little thing, but it is great. It means more than the childish truism that one particular Church is not many particular Churches, or that many particular Churches are not a single particular Church. Pompey, couching at the door, knows that one is not forty, and forty not one. It means that the term "Church" can not be applied to a plurality of congregations, organically held under one rule. It is a lever to upheave our whole polity. Believe that statement, and Presbyterianism melts out of sight. The Presbyterian standards maintain that the term "Church" has a five-fold Scriptural application. It means (1) the "Body of Christ," *i. e.* the whole body of believers on earth and in heaven, the plural unit of all who are joined to Christ by individual faith, the Invisible Church;

(2) the whole body, or plural unit of professing Christians on earth, together with their children, *i. e.* the outward Visible Church; (3) the whole body, or plural unit of professed believers in any particular spot, *i. e.* the particular congregation; (4) the whole body, or plural unit of associated congregations organically connected together under one ecclesiastical order or rule, *i. e.* the particular denomination; (5) the whole bench, or plural unit of representatives, or office-bearers, as distinguished from the congregation or the people, *i. e.* a particular court. Mr. McCune denies two of these definitions in whole, the 4th and 5th, and two in part, the 2d and 3d. He holds that the term "Church" is applicable, "in the singular number," (1) to the Body of Christ, and (2) to a particular congregation, minus the infants of believers. He denies that it is applicable to a plurality of congregations organically connected under one ecclesiastical rule, with superior representative Courts of review and control, *i. e.* he denies Presbytery and asserts Independency. A Presbytery for him is "an unauthorized and unscriptural" body, a Synod, the same, a General Assembly, the same. The necessary result is that the Presbyterian denomination, as such, is no "Church" at all. It follows from his argument on the definition of a Church. This denial strikes at the root of our whole polity. Every Presbyterian knows, perfectly well, that the peculiar and distinctive mark of Presbyterianism, as a polity, is not the eldership, for the early congregationalists all had their bench of elders, and John Owen's celebrated treatise on the "True Nature of a Gospel Church," abundantly establishes this fact; but it is (1) the doctrine of a plurality of congregations organically held together in subordination to one common ecclesiastical rule, and (2) an ascending series of courts built upon that rule. These in their totality constitute a Church. This is Presbyterianism as opposed to the individualistic idea of Independency. Mr. McCune retires from the Hall of Westminster, with the Independents, unable to stand beside the Presbyterians, and maintain the proposition "the Scripture doth hold forth that many particular congregations may be under one Presbyterial govern-

ment." Gillespie's "Armor" he throws aside. His theory repudiates an ascending series of courts. Distinctive Presbyterian polity can not survive his denial of the application of the term Church "in the singular number" to a plurality of associated congregations organically held under one ecclesiastical rule. The Presbyterian denomination is, therefore, "not a Church." "Admit," says Dr. Bannerman, "the narrow position taken by the Independents in regard to the true meaning and nature of the Church, as defined in Scripture, restrict the term to one or other of the two significations of either the invisible Church at large, or a single congregation of believers in a particular locality, and you, in fact, concede every principle that is necessary for them to establish their views as to the form of the Church and the nature of its government." It is precisely just what Mr. McCune has done. It is not possible for a man sincerely to adopt and approve our Presbyterian polity and advocate the views of Mr. McCune. I affirm again, upon his own testimony, that Mr. McCune is an Independent in polity, and not a Presbyterian. It is not possible for a man with such convictions to be at rest, or study the peace, unity, and purity of the Church. The first advening opportunity he will either seek or create an independent pastorate where his particular local Church "in the singular number" will exist "outside Presbyterian jurisdiction," as at Linwood and Mt. Lookout, while he himself still hangs on to his "unauthorized," "extra-Scriptural" Presbyterian organization, for the sake of "good standing" and public "indorsement" by a body whose character he denounces as "sectarian," whose distinctive creed he traduces as an "excrescence," whose "right to exist" he denies, and whose name as a "Church" he rejects, and with a boldness unparalleled he informs us that his purpose is to remain in the Presbyterian Church, spread abroad his doctrines and "imbue the whole denomination with them," and agitate and seek "revision" of the standards in the interest of his scheme. Is this loyalty? Is it honor? I affirm that it is disloyalty and treason of the most glaring character, deliberate, intentional, and persistent to the Church, as well as

persistent misrepresentation of Scripture, and that, as a secular editor has well said, "a charge of nitro-glycerine under a nine inch wall, would not be more destructive to the wall than McCuneism is, if allowed, to the Presbyterian denomination." In answer to Mr. McCune's allegation that the Presbyterian denomination is not a Church, I present her legal title, under which she is incorporated and which flames on the frontlet of her standards he professes to approve, "*The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.*" I pass to the third specification.

SPECIFICATION III.

Creeds.

If Mr. McCune's views have amazed us, already, on account of their gross perversions of Scripture, and point-blank contradiction of our standards, they will, under this specification, make us almost doubt our own eyes, and compel us to read again the proofs, finger on every line. What is it we see? The sight of a Presbyterian minister, who having professed sincere adoption of the Westminster standards, yet lifts up the voice of remonstrance and declares to the church that he is utterly opposed to all human creeds; that the only creed he will accept is a "genuine New Testament creed," *i. e.* a syllabus of unexplained texts, a "few leading truths," or what he calls "the common faith" "expressed in God's own language" as "commonly received," "without any human inferences," "deductions," or "modifications;" that he would "strike out" of every creed, had he the power, everything all Christians could "not see to be law in Scripture;" that "the Bible" (he does not say whether in Hebrew or Greek or English) is the "only *true*, proper, and sufficient creed for all ministers;" that human creeds are sectarian creeds and "always mischievous and sinful;" that every argument to prove the need of an enlarged creed is a "falsity;" that no creed tests are to be allowed in the examination or ordination of ministers (an illustration of which was had in the "Council" that examined and installed Mr. McCune over the new institute that requires "no assent to any denominational peculiarity!"); that "no surrender" of any peculiarity, and free speech, with no

"enforcement" of any peculiarity and free speech is the Gospel style of things, and that before the Church has any right to make a creed at all, she must be either unanimously orthodox, or unanimously heretical, in order that no man's conscience may be oppressed! The reason for all this, he tells us, is, first, that "Saving Faith," and second, "a few leading fundamental doctrines" (he does not say how many) effectually "exclude all fatal heresy" (not saying whether he means fatal to salvation, or fatal to the truth of God, which is the means of salvation); and that herein the blessed apostles were an example to us, and to all sectarian Protestantism, *versus* our own "unblushing assumption of divine prerogative," which differs nothing, he assures us, from the "rotten basis on which Rome stands." "If," in the language of Mr. McCune, "the whole Church of the living God, including all, of every name, who give satisfactory scriptural evidence that they are born of the Spirit," had only entertained, from the beginning, similar sentiments to these, what a literature had been spared, how abbreviated the theological curriculum had been, what a saving of funds unnecessarily wasted on seminaries, and of toil in laboriously writing the career of the Church, and how multiplied prototypes of the Council at Mount Lookout would have dazzled in history, instead of the dull spectacles of Nice, Chalcedon, Dort, and Westminster!

Our Standards set their face against the doctrine of Mr. McCune and repudiate it as dangerous and false. They do it in the declaration that every Christian Church has the right to declare its own terms of communion. They do it not only in affirming the right of private judgment, but the Church's right, as the Steward of the mysteries of God, to declare to the world in her own language, as a witness on the stand, speaking in his own words, what she believes the Word of God means, and what she understands thereby. "Understandest thou what thou readest? How can I except some man should guide me?" Acts 8: 30. "The *meaning* of the Bible," says Cecil, "*is* the Bible." "The *sense* of Scripture," says Waterland, "*is* Scripture." The Presbyterian Church affirms that "Confessions of Faith,

containing formulas of doctrine and rules for conducting the discipline and worship proper to be maintained in the house of God, are not only recognized as necessary and expedient, but, *as the character of human nature is continually aiming at innovation*, absolutely requisite to the settled peace of the Church, and to the happy and orderly existence of Christian Communion." Digest, p. 54. She believes her creed "can not be abandoned without abandonment of the Word of God," p. 54. She enforces it, by solemn vows, upon all her ministers, elders, and deacons, pp. 399, 410. They who "traduce" it are amenable to discipline, pp. 54, 55. "Ministers who can not adopt the standards are not to be received," p. 57. Those who change their views are to "peaceably withdraw," p. 48. Others, who come to her from other bodies, are "to teach in the manner required by our standards," p. 148. She repudiates any and every doctrine that would "impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system," p. 85. She appends the apostles' creed at the end of her own, and recommends the Heidelberg Catechism as one of a number of reformed symbols, as maintaining "the faith once delivered to the saints," p. 56. She expressly forbids the teaching of any doctrine "inconsistent with the sacred Scriptures *as explained and summarily taught in the doctrinal standards of our Church*," p. 304. As to "human deductions and inferences," which Mr. McCune will not tolerate, she says "that the whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, *or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture.*" Conf. of Faith, ch. 1, sec. 2. She charges the Synod "to take effectual care that Presbyteries observe the Constitution of the Church," p. 191, and warns, in the most earnest language, against any one who, "under the specious pretense of honoring the sacred Scriptures, would persuade you to reject all written or printed creeds, and forms of discipline, alleging that those who adopted such, substitute them for divine inspiration." Baird's Digest, p. 638. Such is the law of the church to which Mr. McCune belongs; its denominational law; its enactment. He denounces it as an

"excrescence," a "sin," a "sectarian oppression," and wishes it were out of the way. Do you believe he "sincerely adopts" our Confession, or "sincerely approves" our government and discipline? He does no such thing. He disparages and traduces both, and inquires, with a triumphant air, "*Did the Apostolic Church demand assent to the Presbyterian Confession of Faith?*"

Mr. McCune's theory is as ridiculous as it is dangerous and sophistical. He thinks that, because "the Word of God is the only infallible rule of faith and practice"—one human deduction, at least, that he accepts—therefore a creed declaring and defining what is the sense of that rule is unnecessary. A man, not believing the Bible infallible, comes to Mr. McCune and applies for admission to his church. Mr. McCune repeats the "human deduction" that "the Word of God is the only infallible rule of faith and practice." No "human deductions," exclaims his friend; "confine yourself to the language of God as commonly received." Mr. McCune appeals to the naked text. Who shall decide now whether the Bible is infallible or not? Or is a decision needed on so non-essential a matter? If a decision is made, the statement is a "human deduction"—a veritable creed. But no human creeds are allowed, and Mr. McCune's friend, while accepting the texts, understands them in a different way. Will you receive me in Linwood and Mount Lookout, to the glory of God, as Christ has received me? cries his friend. Not if you don't believe the Bible infallible, responds Mr. McCune. But, replies the other, Christ has received me; I believe in Christ, and my walk and conversation are as good as your own. Besides you have taught that a man may be a true Christian and "not believe the Bible infallible." I had forgotten that, responds Mr. McCune; but come in, you give satisfactory scriptural evidence that Christ has received you, and though we differ in minor matters, we will extend to you "forbearance in love," and not enforce our "mere peculiarities, contrary to conscience, as a matter of sectarian law." Come in. Another steps up for admission, confessing, however, he does not believe in the true and proper

humanity of Christ. Will you receive me, to the glory of God? enquires his second friend. "The Son of God," says Mr. McCune, "became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul." No "human deductions," replies his friend; "confine yourself to the language of God, as commonly received." But that's what it means, says Mr. McCune. No "human modifications," again his friend insists. Mr. McCune appeals to the naked texts. His friend receives them, but understands them differently, and adds, You have taught, Mr McCune, that a man may be a true Christian and not believe in the humanity of Christ. Will you receive me? Christ has received me. Come in, says Mr. MCune, I had forgotten that article of our belief, but come in; you give satisfactory scripture evidence that Christ has received you, and though we differ on non-essentials, we will treat you "with forbearance in love." Next comes a friend who has doubts as to the Deity of Christ, and whom Mr. McCune refuses to call evangelical. Will you receive me, says he, to the glory of God, at Linwood and Mount Lookout? "Christ," says Mr. MCune, "was very God as well as very man." No "human deductions," retorts the Unitarian. Christ has received me. I believe the Bible is infallible, but understand it differently from you. Mr. McCune appeals to the texts. The Unitarian accepts the "language of God." Will you receive me? he cries. You are not "evangelical," says Mr. McCune. "Evangelical," exclaims his friend. If you admit one who does not believe in the humanity of Christ, how refuse me because I do not believe in the Deity of Christ? I believe in Christ without any human deductions, or inferences, or modifications. I understand the language of God differently from you. I believe with the Semi-Arians and three-fourths of the Christian Church in the fourth century. Will you receive me? Just at this point a Universalist steps up to solicit the same favor of admission to the church on the Mount. "They who die impenitent are lost forever," says Mr. McCune. No "human deductions," cries the Universalist. I believe that Christ has received me, and that none will be finally lost.

I accept all your texts; you need not repeat them. Will you receive me?

By what right, on what ground, I ask, granting Mr. McCune's creed of unexplained texts, can he refuse to receive the Unitarian and Universalist, while he cordially admits the man who neither believes the Bible is infallible, nor that Christ was truly and properly man? Is it because Mr. McCune's human deductions are different from theirs? But he has no right to any deductions in this matter whatever. Is it because they dispute those deductions? But they accept the language of God. Is it because they don't accept the language of God as "commonly received?" But neither does he who does not believe the Bible infallible, nor the true humanity of Christ, and yet Mr. McCune would receive them. Is it because they have no genuine New Testament creed? They all say "the Bible is my creed." Is it because they are in a minority? So was Athanasius and the Orthodox of the fourth century. I affirm, there is not an errorist in the list of them all, for eighteen centuries, that Mr. McCune's creed-theory can consistently reject, and I present the phenomenon of Mr. McCune as a Presbyterian minister for "ten years," advocating these views and announcing his purpose to continue their advocacy.

Mr. McCune's whole doctrine about creeds, is the doctrine of every heresiarch from the days of Arius and Pelagius to the present time. "The Bible is my creed," is the standing word in the mouth of every perverter of its truth. The Unitarian, the Socinian, the Universalist, the Swedenborgian all say, "the Bible is my creed." Every one of them will accept the naked texts without what Mr. McCune calls "human deductions." Mr. McCune's denial of the right of the Church to "enlarge" her creed, is the denial of her right to make any creed at all, for the right to make a creed involves the right to enlarge it, and the denial of the right to make is the denial of the right to enlarge. But what is the nature of this denial? It is the denial of the church's right to make, as a church, a public confession of her faith in Christ, for the right to make a

creed is grounded in the right of confession. The Church must confess Christ, Mr. McCune will say, but she must not confess her *faith* in Christ, or tell what that faith is. She must confess distributively, *i. e.*, by her individual members, but not collectively and officially through her ministry, except in "the language of God." It is the denial of her right, as steward of the heavenly mysteries, to authoritatively decide, under the influence of a guiding Spirit, between what is truth and what is falsehood in the public teaching of her ministry, and to authoritatively bear witness in her own words, or testify on the stand as a witness-bearer does in his own language, what her understanding and belief are concerning the doctrine of God. It assails the office of the Church as a public teacher, witness and confessor of the truth; for the relation of the Church to the Bible is more than that of the preserver and guardian of the volume, and her mission, as a witness and instructor to the world, is more than that of a compiler of a few unexplained texts, or a *minimum quid* statement, the lowest and least expression on which a sinner may be saved. Her office is to furnish the *maximum quid* of her faith, the largest possible expression of her religious consciousness and belief, and to have relation, in her whole confession before men, not merely to the simple conditions of personal salvation, but to the whole compass of the divine plan, the whole sphere of the heavenly doctrine, and the whole extent of her work as a light in the world. The diadem of titles that adorn the brow of Christ, he has placed on the brow of his church. She is with him, her Divine Lord, the light, the witness, the prophet, the priest, the king, the life of the world.

Mr. McCune has not yet learned that the Bible is not a creed, and never can be any man's creed, and that this is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church, as it is of all Evangelical Protestantism. The case was never yet known in history, where a man boasted "the Bible is my creed," that the boast was not used as a shield of unevangelical views and doctrines, or a cloak for indifferentism and toleration of error. The Bible is no man's creed, and can be

no man's creed, for the Bible is the expression of God's will, whereas a creed is the expression of man's faith. Splendidly has Dr. Schaff, following the Reformed Divines, said, "The Bible is the word of God to man; the creed is the answer of man to God. The Bible is the only sufficient Rule of Faith; the Creed is the Rule of public doctrine derived from the Bible." It is no exaltation of human authority over the Divine word, but a subjection of the human understanding and faith to Divine truth, for the creed is ever and only, in the language of Reformers, *mensura mensurata*—the rule ruled—while the Bible is *mensura mensurans*—the rule ruling. So Dr. Krauth, in his "Conservative Reformation." The Rule of Faith is God's voice to us. Faith is the hearing of that voice. The Confession is our reply. To confess Christ is to confess *what* is our faith in Him. As the creed is not, and can not be, the Rule of Faith, but its confession, so the Bible, because it is the Rule of Faith, is, of necessity, not its confession. The Bible can no more be any man's creed than the stars can be any man's astronomy." This is the doctrine of our standards, underlying every expression I have quoted from them. It is not Mr. McCune's doctrine. And as to the outcry of Mr. McCune against the growth and enlargement of a creed, so far from this being a "Popish usurpation," and every argument in its defense a "falsity," and the thing itself "an unblushing assumption of Divine prerogative," if he will but read the Scriptures, he will find not only human-made Christian creeds in abundance, but, as Dr. Bannerman has well shown, that, even during the Apostolic age, "on three memorable occasions, the Church was compelled to recast and exhibit in new forms of language the truth formerly held, and compelled to do this because of the perversion to error and heresy of the terms formerly employed to set forth the truth." The Church of Christ, Vol. I., p. 292. What, then, becomes of the assertion of Mr. McCune, contradicted by every leaf of history, sacred and profane, that saving faith, *ipso facto*, excludes all fatal heresy, and that as the "brief creed" (!) of the Apostles was sufficient to exclude it in their day, "so it is sufficient now!" If it is answered

that inspired Apostles might make a creed, but not uninspired men, let Mr. McCune remember that the stream between Jerusalem and Gaza beheld the Abyssinian baptized by Philip upon the Abyssinian's own human-made creed; and let him further remember that not the fact of inspiration, but the pressing need of the Church, was the ground for creed-enlargement and restatement in Apostolic days, a need existing subsequently as well as then, and its supply warranted in every age by Apostolic practice. What had become of pure doctrine, on Mr. McCune's principle of no human creed, in the fourth century, when the Church, to use the words of Jerome, "woke up to find itself Arian?" or again, woke up to find itself Pelagian? or, in the sixteenth century, woke up to find itself Pagan? Were Athanasius, Augustin, Luther, Calvin, "unblushing usurpers of the Divine prerogative?" So teaches a Presbyterian minister who subscribes the Westminster Confession.

Mr. McCune charges the Presbyterian Church, in common with all other evangelical denominations, as being an oppressor of the conscience, because, by denominational law, she recognizes conformity to her standards, and binds them on her official ministry. It is a severe charge. But whose conscience is oppressed? Not mine. Not the conscience of any who sincerely adopt the standards. Does she oppress the conscience of the members of this Presbytery? Are what Mr. McCune calls her human deductions and inferences "contrary" to the word of God? She declares they are "*agreeable* to the word or God," and Mr. McCune has professed sincerely to adopt them as such. Has he yet to learn that what is deduced by good and necessary consequence from Scripture is Scriptural? Concede, if you will, that all other creeds are an oppression of the conscience, is our own amenable to that charge? The fundamentals of the Presbyterian Church are her creed, her standards, and nothing less, all professedly adopted and approved by Mr.McCune. Again, I ask, whose conscience is oppressed? The allegation betrays the fact of Mr. McCune's practical and avowed abandonment of the distinctive Creed, Government, and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church,

while yet remaining in her bosom, an abandonment began years ago. The Presbyterian Church repels the libel from the lips of her own son, to whom she has yielded almost boundless license, that she is an oppressor of the conscience. Never once has she interfered with his right of private judgment, even when insisting on her own rights of authoritative instruction, and on her right to interfere and restrain his public *conduct*. Never once has she said to any man, you *shall* adopt my creed, you *shall* submit to my government. What she has said is, if you can honestly and sincerely adopt and approve the Standards, then welcome here. If you can not, then let us remain apart in peace. The applicant for ministerial office can find another home more congenial among the people of God. But if the proposal is accepted, she demands that good faith shall be kept, and no "Trojan Horse" introduced within her walls to betray her. Mr. McCune pleads rights of conscience. Rights of conscience are not rights of membership. Rights of conscience are not rights to profess one thing and practice another. He pleads the right of private judgment. The right of private judgment is not the right of belonging to this Presbytery and advocating "no creed" and a polity at war with our Constitution. Detraction is not a right of private judgment. The Arian's right of private judgment gives him no right here. A man may have the right of private judgment and not be able to tell the difference between Presbyterianism and Popery. He may be a simpleton. The possession of the right does not confer the thing. A beggar may have a right to be rich and a foolish man to be wise, and yet the one remain poor, and the other a simpleton, all their days. A man may have the right to be a Presbyterian and yet be a Cardinal or Pope. Does the right of private judgment make him a Presbyterian, or does it give him a right to profess to be what he is not? or to be where he has no right to be? The right to membership in this Presbytery does not rest on the right of private judgment, nor on the right of conscience. It rests upon sincere and honest adoption and approval of her Standards, and upon the zealous and faithful maintaining the peace, purity, and

unity of the Church. It rests upon the solemnity of a personal vow that the man is a Presbyterian by conviction, and in heart, and not a mere wearer of the name, one-third Presbyterian, one-third Papal, and one-third Independent in his theories. A Presbyterian minister is a man whose Rule of Faith is the Word of God, and whose creed is the Westminster Standards. Is this Mr. McCune's description? I aver that if the ministry of the Presbyterian Church were allowed to teach and to do as Mr. McCune has been allowed to teach and to do, in reference to the question of creeds alone, and to traduce the denominational enactments and laws of their own Church as "sectarian," and as an oppression of the conscience, and publicly recommend the "striking out" of every thing that all other Christians "can not see to be law in Scripture," a generation would not pass away until the treacherous hand of organic union, preferring Union before Truth, had laid it in its grave. Already, by public utterance, he remands to what he calls "the broad and free domain of Christian liberty," under her no-creed system, every thing distinctively settled in the Presbyterian Standards, as to "man's relation to God's sovereignty, forms of making religious profession, modes of worship, subjects of Baptism, methods of organization, kinds and functions of Church-officers." He is looking for "greater light." Is this loyalty to the Presbyterian Church? Is this maintenance of her doctrine and order? "Strike out" all that, and how much is left of the Standards? I pass to the fourth Specification.

SPECIFICATION IV.

Vows of Ordination.

This Specification asserts the teaching of Mr. McCune to be that Presbyterian ministers, under solemn vows to study the peace, unity, and purity of the Church, are yet free to advocate views antagonistic to those they have vowed to maintain, and still remain in their ecclesiastical connexion, while they who object, should themselves retire from the body, if not content to indulge such liberty. The ever-varying axis of rotation for elders, ministers, and deacons,

upon such a principle, would reverse the ecclesiastical poles themselves. The ecclesiastical orbit, under such a theory, may be a circle, an ellipse, a parabola, or an infinitely unreturning hyperbola, and the minister himself become, in doctrine, like the comet-forms that sail and sweep the interplanetary spaces. According to Mr. McCune, a Presbyterian minister is at liberty, *after* his ordination, to hold "any views" he held before his ordination, and advocate the same. His doctrine is that ministerial vows are not binding. Under the manifestly sophistical form of expression, "the Church only asks men, at their ordination, what their *present views* are, and *never pledges them not to change their views*," he teaches that every Presbyterian minister may face about to the full extent of his own variations and yet remain in the body for the sake of indorsement and good standing. The clearly implied assertion is that such liberty is consistent with ministerial obligations. He suggests to an objector to his "views," "course," "scheme," "project," and "aim," that the proper solution of the objection is for the objector himself to retire. He proposes, with a cool temperature, that his name "*shall stand* on the roll of the Presbytery" as long as he is in its bounds. He declares that to ask a man not to advocate what he, an individual, believes to be God's truth, is to ask him to disobey God, and that if Presbytery requires him to renounce opinions and ways destructive in her judgment to the peace, unity, and purity of the Church, she will sit "in the Temple of God," and show herself "as God" over his conscience. He announces definitely for all time that he will never submit to such "usurpation of the Divine prerogative," and informs the court that he "proposes" still to advocate his peculiar views. He pleads the prestige his doctrines have won from the official circulation of them ordered by the Synod of Cincinnati in 1870, the first Synod after the Reunion, and seeks shelter behind that body as the ecclesiastical indorser of his Organic Union principles. He pleads the countenance and concurrence of this Presbytery. He says: "It is susceptible of proof that the advocacy of these Christian Union doctrines has been with

the knowledge and by the permission of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, and by the consent and with the co-operation of the Synod of Cincinnati, and that this advocacy is not in violation of any Presbyterian law whatever." Collateral No. 4. Such is the ground on which he establishes his claim to teach and preach his peculiar views, and advocate their necessary and legitimate consequences. Briefly stated, his doctrine is that ordination vows do not bind Presbyterian ministers, while remaining under them, not to become anti-Presbyterian, nor to abstain from the public proclamation of their new departures from the faith and order of the Church.

It is not the first time such license has been proclaimed in the world, but it is the first time, in the history of the Presbyterian Church, that any Presbyterian minister has ever dared publicly to utter such sentiments and remain unchallenged either by his Presbytery or Synod for "ten years." It is a feature of our times. It is non-enforcement, the result of the new non-excluding law of organization.

The vows of Mr. McCune are solemn and unambiguous. They are the vows of every Presbyterian minister, elder, and deacon—a solemn covenant between himself and the whole Presbyterian Church, and every individual officer in it, before which he stands charged to-day for breach of that covenant, Christ, his brethren, the Church, and the world, being witnesses. The vows of Mr. McCune in the United Presbyterian Church, of which he was a member, and which he took, expressly bound him to "adhere to the Westminster Standards, so long as he remained in that body. The vows of our own church bind to the same adherence every one of its ministers. Their education is to this end, as also their examinations, trials, licensure, ordination, and installation. They not only declare that they "*sincerely receive and adopt* the Confession of Faith as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures," and that they "approve of the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in these United States," but they vow solemnly before God and the Presbytery to

"study the peace, unity, and purity of the Church," and to be "zealous and faithful" in maintaining the same. Digest, pp. 399, 410, 411. All this, replies Mr. McCune, does not involve continued adherence to views professed at the time of ordination. He claims that "any views" a man may have entertained "*before*" he comes into the Church, he has a right to hold and advocate *after* he comes in." (Spec. VI, Proof 3.) Moderator and brethren, all this pleading is worse than a quibble. It is evasion and bad faith. It is inconsistent with honor, truth, the precepts of the gospel, and loyalty to the Presbyterian Church. True, the Church does not pledge any minister "*not to change his views*," but she does pledge him, in his vows of ordination, to "*study*" her "peace, unity, and purity," to be "zealous and faithful in maintaining" these, as also in his vow to "submit" to her authority, to respect her "denominational laws," and her "organic enactments," which not only *require* the teaching of her doctrine and polity, but *forbid* the teaching of anything contrary thereto. He is not at liberty publicly to exclaim against her distinctive tenets and laws as sinful sectarianism, and deny her right of distinctive existence. He is not at liberty to advocate the dropping off of her Presbyterian peculiarities for the sake of "Organic Union." They are not "mere peculiarities;" they are vital to her system and to the truth of God. No. Vows do not bind any man "*not to change*" his views, but a change of views does bind every honorable man to ask a release from the vows he took to advocate the old views he has now abandoned, and not to advocate the new ones he has embraced. Apply Mr. McCune's views of liberty to the oaths of Federal and State officers to support the National Constitution, and to our Theological Professors to maintain the Standards of the Church, and then imagine the result! The doctrine is treason in both cases. It was for the purpose of binding to adherence and non-departure from sound doctrine our Standards were adopted by the fathers of the Presbyterian Church in this land. It was in the overture of John Thompson, a sire, for aught I know, of the respected elder you have put on this Committee of

Prosecution, and at a time when the infant Church had no written Constitution, in 1728, preliminary to the Adopting Act, that he besought the General Synod "to publicly and authoritatively adopt the Westminster Confession and Catechisms," and then "to oblige every Presbytery within their bounds to oblige every candidate for the ministry to acknowledge, *coram Presbyterio*, the said Confession of Faith, and next, "*to promise not to teach or preach anything contrary to it.*" Baird's Digest, 29. Did this mean non-adherence? The Constitution was adopted and the vows were taken. Is contemporaneous exposition an authority? Is the uniform practice of the Church an authority? Non-adherence! What means the act of 1758, "strictly enjoining it on all our members and probationers for the ministry *that they preach and teach according to the form of sound words in said Confession and Catechism, and avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereto*," and if their consciences will not permit them to allow any matter determined by the major vote of the Presbyterian Church, to "peacably withdraw." Digest, p. 48. What means the solemn pledge which, in 1819, the Presbyterian Church imposed upon her Theological Professors, to whom she was about to intrust the training of her ministry? Was it consistent with non-adherence? Does it allow Professors to drop off the distinctive features of Presbyterian doctrine and polity in their instruction, or encourage her ministry in a disorganizing course she would not herself tolerate for a moment? I will repeat it. "In the presence of God and of the Directors of this Seminary, I do solemnly and *ex animo* adopt, receive, and subscribe the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America as the Confession of my Faith, or as a summary and just exhibition of that system of religious belief which is contained in Holy Scripture, and therein revealed by God to man for his salvation; and I do solemnly, *ex animo*, profess to receive the Form of Government of said Church as agreeable to the inspired oracles. And I do solemnly promise and engage not to inculcate, teach, or insinuate anything which shall appear to me to contradict or contra-

vene, either directly or impliedly, anything taught in the said Confession of Faith or Catechism, nor to oppose any of the fundamental principles of Presbyterian Church Government, while I shall continue a Professor in this Seminary." Digest, p. 377. Why bind her instructors so strictly unless that she might also have a ministry trained, without equivocation, to the faithful maintenance of her Standards? What means the act of 1825, that "ministers who manifested a decided hostility to ecclesiastical creeds, confessions, and formularies," shall also "withdraw?" Digest, p. 55. Does it mean non-adherence? What means the vested right of the Presbytery, inscribed in the Constitution, "to condemn erroneous opinions which injure the purity or peace of the Church," *i. e.*, which conflict with the solemn vows to study and maintain that purity and peace, in matters of doctrine and order, if it does not mean adherence to the Standards? What means that other positive obligation on the Synod to compel the Presbyteries to "preserve" and enforce the Constitution, which is the sole bond of our union; and that other of the Assembly to deal with every Presbytery and Synod derelict herein? Digest, pp. 144, 191, 218. But I forbear to expand the law references on this point.

The doctrine of Mr. McCune as to non-adherence, with liberty to remain in the body, is twin-sister of his doctrine of non-enforcement. It is disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church, intensified by the lordly utterance, "It is useless to make any intimations to me on this subject. I *propose* that my name shall stand on the roll of this Presbytery so long as I remain in Cincinnati or vicinity."

One other remark germane to this point. It is the habit of the advocates of so-called "liberty" in teaching the Presbyterian faith and order, to plead that in their vows of ordination they only subscribe to a "*system*" of doctrine as "contained" in the confession. The emphasis is put upon the word "system." Mr. McCune has used it abundantly. It is a grievous misfortune for Mr. McCune in the first place that even this shelter for his new doctrines will not avail him, for he holds that denominations, as such, are "essen-

tially sinful," and have no scriptural right either to a distinctive "system" of doctrine or to a distinctive existence. Upon his own showing, he has no right even to take a vow to maintain a distinctive "system" of doctrine, let alone objecting to the doctrines of the system! He is utterly opposed to "human deductions," system or no system. To plead that he will maintain the distinctive system he declares has no right to exist, because the denomination it represents has none, is simply to convict himself of self-contradiction. If he maintains the "system" has a right to exist, then the denomination built on that system has a right to exist also. If he maintains the denomination, as such, has no right to exist, then the system goes along with it. Either way the interpleader is vain.

But, granting Mr. McCune the benefit of his contradiction, how can ordination vows bind to maintain the "system" of doctrine, and not bind to maintain the "doctrines of the system?" A "system of doctrine" is a science of doctrine, all whose parts are organically related, each one of whose doctrines is necessary to the integrity of the system, and all which are inseparably linked with the fundamental principles and facts on which it rests. The system of doctrine in its integrity is the sum total of the doctrines of the system organically bound together.* To explain away the doctrines, is to impair the integrity of the system. To impair the integrity of the doctrines is to impair the integrity of the system. How can Mr. McCune advocate the doctrines he holds, and yet claim that he holds to the system of doctrine, and so keep his vows inviolate? It is impossible. If, by non-adherence, you take away one doctrine, you may take away two; if two, you may take away ten;

---

* It was argued, and confidently asserted, by Mr. McCune and many others in Presbytery, that the last twelve chapters of our Confession do not belong to, and make no part of our "system of doctrine," and that Dr. Charles Hodge, of Princeton, so teaches, in the Princeton Review; and that, *therefore*, Mr. McCune's peculiar views about the Nature of the Church, the Covenant of God with believers, Infant Baptism, Infant Church-membership, the binding and perpetual obligation of the Sacraments, etc., etc., *did not impair the integrity of our system!* I deem it but just to the name of Dr. Hodge, to append this note, by way of protest against the perversion of his words so persistently made in order to find a shelter and defense for Mr. McCune. T. H. S.

if ten, the whole. Can a man who denies that a plurality of congregations, organically bound under one ecclesiastical rule, is "a church," maintain the integrity of our system of polity? He denies the polity itself. Can a man who holds that the "body of Christ" is the "visible church," that infants of believers are not members of the church, that infant baptism as a *covenant* transaction is to be repudiated, that unbaptized persons may become members of the church, that a man may be a christian and not believe either the infallibility of the Bible or proper humanity of Christ, or who remands to the broad domain of liberty, "modes of worship, subjects of baptism, methods of organization, kinds and functions of church officers," and denies the scriptural right of Presbyterianism, as such, can such an one, when called to account, put in the interpleader, Oh! I did not bind myself "not to change my views," I vowed only to maintain the system of Presbyterian doctrine, not everything in the confession? Moderator, he neither holds the system of doctrine, nor the doctrines of the system. And it is a vain excuse to plead conscience, private judgment, and a liberty "unchallenged" for a decade of years. I can not forbear to quote the admirable words of Dr. Krauth on this subject, "If a man," says he, "were examined as a candidate for a chair of astronomy in a university, and were asked, 'What is your astronomical system?' and were to answer, 'I accept the teaching of the stars,' the reply would be, 'You may think you do; so does the man who is sure that the stars move round the world, and that they are not orbs, but gimlet holes to let the glory through! We wish to know *what* you hold the teaching of the stars *to be?* Do you receive, as in harmony with them, the results reached by Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Laplace, and Herschel, or do you think the world one great flat, and the sun and moon mere pendants to it?' 'Gentlemen,' replies the independent investigator, 'the theories of astronomers are human-made systems—man-made theories. I go out every night on the hills and look at the stars, as God made them, through a hole in my blanket, with my own good eyes, not with a man-made telescope or fettered by a man-made theory; and I believe in the stars and in what they teach

me, but if I were to say or write what they teach me, *that would be a human-made creed, and I am opposed to all creeds.*' 'Very well,' reply the examiners, 'we wish you a good pair of eyes, and feel it unnecessary to go any further. If you are unwilling to *confess* your faith, we will not tax your conscience with the inconsistency of *teaching* that faith, nor tax our own with the hazard of authorizing you to set forth, in the name of the stars, your own ignorant assumptions about them." Conservative Reformation, p. 167. Think of an astronomer pledged to teach the Newtonian system, pleading Mr. McCune's argument! Think of a Presbyterian minister pledged to teach the "old ancestral Calvinism," the Standards, "pure and simple," the Calvinistic system, asserting that he does teach that "system," and so keeps his ordination vows, while yet pleading "the Bible is my creed," "I have a right to change my views," and still remain unchallenged on the roll of the Presbytery! Were commercial business to be transacted on such interpretations of promises to pay, the whole community would be wrecked. There is not a business man in the world who would loan to another an amount of money, under such a liberty of interpretation, and ever expect one dollar of it to return to his hands. I pass to the fifth specification.

SPECIFICATION V.

Plurality of Official Membership.

This specification reveals a new planet in the ecclesiastical heavens, and one of baneful omen. It is an admitted fact that every planet in our system affects the motions of every other planet, and the same is true of every denomination. When Uranus was discovered, it was found there was something still affecting its motions, and the suggestion was made that a planet beyond itself was in existence. Thanks to the observations of Adams and Le Verrier, and the superior Berlin star-map, Neptune was discovered whirling his way in the skies, only two billion seven hundred thousand miles away from the central sun. The disturbances of our Presbyterian planet here have awakened similar suspicions, and all eyes have been on the Lookout to discover, if possible, the reason of the perturbations.

Your Committee of Prosecution announce that a new denomination exists, much nearer to ours than Neptune to the sun, and that its singular and contradictory law of motion is this, that it moves in the orbits of every other while yet claiming to move in one of its own. "Anti-denomination" is its denomination. "Official Plurality" is its law. It is an ecclesiastical phenomenon. Never before, in history, was such a thing known—never before in morals. It is an absorber and disorganizer; an absorber in that it feeds upon all the rest—a disorganizer in that it denies their right to exist, accounting all creeds but its own heretical and schismatical. It moves in the hazy atmosphere of "Organic Church Union." One of its chief creators in these parts is Mr. McCune. If not a creation *ex nihilo*, it is a development *ex materia præexistente*, and is claimed to be the Darwinian fittest to survive. The stride of progress is immense, wider than the steps of Homer's gods in space. The inhabitants of all other church planets are called upon to keep one foot in their own denomination and plant the other in the new, claiming still that they are lawful denizens of both. If any choose to make the full spring at once, all well; but dismissed or undismissed, it makes no difference. For private members and public ministers, two consciences, two private judgments, two conflicting obligations, two communions, two creeds, two opposing jurisdictions, two antagonizing denominations, plurality of membership and plurality of office. This is the doctrine publicly advocated by Mr. McCune. It is the law of a strange progeny, bad in ethics, self-ruinous in practice, condemned in Scripture. It is the central device of the new movement whereby its advocates hope to forestall the recoil of their own principle upon themselves; an ingenious hold-on-and-let-go expedient of defense against the reproach of disorganization; a last-born plea wherewith to refute or parry the charge, that while professing to oppose all distinctive denominations they are caught in the very act of adding one more to the list. In the case of Mr. McCune, it is the profession of adherence while practicing non-adherence to the Presbyterian faith and order—a quicksand foundation on which to build his claims to

remain on the roll of his Presbytery while still teaching that it is an unauthorized and extra-scriptural body. The mystery of the organization of the Linwood and Mt. Lookout church of undismissed church members, and the equal mystery of the claim of Mr. McCune, as an enrolled member of the new anti-denominational association of ministers and independent churches, to not sever his denominational relations, is completely solved. This double back-acting and forward-acting motion at one and the same step is the law of the new enterprise and a fact in ecclesiology unknown before.

The fact of a new organization is abundantly evinced by the proofs under the specification. The extensive appeal signed by Mr. McCune and his co-laborators in organic union, and made to "all the Christian ministers and churches iu North America," to begin the organization of the New Testament Church, is now in court, and on your table. The evidence of the call and action of three general conventions at New York, Cincinnati, and Suffolk, Va., in this interest, over one of which Mr. McCune presided as chairman, is here. The additional evidence of organization and subscription to the "New Basis," is taken from Mr. McCune's own paper, the *work done* in that behalf being left for consideration under the Second Charge. The recognition of the Texas "plan of organization" as one with the Cincinnati and Suffolk movement, establishes the fact of "organization" beyond a question. You will observe carefully the dates, and the progress of the work: first, the "Address to all Christian Ministers and Churches in North America," signed by Mr. McCune and others, Oct., 1874, page 13 of the case; second, the three general conventions respectively at New York, Cincinnati, and Suffolk, Va., Oct., 1873, 1874, and 1875, page 15 of the case; third, the language of the Christian Unity, resumed under the triple editorship of Dr. Wellons, Mr. McCune and Mr. Melish, saying, "The Christian Unity begins its career (again) with fixed purposes and aims, etc.," and "*we must organize, band ourselves together as ministers and churches, etc.*," Aug. 1875, p. 15 of the case; fourth, the response of Mr. McCune to Mr. Thrall admitting the "*organizing by actual visible oneness*," Aug. 1875, page

15 of the case; fifth, the actual, visible organization of Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church, and the publication of its basis to the world, Dec. 1875, pp. 14 and 27 of the case. The "project," scheme and "aim," and actual "organization" are beyond a peradventure, both as to a General Association of Ministers and Churches, and as to a particular, actual and visible organization, where all evangelical Christians were to be received, of every denomination, the Gospel preached, candidates trained for the ministry, and ministers sent out into the world. I have established the fact. I have given the data of the approach and visible outstanding existence of the new planet in our hemisphere. The remainder of the testimony I need not go over. The "initial step" of the visible embodiment of the organic union principles in the new anti-denominational denomination is expressly shown to be the actual reception of Christians into a separate, independent and particular society.

The law of this organization is as already described. Ministers, dismissed or undismissed from their old denominational relations, are received. "Any minister who has adopted this Basis, *but does not deem it expedient to sever existing denominational relations, shall, at his own request, be enrolled, notwithstanding.*" Such is the law. "Notwithstanding" what? Notwithstanding his solemn vows and obligations to the denomination where he belongs: Signature to the Basis, and enrollment, constitute him, *ipso facto*, a standing member in the new Association. But signatures and enrollments have already been made. The organization, the "banding ourselves together," with the "Basis," as a bond of union, is a historical fact. What shall I call this law of plurality, of individual ministerial membership in two antagonizing organizations—this double allegiance, genuine in the one case and spurious in the other? Will historic congregational "usage," or Dexter, or the Boston platform, cover it? Not exactly. Is it the new Oberlin departure of 1871 abandoning its Westminster banner precisely for such a thing as this? Then we know indeed what the character of that new departure is. Is it anarchy? Will Presbyterian usage cover it? Not exactly. The same limitations are found here also. Will "Independent Presbyter-

ianism" cover it? Not exactly. The thing is a phenomenon. What shall I call it, this advocacy of plural and antagonizing responsibilities, the profession of loyalty and sincerity in all, while the last aim at the ruin of the first? When I say it is a "Trojan Horse" introduced into this Presbytery, I say all that need be said. The moral character of that transaction speaks for itself. "Timeo Danaos *et* dona ferentes!" When I affirm that such a law of double and conflicting jurisdiction is advocated by a Presbyterian minister, with the express aim of depreciating the distinctive peculiarities of his own denomination, I affirm that it is morally wrong, and no ingenuity can harmonize it with an honest and sincere adoption of our Standards. It is disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church. Whether in the case of ministers or private members, to act upon such a principle is to break covenant, and violate both ordination and sacramental vows.

But this claim to double-membership, whether official or private, is ridiculous, as well as morally wrong. If a communicant may be a member of two churches at the same time, the same principle will allow him to be a member of three, and of as many more as he pleases, *provided, always*, the new divine law of organization, "Receive ye one another," is understood by all according to Mr. McCune's interpretation! If a minister may belong to two different organizations at the same time, he may belong to a dozen. If he may join the new organic union organization of "Christian Union Churches," he may become a standing member in the house of Bishops, one in the Methodist Conference as well, one in the Baptist Association too, and a member of the Presbyterian General Assembly besides. There is no limit. His blooming honors thick upon him, he may run and radiate through the whole circle of denominations, *provided, always*, they would "receive" him, as he would "receive" them. If ejected from one, his standing would be good in all the rest. Besides, once in, they have no right to exclude him. He can remain on their roll. It is such a privilege Mr. McCune advocates—the privilege that a United States senator should be a member of the British Parliament, of the Reichsrath of King William,

and of the French Chambers at the same time; the privilege that the autocrat of all the Russias should be President of the United States, King of Italy, Sultan of Turkey, and Hospodar of Bosnia, all under different oaths, laws, and governments, and yet advocating allegiance and obedience to all at the same time. True, he has the prevision that under the operation of such a rule, denominations would soon disappear; but, meanwhile, till that millennium comes, this plurality of contrary membership is to be indulged, in hope that thus the Savior's prayer may soon be answered, the world converted, and denominations be ready to vanish away.

But the Presbyterian Church will not allow this duplicity of membership, self-contradictory and suicidal to the church, its individual members and ministers together. Ministerial and sacramental vows, moral consistency, covenant obligations, the already quoted organic enactments of the church, which I need not repeat, are all against it. In the case of private members, "willful absence" from the regular ministrations to attendance on which they are solemnly pledged, the absenting themselves from and refusing to support the church to which they belong, "is a disciplinable offense, and upon its occurrence discipline is enjoined." Digest, p. 494. The confession of a "change of views" is no defense against the sin of "having violated covenant by continued absence from the ordinances of the church." p. 494. Attendance upon another church is no excuse, for the delinquent is still a member. The plea that he has joined another church, without dismission, in the region where his own exists, is not allowed, for it is a disorderly withdrawal and an irregular connection. "No church member can ever properly cease to be such, except by *death*, *exclusion*, *a regular dismission*, or *an orderly withdrawing* to join some other denomination." p. 625. "To withdraw from a use of his privileges as a member, *either by irregularly connecting himself with another denomination*, or by going to a distant part of the world, etc., without making known his removal to the church session, and asking for a certificate for the purpose of enjoying occasional communion elsewhere, or of *dismission to join some other church*, is itself a

censurable violation of the principles of church fellowship, and may infer suspension from its privileges." pp. 625, 626. The law of our church is very clear, and its application to the principle and case before us is inevitable. For church members to join another organization without dismission from the church to which they belong, so absenting themselves willfully from the organization and ministrations they are under covenant obligations to support, is an evil example, a breaking of covenant, a censurable violation of the principles of church fellowship, an offense upon which discipline is enjoined, and may infer suspension from the church. These are some of the "denominational laws" and "organic enactments" Mr. McCune would like to have out of the way. Double-membership is not allowed. If the parents do this, what will the children do? What kind of a church shall we have the next generation?

In the case of a public minister, the argument is *a fortiori*. If a private church member may not be guilty of such license, much more a Presbyterian minister may not encourage him in the same. If the Standards of the church condemn it, the officer under vows to maintain the Standards may not be a party to the propagation of doctrines at variance herewith, nor a party to the censurable irregularity. If a private individual may not assume a double-membership, much more a public officer under vows to exercise discipline in such cases may not himself be guilty of advocating or doing the same. If *not* in the member, *much more not* in the minister. The Presbyterian Church orders that any of her ministers who have joined another ecclesiastical association or another denomination are to be "stricken from the roll, if not chargeable with fundamental error in doctrine or immorality in life." Digest, pp. 109, 620. She will not allow ministers of another association to belong to her own at the same time, nor her own to belong to another. Others who come to her fold must bring letters of dismission and good standing. Plurality of official membership in different denominations she will not permit. The plea of "non-withdrawal" from her own body, while uniting with another, she will not tolerate, and

could not, for it is the very gravamen and core of the transgression itself. It is a plea for double and conflicting jurisdiction, double and conflicting allegiance, under creeds, laws, vows, and obligations mutually contradictory, and destructive of her peace, unity, and purity as a church; and putting out of sight altogether the question of a pastoral relation to a particular church "outside of her jurisdiction," the personal presence in Presbytery and non-withdrawal of a minister, himself under two distinct allegiances —one Presbyterian, the other Independent—mutual contradiction in polity, a regular officer in one denomination standing and claiming the right to be enrolled in another, is no argument in his vindication. It is the very substance and essence of the offense itself, making the violation of obligations of loyalty to the distinctive faith and order of his church its own justification. He says to the one organization, "I'm on your side," and to the other organization, "I'm on your side." He can not be true to both. Plurality of official relation here is insincerity. He can not sincerely "adopt," "approve," and "maintain" the distinctive faith and order of the Presbyterian Church with a good conscience or "singleness of heart," either toward God or man. Such double dealing, were it generally accepted as a rule of action by our ministers, would bring the Presbyterian Church, first to contempt and at last to ruin. It is the natural fruit and legitimate consequence of the newly invented "divine law of organization." The organic unity that gives birth to a principle like this is simply organic duplicity. The tree is bad. It is known by its fruits. Men do not gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles.

I pass to the sixth specification.

SPECIFICATION VI.

Terms of Ministerial Membership.

The doctrine charged in this specification is that no Presbytery has any right to exclude from its official membership any Christian minister, no matter to what denomi-

nation he belongs, but that every Christian minister is, *ipso facto*, *entitled* to a seat in any Presbytery, to a pastorate in any church, and to any position of office and trust the church may have to offer. This title is said to rest upon a "*right*" to official membership. This "right" is said to rest upon the simple fact that a man is a "*Christian minister*." His *call* to the ministry is assumed as the ground of the right, and no other test of ministerial qualification is allowed, save assent to a "few leading truths," "expressed in God's own language," without any "human deductions" or "inferences" therefrom, or any human "modifications." The simple fact that he assents to a few unexplained texts, as his creed, is a Christian man, and wants to be in the Presbyterian Church, is enough. He must be admitted to the Presbytery. If he is an Independent, denying our ascending series of courts, and the right of one ecclesiastical rule over many congregations organically bound together, and the right of such organization to be called "a church," he is nevertheless to be admitted. If he is a Prelate, asserting apostolical succession, three orders in the ministry, repudiating the parity of the clergy, and disputing the ordination of his brethren, he must be admitted. If he is a Lutheran, proclaiming consubstantiation and the ubiquity of Christ's body, he must be admitted. If he is a Baptist, denying infant baptism, infant church membership, and asserting immersion, he must be admitted. If he is a Quaker, repudiating external sacraments as signs and seals of the covenant of grace, he must be admitted. If he is a Semi-Pelagian or Arminian, the one advocating a theology that starts from the principle of human agency and only introducing the Divine as a synergistic help to the sinner, the other advocating a theology that denies the absolute election of men to eternal life, and affirming their salvation only on the condition of foreseen good works and faith, both must be admitted. Apollinarian, admitting that Christ had a human body and soul, but denying that he had a human spirit; Nestorian, sundering the natures of Christ and teaching a double personality; Eutychian, absorbing the human in the Divine and compounding a new person-

ality—all must be admitted. The Calvinistic Church has no right to distinctively exist as a separate denomination. The distinctive tenets of faith and order, achieved after long conflict, consecrated in the Westminster Standards, and bound upon the official ministry of our church, are to be remanded to the category of indifference because the "new divine law of organization" is grounded in a text that relates to things indifferent. In other words, and precisely, denominations are "essentially sinful," and should be abolished, the Presbyterian with the rest, the Court of Christ turned into a plain of Shinar with a new Babel as its tower, no man surrendering anything, each one enjoying free speech, the rights of conscience accorded and exercised to the last breath, a "*Concordia Discors*" of mutual "forbearance in love," a "*Campus Martius*" of conflicting beliefs and policies, an amphitheater of belligerent priesthood, anointed for the combat, but not with Aaron's oil, "brethren" dwelling together in "Organic Unity," where no dew of Hermon descends, and where the Lord commands no blessing, but spiritual death forevermore. Behold! Is it "good and pleasant," this Organic Church Union? It is built on a "new divine law of organization," which entitles every Christian minister, *ipso facto*, to a seat in any Presbytery or conference in Christendom. It is like the under world, the Grave, as Blair describes it:

> "'Tis here all meet:
> The shivering Icelander and sunburnt Moor,
> Men of all climes that never met before,
> *And of all creeds.*"

Its name is "Legion," for it is many. Multitude is its motto. Indifference its creed. It is the toleration of the Grave. It is the warfare of the shades. It is the extravaganza of supreme folly.

Have the committee misrepresented the defendant? Read the proofs. Read the bold declaration, dogmatic and authoritative, squarely made in face of the excluding law of our Standards, that "any Christian minister has a right to membership" in this or any other Presbytery, no matter what his peculiar creed; that he is both "eligible" and

"entitled" to "every privilege" and "every position" implied in such membership, whether pastor, teacher of theology or church government, with free speech unchecked, and full power to "imbue the whole denomination" with his views, and that any one who dares to ask him not to advocate his antagonisms to our Standards usurps the "Throne of the Lord God Omnipotent." Read the double mockery of a liberalism that scorns to even respect the vow that binds to reverence and defense of our organic law, and sneers at our "beautiful consistency" and "delightful fellowship." Is this loyalty to the Presbyterian Church? Is there "some difference of opinion" here? How long would the church survive were such a course generally allowed? Is the claim of a plenary indulgence to spread abroad unchallenged for "ten years," such palpable contradiction of the Presbyterian Church, by sermon, paper, lecture, and debate, while receiving thousands from her funds, and subverting her order, an argument in defense of loyalty to the church and to ministerial vows? Is the license of unrebuked abuse against members of this Presbytery who have sought by milder measures to arrest this revolutionary liberty, so long indulged, or the plea that a personal defense of our faith and order against such doctrine was a persecution of the defendant, or that conscience consecrates the right of a Presbyterian officer to revolt against his standard and yet remain undisciplined, is this a demonstration that our terms of ministerial fellowship are sinfully sectarian and should be blotted out? Moderator and brethren, your Committee are of one mind that our denomination, and our ministry, have been brought into contempt by the necessity that has demanded this judicial process.

The doctrine of ministerial non-exclusion from the Presbyterian Church, advocated by Mr. McCune, rests, as I have said, upon what he calls a "right" of inclusion, and that so-called right rests upon the simple fact that the applicant is a Christian minister. In other words, an assumed call to the ministry, *ipso facto*, entitles to membership in this Presbytery. Under the toleration, in our midst, of such a

sentiment, and with the old rule for the examination of ministers suppressed, who may not now knock at our door, or if knocking be refused admission? Is this our boasted Reunion? The doctrine of Mr. McCune is that, precisely as a private Christian has, *ipso facto*, a right to be in any Presbyterian Church, no matter what his opposition to Presbyterianism may be, and no matter how calculated, by talent or otherwise, to make trouble in our house, so any Christian minister has, *ipso facto*, a right to be in this Presbytery, no matter how opposed to our Standards. The plain English is, our Standards have no right to exist. It is no misrepresentation of the defendant. The doctrine has been publicly advocated for ten years, and is well known. The proofs are abundant and specific. Our polity is sinful—that's what it means. It is a "Wedge of Division," an "Apple of Discord," an "Achan in the Camp."

It will be enough that your Committee refer, without comment, to our law which Mr. McCune has so persistently opposed. The Presbyterian Church condemns the doctrines of Mr. McCune, and affirms that, as a guardian of the Truth of God, she *has* a right to exclude from her ministerial communion any minister who refuses to adopt the standards she has declared to be agreeable to the Word of God. In most express language, she declares her own inability to depart from the same, unless by "abandonment" of the Word of God itself. Her convictions are unalterable. Her judgment is the latest and ripest conclusion of all the contests in the Church of Christ for eighteen memorable centuries. She affirms, in common with every other branch of the Church, from which in many things she differs, that she is "*entitled to declare the terms of admission*" into her own communion, and the "*qualifications*" of her own ministers, and in such manner "that the faith once delivered to the saints be kept pure and uncorrupt among us, and so handed down to our posterity." Digest, pp. 44, 45. She does it all for the sake of the "Heavenly Doctrine," of more value than any organic union in earth or Heaven, and under a profound sense of her responsibility to Christ, the Head of the Church. She does exclude, and this is part of

her fidelity, historic glory, and blessing. She has inscribed her terms of admission in her standards, by requiring a sincere adoption, approval, and zealous maintenance of those standards, and of her peace, unity, and purity, bound up with such adoption, approval, and maintenance. Digest, pp. 48 (1), 49 (6), 55 (1, 2, 3). She is not a voluntary association, nor a Christian Commission, nor an irresponsible Council. She is a Divine Foundation, under law to Christ, accountable for the light she diffuses, or the darkness she spreads upon the world. She imposes solemn vows on all her officers, ministers, elders, and deacons to adhere to what she believes God's word to be. Digest, pp. 399, 410, 411. She therefore excludes all ministers who can not accept her standards. p. 57 (14). Churches that repudiate her polity can not be received or retained. pp. 62 (2), 92 (II, 2). She binds herself to the Calvinistic system. p. 85 (4.) By her Reunion covenant she makes her Confession of Faith a perpetual bond, and demands a positive approval of her polity. p. 91 (2). She requires that all her ministers shall teach according to her standards. p. 148. She strikes from her roll all those that join other denominations. pp. 620 (7), 169 (8.) She insists upon the "enforcement" of her standards. p. 191 (IV). She subjects to discipline all who traduce them. p. 54. She repudiates Mr. McCune's "human deduction," drawn from the language of God. Rom. 15:7, p. 45. She wants no new Confession. p. 73. She will unite with none, organically, except upon the "Basis of the Standards." pp. 45–48. Is it possible for her to be more explicit in her condemnation of the doctrine of Mr. McCune, a doctrine which is a point-blank impeachment of the very terms of fellowship on which he was received into her ministerial communion? I place the responsibility where it belongs. I submit that a bolder assault upon the Presbyterian Church, or a more defiant propagation of errors, destructive of her existence as a denomination, a more intelligently aimed stroke at her fundamental and vital doctrine, by any of her ministers, never was known in all her history. No other cases in the Digest will compare with it. The disastrous effect of this propagation for "ten years"

in this region can not be calculated. I appeal to living proof. It has been almost as much as a minister's reputation is worth to dare to stand up and resist the spirit under which this liberalism and lawlessness enjoyed their triumphal march. And with their eyes full upon the facts, and opening wider with astonishment at every step, your Committee are of one mind, that such a doctrine as the one in this single specification, and so clearly proved, and pregnant with such measureless consequences, is, of itself, amply strong to sustain the weight of the whole general charge. I pass to the seventh specification.

SPECIFICATION VII.

Infant Church Membership Denied.

This specification charges Mr. McCune with the public denial of the doctrine of infant church membership, and the affirmation of the counter-doctrine, that the visible Church on earth is simply a company of regenerate believers. He holds that the doctrine of infant church-membership is to be repudiated as a High Church theory, the child of a sacramentarian dogma, which mediates the grace of Christ through an apostolic succession and the outward performance of sacramental rites and ceremonies. The "offspring" of believers, or of professing Christians, are thrown outside of God's covenant with the Church, and upon which the Church rests. "A Christian Church," says he, "is a Church of Christians, an assembly of believers, a company of regenerate souls." The inclusion of their "children," he tells us, "is not a part of the common faith." His principle of Organic Union, built upon his interpretation of Rom. 15 : 7, "excludes all baptized children from church-membership who can not give satisfactory scriptural evidence that they are Christians;" *i. e.*, it excludes all infants. His language is as unmistakable here as elsewhere. He says: "*I utterly repudiate the doctrine of infant church membership.*" "Unbelieving, unconverted children" are not members of the visible Church, even though their parents are in church covenant with God. It is "a

High Church theory." He would baptize an infant, but not recognize that Baptism as a covenant sign and seal of grace, nor the infant as having any Church right to Baptism. Baptism, as a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, is only to be administered to regenerate souls, and this not upon a credible *profession* of their faith, but upon a credible "*evidence*" of faith; *i. e.*, evidence regarded as "satisfactory" to human judgment that a person is truly regenerate. To crown all, and strengthen his assertions, he assumes to speak authoritatively, and declare to the world that "*the Presbyterian Church has ceased to enforce Infant Baptism.*" These views of Mr. McCune betray, in an unmistakable manner, his true position, both as to doctrine and order. They rest upon a mutilation of the Abrahamic covenant, an identification of the "visible Church" with the "Body of Christ," an actual expulsion of the offspring of believers from their rights, the substitution in the case of adults of "credible *evidence* of faith" for a "credible *profession* of faith," and the theory that the terms of visible church-membership are identical with the terms of salvation, or membership in the "Body of Christ."

Before passing to the law of our Standards, I desire to quote the singularly appropriate words of Dr. Bannerman, to whose admirable work I have already referred. Having established the clear distinction between the visible and invisible Church, or the "visible Church" and the "Body of Christ," he says: "The principles in regard to the visible and invisible Church, already indicated, have a very important bearing on the question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of Infant Baptism." "The doctrine of the visible Church and its external relationship to Christ *lays the foundation* for those views of church-membership which justify us in regarding the infants of professing Christians to share in the communion and privileges of the Church." "The Independent view, which insists on the possession of a saving faith in Christ as the *only* footing on which church-membership can be conceded, and the only title to the enjoyment of church ordinances, tends very directly, if consistently carried out, to deprive the infants of professing

Christians of their right to be regarded as members of the Church, or to claim the benefits of its ordinances." Again, speaking of the Presbyterian terms of Communion, "a credible *profession* of faith," and a "corresponding life and conduct," he says: "The Independents demand something more than this. Positive *evidence* of a credible kind that a man is a true believer, and savingly united to Christ, is alone held to be sufficient warrant to admit him to a Christian Society, the work of grace effected in his soul being accounted the *only ground* and condition of *church-membership*. The difference between the principles of Presbyterians and Independents is broad and fundamental. With Independents, a *saving belief* in Christ is the only title of admission to the Christian Society. With Presbyterians, on the other hand, an intelligent *profession of belief in the gospel* is the title to admission to church-membership. The Independent system of church-membership is founded on a denial of the distinction between the visible and invisible Church of Christ." Church of Christ, Vol. I, pp. 36, 73. I think these quotations from so standard an authority, taken in connection with Mr. McCune's words, leave no room for doubt that Mr. McCune is not a Presbyterian, but an Independent, under a Presbyterian name, and can not, and does not, either adopt the system of doctrine in our Confession, or the system of polity in our Discipline. Brownism is not more radical.

Mr. McCune can not plead ignorance of our standards, however much he may plead "indifference," for he has studied them on this point, only to deny their doctrine, publicly, before the Evangelical Ministerial Association of Cincinnati, and spread the denial broadcast through the *Commercial* of May 9, 1876, even after the Presbytery had appointed its Investigating Committee, April 13, 1876, at Glendale. See Proof and Spec. XI., Proof 2. He quotes the standards only to assail them before others, and affirm that on this question they are no part of the common faith. Our law asserts that the "universal church consists of all those persons, in every nation, together with their children, who make *profession* of the holy religion of Christ, and of

submission to his laws." Digest, p. 107. "A particular church" it defines to "consist of a number of *professing* Christians, *with their offspring*, voluntarily associated together for divine worship and godly living, agreeably to the Holy Scriptures, and *submitting to a certain form of government.*" p. 107. "Children *born within the pale of the visible church*, and dedicated to God in baptism, are under the inspection and government of the Church." p. 108 (2, 6). "Not only those who do actually *profess* faith in, and obedience unto Christ, but also *the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized.*" p. 108 (2, d). "*All baptized persons are members of the church*, are under its care, subject to its government and discipline, and when they have arrived at the years of discretion, *they are bound to perform all the duties of church members.*" p. 497. The same doctrine is declared, p. 671, and the confirmation of it, p. 705. The same again in Conf. of Faith, Chap. XXV, Sec. II, and XXVIII, Sec. IV. Larger Cat. p. 62. Our Church forbids Mr. McCune to administer baptism "*to any that are outside of the visible church,*" and therefore to infants, if he regards them as not members, for "*all baptized persons are members of the Church.*" Larger Cat. Q. 166. Digest, p. 497. Shorter Cat. Q. 95. The visible church she declares *not* to be exclusively an assembly of believers and company of regenerate souls, but an assembly of *baptized professors of the true religion with their unregenerate offspring.* "The purest churches under heaven," she declares, "are subject to both mixture and error, and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan." Conf. of Faith, Chap. XXV, Sec. V. "Ignorant, wicked, and ungodly men," she says, "do receive the outward elements in the sacrament," "are unfit to enjoy communion with Christ," "unworthy of the Lord's table," and are "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord to their own damnation." Conf. of Faith, Chap. XXIX, Sec. VIII. Such is our definition of the New Testament Church, corresponding with our Saviour's illustrations in His parables of the tares and the wheat, the sheep and the goats, the good fish and the bad, the wise and the foolish virgins.

Both classes are included and sit under the means of grace, profess Christ, partake of the Lord's table, and meet together at the judgment seat, to be forever separated—some on the right hand, welcomed to life eternal, the rest, on the left, going away into everlasting punishment. Mr. McCune would be wiser than the Master. He says the New Testament Church is an "assembly of *believers*, a company of *regenerate* souls." His organic union church desires to be an improvement, in this dispensation, on the Master's plan. Peter's sheet, let down from heaven, had in it "all manner of four-footed beasts and creeping things." Mr. McCune's would contain only regenerate doves. Peter's net at Pentecost inclosed Ananias and Sapphira; Mr. McCune's at Mount Lookout would gather only such as Stephen, Paul, and Cornelius.

I dwell upon this specification, because of the fearful latitudinarianism of our times, with a host of lay preachers, who never refer to the covenant of God as the foundation of the visible Church, who regard the individual as its ultimate unit, and not the family, and who judge the title to membership in the church to be exclusively experiences and *evidence*, to fallible judgment, of regeneracy, and with whom, nevertheless, the doctrine of repentance has a small place in their preaching, while the mistake of emotional excitement for a work of grace has a wide berth—all this, with the increasing neglect of infant church-membership, baptism, and family training for God—threatens to sweep us away from our moorings. Organic union principles work in the same direction.

It is not true that the "offspring of believers," are not members of the visible church, and to be treated as such. They are *born* within the pale of the church. They were never outside of it. The first breath they draw, and the first light they see are covenant breath and light. The arms that press them first to a mother's breast, and the tears that fall upon them, and the soft kiss that blesses their infant cheek, are arms and tears and kiss of covenant love. Their birthright in the church is the result of a promise of grace made to Abraham and his seed. Their

first home on earth is in the church of God. They belong to it as truly as did Isaac in Sarah's arms, or Jacob in Rebecca's. The church covenant is a household covenant. "*I will be a God to thee and thy seed after thee.*" The promise is made to the children as well as to the parents. "*It is to you and to your children.*" God never made a covenant that did not include the children, all of whom had a right to its sign and seal. The covenant with Adam involved his posterity. The race-covenant with Noah involved the human family, and its radiant seal still spans the heaven in every storm. The Sinai covenant took in the children. The church covenant with Abraham does the same. The unity of Old and New Dispensations is so vital to the doctrine of the Church, and was so well understood, that special precepts under the New, for requiring the signs and seals of the covenant to be given to all included in it, were not required. The covenant with Abraham was confirmed in Isaac, in Jacob, and in Christ, at last, the Promised Seed, in whom all believers and their offspring were represented. "For if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." It is under the general provisions of grace made to Abraham, who is "the father of all them that believe," that believing parents now present their children to God in Baptism upon the sacrifice and service of their faith, taking hold of God's covenant in behalf of their seed, and pleading with Him for the gracious fulfillment of its promises, all which are "Yea and Amen in Christ Jesus." It is because the children are included in that household covenant on which the Church of God rests, they are to be baptized. Mr. McCune says, the doctrine of infant church-membership is "no part of the common faith." Astounding declaration, if he knows what the "common faith" means! In the Roman Catholic Church, in the Greek Communion, in all the authoritative creeds of the Protestant Reformation, Lutheran and Reformed, orthodox Puritan and Presbyterian, as in the Apostolic Church, there is no other doctrine. "*Fœderati sunt baptizandi,*" is the consecrated motto, "the federate or covenanted are to be baptized," and only such. Has Mr. McCune yet to

learn, in express language, Paul assures us that baptism takes the place of circumcision, which signified regeneration, or the putting away of the sins of the flesh, the new uncarnal birth, effected by the Holy Ghost, whose work is symbolized by water? Col. ii: 11, 12; Rom. vi: 3, 4. Is he a Master in Israel, and has he yet to learn that, in God's constitution and economy, *all* church-membership rests upon the *prior* fact and condition of covenant relationship, that in the case of infants it is this stipulated inclusion of them in the church covenant, which is a household covenant, that guarantees the right of membership and right of Baptism, its sign and seal; and that in the case of adults, outside of the covenant, their interest herein is to be attained, as Abraham's was, by faith? Has ye yet to learn that it was because all this was so well understood in early times, Lydia and her house, and the jailor and his house, and the household of Stephanus were baptized, the believing parents upon their own faith, the children on the faith of the parents in a covenant confirmed to them and to their seed after them? Or were they the adult domestics and workhands called in from the field, or Roman slaves, who imagined it would be a good thing to be baptized too, because their masters and mistresses commanded it? Is Mr. McCune ignorant of the fact that in the New Testament there is more historic proof of household baptism, than there is of the celebration of the Lord's Supper? Moderator, the reason Mr. McCune assails infant church-membership is because he either assumes that the grace of God does not reach the infant's heart, in infant measure, and abide there as a living seed, or if it did, yet membership shall be denied because of infant incapacity to speak. Sir, the presumption is that grace does come to the children of believing parents, until that presumption is destroyed by evidence of scandal in their lives, and positive refusal to believe in Christ. Our Presbyterian law is built on this, when it requires all the baptized children of believing parents, when they have reached the years of understanding, to come to the Lord's table. The reproach Mr. McCune suggests, of admitting to external membership "a multi-

tude of unbelieving, unconverted children," is a reproach against God's covenant, for they are born "unholy and unclean" yet *federally* "clean." "Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy." The efficacy of divine grace is not tied to sacramental administration in the Presbyterian doctrine of Infant Baptism, and it is a false charge to say that our doctrine involves it. The sacramental union that exists between the sign and the thing signified, is not a realistic but symbolical ordained relation, whereby the sign both represents and seals the grace proposed, upon declared conditions, on the parent's part, without a limitation as to time or ceremony. The Lord's Supper does not cleanse from guilt, but only Christ. Baptism does not purify, or create anew, but only the Holy Spirit. The first may be administered only to believing adults because a Public Object is proposed therein to faith, Christ crucified, whom the believer must know. The second may be administered to unconscious infants, because it represents a Spiritual Agent's power behind the human consciousness, unseen and secret in his work.

I would gladly dwell longer on this, but other subjects demand consideration. I affirm that for a Presbyterian minister to say, or any one to say, "*I utterly repudiate the doctrine of infant church-membership*," is to deny God's covenant in Christ with all believers, and for believers and their seed; to deny the very foundation of the Christian Church itself, and the ground of all church-membership, and prostitute the sacred ordinance of Baptism to a mere profane æsthetic art of fixing to a child a *name*. And yet "ten years" of this we have had, blown in every direction with a flourish of trumpets in the interest of Organic Union! Is it the doctrine of our standards? Is it loyalty to our system of doctrine? It is disloyalty to the sacred truth of Christ and to the Presbyterian Church, a public violation of most solemn ordination vows. Grant this license for "ten years" to all our ministers. Allow the liberalism of the times to rush in like a flood. Proscribe the men who dare to lift their voices against the palliation of ruinous encroachments, and what then? Shall we wonder why a covenant God who

has said "I will pour water on him that is thirsty, and floods on the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit on thy seed, and my blessing *on thine offspring*," has left our fleece dry, and seemed to us as though His promise failed forevermore? Vows have lost their sanctity, and the phantom of organic union, caressed too long, like some Delilah, has grieved away the Spirit of all grace. We have risen up to shake ourselves as at other times, and "wist not that the Lord was departed from us!" I pass to the eighth specification.

SPECIFICATION VIII.

Admission of Unbaptised Persons.

This specification brings to notice a doctrine of Mr. McCune, worthy to stand beside his mutilation of God's covenant with believers in behalf of their offspring. I show you the abstraction of membership from a helpless infant, the dowry God has given it, and charging it unjustly to the credit of a man whom Christ forbids to take it. I show you the tearing of the seal from the official deed conveying to the child its own inheritance, and giving it the seal without the parchment, and then the giving of the parchment to the adult without the seal. Such is the administration and stewardship of the mysteries by organic union, and such is the account kept in its bank. Is it the part of a faithful and wise steward whom his Lord makes ruler over His household to give them their portion in due season? Mr. McCune refuses to children of believers their covenant title to church-membership, and yet *baptizes* them, affixing the sign and seal of their abstracted right. Mr. McCune gives to adults the official deed itself, and covenant inheritance, conveyed to them without the sign and seal of its possession. The testamental seal he gives to one from whom he takes away the testament itself. The testament he passes to the other whom he lets reject the testament seal. Christ has made *baptism* an essential condition of external church-membership, though not an essential condition of membership in the "one Body" of Christ. Mr. McCune will not have it so. Jerusalem below must shine in the

prerogatives of Jerusalem above. The outer palace wall shall be confounded with the Bride herself who sits within the secret chamber. Israel, external, shall have the privileges of Israel, within. The Church invisible and visible shall be melted into one. Mr. McCune declares that the *possession* of saving faith, the door of entrance to the church invisible, shall be the door of entrance to the church visible, and that Christian *Baptism*, on the profession of that faith, shall not. He will admit *unbaptized* possessors of that faith to church membership. Such is Mr. McCune's Organic Union—a bid for Quaker suffrage to his scheme, just as the denial of infant church membership is a bid to Baptists for their suffrage too; just as the denial of organic rule over a plurality of congregations is a bid to Independents for their vote; while the administration of the rite of baptism to infants is a sop to Presbyterians, the Prelatic posture of a minister without an Eldership a crumb to all Episcopalians, and creeds, condemned to dungeons and to chains, a sound of liberty to all Disciples! Moderator, what kind of a thing is baptism upon Mr. McCune's theory? Our book tells us that it is a covenant ordinance, a sign and seal of covenant blessing. With Mr. McCune it is neither. Having destroyed the covenant relation, baptism becomes nothing more than if one man should throw water into the face of another, and profanely pronounce upon him the name of the Trinity. With us baptism is an "*ordinance*," with him it is a handful of water. And must we spend our time here, in judicial process and trouble for a year, before such nonsense and such disloyalty to our confession and our vows can be arrested, and our Church's peace secured?

Mr. McCune is bold to tell us what he would do, and what he *has* done in this respect. He would, he says, "receive any one" whom he judges to be regenerate, "although" such one has the views of the "Friends" concerning water baptism. Let the Presbytery observe, not only every member of the societies commonly called Quakers, who he judges "make a credible profession," and therefore, as he concludes, are regenerate, but "any one" though not among "Friends," yet having their "same

views," as to water baptism, he will receive. In other words, all credible professors who, *ipso facto*, are decided to be credible possessors of saving faith, and yet "*who at the same time deny the perpetual obligation of water baptism*," he would "receive." He breaks down the door of entrance into the visible church, already made by Christ, and makes another for himself. And then he pretends, while pleading his broad principle, that it is only an "*exceptional case.*" Christ's command is absolute. Our Standards bind it on the conscience of Mr. McCune. If one may enter unbaptized, ten thousand may. No "exceptional case" is allowed by Christ. None by our Standards. When writing his book on Organic Union, and trying to establish the proposition that none may be excommunicated, except upon the previous judgment that they are unregenerate, he lays down the doctrine that if a man refuses to obey the words of Christ, he is not a Christian. He asks, "Can a man *refuse to obey* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ and *still be a Christian?*" The judgment of charity would lead us to say, "Yes," for Mr. McCune's sake, when we remember that he is under orders from Christ himself to baptize all nations. He asks again, "Can a man *refuse to obey* the inspired apostles and be a Christian?" The same judgment of charity inclines us to answer "Yes," for the sake of Mr. McCune's "Friends," for the Apostles "commanded" believers to "be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts 10 : 48. Organic Union, pp. 77, 78. Many a "proud" and many an "ignorant" man is a Christian, and can say and do many bad things. Mr. McCune, defending his new "divine law" as to excommunication, not only refuses to admit to membership, but excludes from membership, as unregenerate, the man who refuses to obey a known "command" of Christ and His Apostles. *But* when expounding his new "divine law" again, he assures us, "*unhesitatingly*," that he will judge to be *regenerate*, and receive to membership "every" man, "any" man, *anywhere*, who refuses to obey what Mr. McCune himself acknowledges to be a perpetual command of Christ and His Apostles, and be baptized. On his own confession,

therefore, his net takes in a whole swarm of unregenerate souls, believing unbelievers, who not only repudiate Baptism, but both the sacraments together, and makes mere membership "all the fellowship they will accept." How then, on his own showing, is the Christian Church a "company of regenerate souls?" By his own definition every unbaptized man is unregenerate, because he disobeys a divine command in refusing to be baptized. Mr. McCune's "Friends" have no occasion to thank him for his argument. He makes them uncoverted. The "*Quaker gun*" may be heard resounding, "Friend, if what thee sayest is true, we don't need thee; if what thee sayest is false, we don't want thee!" And the Baptist gun may yet explode a flood that will immerse a creed that can't hold water even for sprinkling, and leave not one of all the new communion unbaptized. It avails nothing for Mr. McCune to say, many interpret the command spiritually. "No human deductions!" We want the command "*expressed in God's own language.*" "*The Bible is the only true creed for all true Christians, and all ministers, and all churches.*" "*Every thing human in creeds I oppose.*" With what consistency can Mr. McCune ejaculate such sentiments, and then propose his own "deduction" in face of an express command of Christ and His apostles?—a deduction denying the perpetual and necessary obligation of water-baptism, as a door of entrance to the visible Church?—and then, like Sir Oracle, thunder in our ears, "We *maintain* that faith in Christ is not merely the great condition, but the *only* condition." "When we say that faith in Christ is the *one* essential condition of entrance, we mean that it is the *only* condition." And so the Organic Union "creed—no creed," woven like Joseph's coat of many colors, goes on, and the piebald anti-pro-denomination pleads an "Apostolic pedigree! Pray, moderator, what Apostle was it who fathered such a creed? I am sure it was not Peter who said, "Repent and be baptized." I am sure it was not Paul who tells us, "We are buried with Christ, by Baptism, into His Death!" "If I seek to please *men, then I am not the servant of Christ.*" Christ's command is supreme though a thou-

sand Presbyteries or Synods are willing parties to its transgression. Broad and bold is the utterance of the Presbyterian Church that her whole power in Christ's Kingdom is simply "declarative and ministerial," and she dare no more dispense with Christ's command than Gabriel dare dispute an order from the Throne. By what authority does Mr. McCune leave it for the applicant to decide what the commands of Christ are, what His sacraments are, and how these are to be observed? Such an argument is a destruction of the authority of the Church as a teacher and witness of the Truth, and abdication of the functions of the ministry. If one applicant may decide according to his notion, another may decide a different way, and every command of Christ be trampled under foot. The Standards, moderator, which Mr. McCune has vowed that he sincerely adopts, approves, and will maintain, declare and teach in the most express language the perpetual and necessary obligation of water-baptism. The ordinance is "to be continued in the Church till the end of the world." Conf. of Faith, chap. xxviii, sec. 1; "continued in the Church of Christ until His second coming." Larger Cat. Q. 176. "To neglect or contemn this ordinance is a *great sin.*" Conf. of Faith, chap. xxviii, sec. v. It is to despise Christ's command. "Can the Church answer to her great Head, if this neglect of duty be not mourned over and corrected?" Digest, p. 673. This ordinance is, for uncovenanted adults, the door of entrance into the visible Church, the gate "whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible Church." Larger Cat. Q. 165. Here "*Lo Ammi*" and "*Lo Ruhamah*" enter—Hosea i: 9, 10. It is part and parcel of a credible profession of faith in Christ. "When *unbaptized* persons apply for admission into the Church," after satisfactory examination, and, in ordinary cases, making a public profession, "they shall, *thereupon*, be baptized." Digest, p. 677, (iv). "In the practice of our Church, and according to her Standards, baptism is manifestly regarded *as a part* of the general profession of faith *and obedience* to Christ." Digest, p. 678. By no vote of any session, nor of any committeemen, nor of any court on earth can an *unbaptized* person be

allowed membership in the Church. Mr. McCune is taught, by our Standards, "that the administration of baptism, according to the Word of God, *must* be *involved* in and attendant upon" any vote of reception. p. 129 (4). Expressly is it stated, "The vote of a session does not entitle any *unbaptized* person to the privileges of the Church, for the reason that baptism, as our Confession of Faith declares, (Chap. xxviii, sec. 1), is declared to be a sacrament *for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church.*" p. 130. "The *public profession* of one's faith may be omitted," but baptism may not be omitted, for the "exceptional case" as it is called, has no respect whatever to the omission of *baptism*, but only to the omission of a *public profession*, when, for good reasons, it can not be made. So our Standards: "The public profession of one's faith may, for sufficient reasons, as our Directory of Worship allows, be omitted; but the *exceptional case* does not respect *baptism*, which precedes the admission of the party to the Lord's table." p. 130. The vote of the session or of any court admitting persons to church-membership, "must be *conditioned upon baptism*, and can, in no case, be a substitute for the sacrament itself (baptism). p. 130. Twenty years ago, long before Mr. McCune came into the Presbyterian Church where he now is, the General Assembly settled that question. It settled also the question as to the admission of the "Friends" by referring to the answers of the Larger Catechism, Q. 166, and Shorter Catechism, Q. 95, the undeniable doctrine of which is that they are not to be admitted into the Presbyterian Body while holding their peculiar views. Is Mr. McCune so blind, are *we* so blind, as not to see that to tolerate the omission of either sacrament, is to deny the perpetual and necessary obligation of both, and unchurch the Church? Is any thing plainer in the world than that Mr. McCune's profession of obedience to Christ, as a minister of the New Testament, is a disobedience even greater than to the solemn vows he has taken to support the Standards of the Presbyterian Church? or are Mr. McCune's views, the views of the Friends? Has he yet to learn that although some scruples, by applicants,

in reference to infant baptism may be tolerated, in hope that sound instruction in the word, and loving reverence for Christ's command, and God's covenant, will remove them, yet *no* scruples as to their *own* baptism, upon profession of their faith, are or can be tolerated for a single moment? The Church is under law to Christ, and every applicant must come under law to the Church. He must "submit" to be bound by the Church on earth, binding by the Word of Christ alone, as she hopes to have her administrative acts bound in heaven. There must be submission to Christ's laws. Digest, pp. 675, 676 (7), 107, (ii, iv).

Moderator and brethren, all this Mr. McCune knows. He is not ignorant of the Standards. It is by no fault of logic he has been betrayed into his chosen position. The logic is bad enough, but the "I propose" is worse. His Organic Union Rosinante rides rough-shod over the Standards, and delights to prance and caper under the spurs of her Don, upon those very spots where the truth especially comes into contact with his scheme. He dismounts and lays his Organic Union ax not "at," but "to" the root of the Presbyterian tree; the tree of the visible Church; the tree of the covenant of God; the tree of Church Confessions; the tree of Baptism; the tree of Church polity, and leaves nothing unchopped. His motto would seem to be, "*After me the Deluge*;" or "*After me the Millennium!*" He strikes down the whole distinctive system of Presbyterian doctrine and order. If an unbaptized person may be a member, he may be an officer; if an officer, he may be a minister. If the title of elders may be thrown away, the title of ministers may be also. If he may dispense with ordination by the laying on of hands in the one case, he may do so in the other. There is nothing in the principles of his creed-no-creed to prevent an unordained, unbaptized ministry, called "leaders of the meeting," preaching to a church of unbaptized professing Christians who, having voted to dispense with the observance of one sacrament, are ready at the next meeting to dispense with the observance of the other. Under Mr. McCune's polity, which makes or unmakes anything by a vote of a mongrel congregation, under no constitution, he

may do anything he pleases and plead immunity on the ground that he is "outside Presbyterian jurisdiction." The organization, as such, that would be left, acting on the principles of the new "divine law," would not be worth the while for Satan to tempt or Christ to save. If he may dispense with the Sacraments, he may dispense with the Word; if he may dispense with the Word, he may dispense with the Master. Moderator, such Organic Union, under the guise of Christianity, is verily a "great sin" against Christ, His Cross, and His Crown! "Ten years?" Tell it not in Gath! I pass to the ninth specification.

SPECIFICATION IX.

Saving Faith—What is it?

This specification, and the proofs under it, show what Mr. McCune thinks of Saving Faith, the one condition of external Church-membership. It also measures the liberality of judgment allowable in the ministerial determination of what constitutes credible *evidence* of regeneracy in a suppliant for Church ordinances and privileges. As a result of the *minimum quid* creed, we have the *minimum quid* faith, and the *maximum quid* liberality upon qualifications for Church-membership. Briefly, while it is vastly important that all Christians should believe in the infallibility of the Word of God, upon the unfailing certainty of whose promises in and testimony concerning Christ all salvation hangs, and the whole assurance, comfort, peace, light, hope, and life of a believing soul, yet such a faith as this is not *essential* to being a Christian, and if so then clearly not essential to salvation. The conviction or inner-conscious belief that the Bible can not fail, is not even essential to true and saving faith itself. To say that a part may be infallible, and a part not, is no help here. It is enough that "the Bible is my creed," without believing it infallible. "We believe," says Mr. McCune, "that a man may be a Christian and *not believe in the infallibility of the Bible*, although 'almost' all Christians do believe the Bible to be infallible." So, again, while it is vastly important that the testimony as

to Christ's proper humanity should itself be true, and all Christians believe it, yet such a faith is not essential to being a Christian, and, by consequence, not essential to salvation. The attempt to find a shelter for these views by a reference to Luther, as the defendant has already intimated, and to plead the name of Dr. Hodge, in addition, is vain. The shelter of ubiquitarianism, and the criticism of Luther on some parts of the Canon, will not help the defendant to maintain statements so broad and flat-footed as these. It is an after-thought. Did Luther deny the infallibility of the Bible? Did he deny the proper humanity of Christ? The conviction or inner-conscious belief that Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham, the Son of Adam, the Son of God, was, and is, my true Elder Brother, whose soul and body were a sacrifice to God for human guilt, is not essential to true and saving faith itself, according to Mr. McCune. It is enough that "Jesus is my Saviour," as "the Bible is my creed," without believing in His proper humanity. "We believe," says Mr. McCune, "that a man may be a Christian and *not believe in the proper humanity of Christ.*" Such is the essential nature of Organic Union Saving Faith. It is the acceptance of a testimony concerning whose certainty the soul remains in doubt. It is the repose of the soul upon the word of One who claims to be the sinner's substitute, but whose proper humanity the Christian calls in question. It opens the door for the old exploded Christological heresies. The Bible *may* be infallible, but the Christian need not be sure that it is so. Christ *may* be properly human, but the Christian need not be sure that He is so. The anguish of the loving heart, "They have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid Him," can never pierce a soul to whose Saving Faith no certainty that He is properly man, nor that His word of grace can ever fail, are needed. The miraculous office of this Organic Union Saving Faith is (1) that, *ipso facto*, it excludes all fatal heresy, and (2) it makes regenerate souls all orthodox; the one a negative pole of virtue, the other a positive. "A Saving

Faith in Christ," says Mr. McCune, "excludes all fatal heresies." Again, "Regenerate souls are all orthodox."

I beg of my brethren in the ministry to note to what direful lengths one false principle lodged in the human mind will lead, one false interpretation of God's word! To observe how a man devoted to it is borne, he knows not whither, and stands "amazed," abashed, confounded, when confronted with his own dauguerreotype. To Mr McCune's new non-excluding "divine law of organization," which puts *Union before Truth*, and not *Truth before Union; Indifference before Conscience, and not Conscience before Indifference*, is all this dark perversion to be traced. Organic Union calls for sacrifice, the sacrifice of Truth, her abdication of her throne. The sacrifice is made, and Toleration is the cry. The necessary articles of the Christian Faith are reduced to the smallest possible compass, in order to include the utmost possible number. The interpretation of the Scripture is put in abeyance only to make room for the encroachments of Infidelity. The doctrinal results of eighteen centuries, embodied in our peerless Standards, the martyr-testimony, crown, and heir-loom of our noble Church, with all its barriers, guards, and chosen words, bright like glittering armory, and all their histories, recounting where and how the Truth was saved on many a hard-fought battle-field, all are thrown away. And what is given us here instead? The doctrines of Rome, against which the Reformers fought, and over which they triumphed. *Uncertainty as to God's word! Uncertainty of the believer's salvation!* Room for Tradition to come in here! Room for salvation by works here! Room for the calm scornful smile of the Archbishop of Cincinnati! Room for the mantling cheek of shame in the Presbyterian Church! The Standards a shuttlecock, within five years after Reunion, struck by the battledore of Romanism to the one side, struck back by the battledore of Independency to the other; both in the hands of Mr. MCune. Or is it the spirit of Modern Liberalism, the Sceptical free-thinking "Spirit of the Age," breathing through Organic Union, the Serpent, in the garb of light, lurking in our Eden, and whispering doubt as to

God's truth, saying: "*Yea, hath God said?*" and doubt as to Christ's proper humanity, saying: "Has He come in the flesh?"

"Ithuriel and Zephon! with winged speed,
Search through this garden; leave unsearched no nook;
There tells of some infernal Spirit seen,
Hitherward bent (who could have thought?), escaped
The bars of hell, on errand bad, no doubt;
Such, when ye find, seize fast, and hither bring."

Moderator, the Presbyterian Standards, Mr. McCune has vowed to maintain, teach that no man can be a "Christian," and "*not believe in the infallibility of the Bible*;" that no man can be a "Christian," and *not believe in the proper humanity of Christ*, and that saving faith carries in its bosom, by necessity, the assurance that the Word of God is infallible, and that Christ is properly man. Our Confession of Faith, chap. XIV, secs. 1, 2, declares that Saving Faith is a "grace," "the work of the Spirit of Christ in the heart," and that "by this faith a Christian believeth to be true, whatever is revealed in the word, *for the authority of God Himself speaking therein.*" "He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar." It teaches, chap. I, sec. 5, that this faith is "our full persuasion and assurance of *the infallible truth* and Divine authority thereof," and that this persuasion and assurance are "*from the inward work of the Holy Spirit*, bearing witness with and by the Word in our hearts." This is what the Holy Ghost does when He makes a "Christian." He enlightens the soul to know that the Bible is infallibly true. The believer learns that the "Supreme Judge" in all doubt, is "the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture." It is not possible for a man to be a "Christian," such an one as the Holy Ghost makes, and not believe in the infallibility of the Bible. It is not possible for him to have Saving Faith and doubt the Word of God. The ground for his confidence is gone. To doubt its infallibility is to doubt its *Inspiration*, for it is the Inspiration that makes it *Infallible*. Faith is reduced to mere opinion or conjecture, which is not saving. The only possible argument by which to avoid the force of these conclusions, is to affirm that the "Bible" is *not* the "Word of God," and

that the "Word of God" is *not* the "Bible." Moderator, our Standards have settled this matter for all Presbyterian ministers, and no one in our Church has a right to teach any such doctrine. Our standards expressly declare that the Bible is all the Books of the Old and New Testaments, and enumerates them in order. Our Confession says, "Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the *Word of God* written, are now contained all the Books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these," and every Presbyterian minister solemnly affirms that he receives them as the "Word of God," and the "only *infallible* rule of faith and practice." The "Bible" *is* the "*Word of God*," and the "*Word of God*" is "the Bible," all whose books our Standards affirm are "given by inspiration of God." And so as to our Lord's proper humanity. Our Shorter Catechism tells us that Saving Faith "is a Saving Grace whereby we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation, *as He is offered to us in the gospel.*" Q. 86. And how He is offered to us in the gospel we are told in these words, "Christ, the Son of God, became *man*, by taking to Himself a *true body* and a *reasonable soul.*" Q. 22. Also Large Cat. *Q*'s. 36, 37, 39, where His humaanity is declared to be a *necessity* for our salvation. The object of Saving Faith is not a phantom, not a picture in the mind, not an ideal Jesus, not a work of imagination, but the *Son of God in flesh*; *i. e.*, human nature, "*proper humanity*," a "*man*," who is also God. Deity, apart from humanity, is no object of Saving Faith. Humanity, apart from Deity, is none. Saving Faith must believe in both, or it can not be saving, because it does not receive Christ "*as He is offered to us in the gospel.*" It is the mark of ancient as of modern Anti-Christianity, to deny that "Christ has come in the flesh." It is next door to it to "not believe" that He has so come, and not far from it to question His proper humanity. It is not possible for the Holy Spirit to work in a sinner's soul Saving Faith in Christ, and allow him "not to believe in the proper humanity of Christ." Without that humanity there is no sacrifice, no atonement, no death, no resurrection, no ascension. To not believe in the infallibility of the Bible, is to not believe in its inspi-

ration. To not believe in the proper humanity of Christ is to not believe in his true Incarnation. When Inspiration and Incarnation are thrown into doubt, where is the saving faith? If a Christian need not believe that Christ was properly man, he need not believe that He died on the cross or rose from the dead. The organic-union-liberal-possible Christian is simply an infidel. And yet Mr. McCune would receive him, and informs us that such saving faith as leaves the Word of God, and the work of Christ in doubt, *ipso facto*, "excludes all fatal heresies" (!), and that the possession of such faith is "credible *evidence*" of regeneration (!!), and that "regenerate souls are all orthodox" (!!!) What fatal heresy does it not include? It is fatal heresy itself. Who are the "regenerate?" They are unbelievers. Who are the "orthodox?" The doubters of God's Word and Christ's proper humanity. All this Mr. McCune will tolerate in others, even though he may try to explain it away for himself. Is this the justifying faith of the gospel, defined from its source, the Spirit; from its seat, the heart; from its food, the Word; from its object, Christ; and from its end, salvation? Sir, it is just like the loyalty, in face of the doctrine of our Standards which teaches that the number of the elect is "so certain and definite that it can not be increased or diminished," the loyalty that teaches in Mr. McCune's language, there are "multitudes in the pit of despair who might have been blessedly and eternally saved" if only organic union had existed from the beginning. Christian Standard, July 31, 1875, p. 245. Is this the orthodoxy of our Standards? Is it loyalty to the Presbyterian Church? "Ten years." Publish it not in Askelon! I pass to the tenth specification.

SPECIFICATION X.

Time of Advocating His Views.

This specification, with its appended proofs, establishes the fact beyond question of the sincerity of Mr. McCune in the advocacy of his peculiar views. They are his abiding convictions, formed after mature deliberation, and during

protracted and various discussion, and nourished with assiduous care. They are no transient misjudgments, slips of the pen, unreiterated statements, words hastily spoken, or positions thoughtlessly taken. The Prosecution could have overburdened the Court with a still more redundant testimony. They are the result of a consistent scheme, built on the boundless license of the new "divine law of organization," a scheme revolutionary of all existing denominations but its own. "Ten years" have testified to its propagation, within the bounds of this Presbytery, in every way possible for a propagation to be made. The time, therefore, as the manner of this advocacy, is a demonstration of Mr. McCune's sincerity herein. "Ten years" of unchallenged liberty, he numbers, as if establishing his right to continue the advocacy as long as he chooses. He pleads five of these ten, the period since the official order of the Synod of Cincinnati to circulate his views of organic union, as a special period of encouragement, enough to justify a double protest against the Presbytery's right to bring both them and himself under formal adjudication. "I am," says he, "advocating no sentiments now (Feb. 15, 1876), which I have not *openly proclaimed for ten years back.*" It is the truth. He affirms that the liberty he has enjoyed in the Presbytery for all these years remained officially "unquestioned until Dr. Skinner made" what he calls "his attack upon him;" *i. e.* until the time of the Council that installed him at Mt. Lookout, Dec. 1875. His convictions are sincere, if *time* is an evidence of sincerity. He proposes still to advocate them. "I have publicly advocated," says he to the Committee, "and propose to advocate the following principles on the subject of Christian Union, etc," principles declaring all denominational enactments, and distinctive creed statements, as "wedges of division," "apples of discord," "Achan in the camp," and their enforcement as "essentially sinful." Thus, for "many years," last past, as propagandist and Apostle of Organic Union on such a Basis, he has diffused his teachings throughout the Christian community, as editor in his paper, as minister in his pulpit, as debater in the press, as lecturer

in the country, in all possible ways, invoking the cry of "Sectarianism," "Bigotry," "Popery," against those who have dared to oppose him. Under the claim of "Conscience," "Toleration," and "Liberty," he has espoused and crusaded a doctrinal communism, and an ecclesiastical phalanstery, of which Brown, Fourier, St. Simon, and Robert Dale Owen might be proud.

It is a fair question, Moderator and brethren, how much time a teacher of error may be allowed in the Presbyterian Church for the advocacy of views destructive of her Constitution and her very existence? If Mr. McCune may be allowed "ten years," the rest of us may be allowed the same. Paul, at Antioch, yielded, "no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might remain." Evidently he did not favor any Organic Union scheme the Judaizers proposed, or Peter compromisingly winked at for the time. A "Plan of Union," enacted in 1801, endured a generation, and was brought to its close by legislative enactment in 1838, in order to save the Standards. For several years past, more than a hundred Presbyterian ministers allow their names to be appended, in a religious paper, published at Brooklyn, and devoted to Organic Church Union, to a "brief creed," which Unitarians, or Semi-Pelagians, or Arminians, or Prelatists, or Independents, could readily subscribe. "Ten years" may make a revelation. "*Vereor quorsum evadat!*" Thirty-eight years ago was the following utterance made: "We have in our Church many men who are avowed *anti-sectarians*, who think the barriers which separate the different denominations of Christians should be broken down. It is a possible case that men of these opinions should have, on some occasion, an accidental majority in the General Assembly. Suppose they should avail themselves of the opportunity to enact a plan of Union, by which, not the favored Congregationalist only, but the Episcopalian, the Baptist, and even the Papist, should be allowed to sit and vote in all our Presbyteries. This would be hailed with delight by many as the commencement of a new era, as the adoption of a principle which could stand the test of the millenium." Princeton Essays (Second Series), p. 281. It

is possible that in "ten years" from now something of this nature might be attempted. It was not possible for thirty years past, in either branch of our Church. But as things now go with so many, and "*Union*" is put before "*Truth*," and things allowed in the Reunion that never would have been tolerated in either branch during a generation past, it is fair to ask, how long, *now*, may a man be permitted to propagate views and principles, which not only strike at our standards of doctrine and order, but also at the very truth of God itself, and at the very existence of the Presbyterian Church? The ancient watchword of historic Presbyterianism was "*Truth before Union.*" The Reformers valued it more than all else. They abandoned the boasted Organic Union of Rome, in order to save the Organic Truth of God. "The Paulickian line of witnesses took "Heavenly Truth" for their motto. The Waldensian line held aloft in the Alps and in the valleys of Piedmont their Valdic "Lucerna," a lighted candlestick amid surrounding darkness, inscribed with the words "*Lux lucet in Tenebris*"—"the light shineth in the darkness," although the fields were as green, and the sky as blue, and the sun as bright as they are now. They put "*Truth before Union.*" Calvin's motto was Paul's, "*Let God be true and every man a liar.*" "We can do nothing against the Truth," not even Organic Union. But now the times are changed, and we with them. "*Ten years*" to ply the misinterpretation of Rom. 15 : 7. "*Ten years*" to teach that our Lord's intercessory prayer necessitates the breaking up of all the evangelical denominations as such, and the non-enforcement of the denominational laws of the Presbyterian Church. "*Ten years*" for a Presbyterian minister to exclaim against Church creeds and confessions, and denounce his own, among the rest, as "sectarian." "*Ten years*" to harp on the word "Evangelical," as though it were a word, not of shades and degrees, but of absoluteness in its application. "*Ten years*" to mutilate and deny God's covenant in Christ, with believers, in behalf of their children, and take away the covenant foundation of the Church itself. "*Ten years*" to advocate doctrines and views antagonistic to the very essence of our

Eldership polity. "*Ten years*" to preach that the visible Church is the "Body of Christ," and break down the apostolic distinction Rome destroyed, and the Reformers reclaimed, as they searched for the Truth. "*Ten years*" to deny infant church-membership, advocate the admission of unbaptized professors to full communion, and permission to dispense with the sacraments of the Church. "*Ten years*" to proclaim the right of a Presbyterian minister to be under two different creeds and antagonizing allegiances at the same time, and church members under two conflicting jurisdictions. "*Ten years*" to herald non-excluding terms of ministerial fellowship. "*Ten years*" to maintain that ordination vows do not bind, or bind only to what each minister chooses to teach. "*Ten years*" to assert that the Presbyterian law is an oppression of the conscience, and that the time has come to wake up and begin a reorganization of the whole New Testament Church! "*Ten years*" of set purpose and assiduous labor to "imbrue the whole denomination" with these organic union principles; and now the word that "eight or ten years ago" it might have done to raise the point whether such liberty and such advocacy might be questioned, "*but now it is too late!*" There is some force in this. How long may a Presbyterian minister go on in this way, and how long "propose" still to go on?

Moderator and Brethren, I present it as a case of unparalleled license and persistence, on the part of any minister, in the history of the Presbyterian, or any other denomination, whose respect for its own honor, and the honor of religion and truth has not yet departed, and on whose ecclesiastical walls "Ichabod" has not yet been written. And I present the additional aggravation of an utter disregard of the conscientious feelings of his brethren in the ministry, and of the respect due to this Court, and of the peace of the Church, as also a disregard of the proprieties and duties incumbent upon him in the circumstances,—a disregard no less manifest than that displayed toward the Standards and the Presbyterian Church itself,—persisting with more than indifference to the action of the Presbytery in the public propagation of his views, without restraint, even

after his course had been brought to official notice, and his case put under official examination.

It was on April 13, 1876, the Presbytery's resolution of inquiry was passed. Respect for that action should have prompted Mr. McCune to abstain from the further propagation of his views until an official judgment had been reached by his brethren. Instead of this, we find him, May 8, 1876, only a little over three weeks after the Presbytery's action, publicly advocating again his views on Denominations, the Church of God, Infant Baptism, Terms of Communion, Admission of the Unbaptized, his whole scheme, precisely as before, in presence of the General Ministerial Association of Cincinnati. This was contempt, if not contumacy. Again, his views are spread abroad in the public press, May 9, 1876. Not less confident does he appear June 26, 1876, in presence of the Presbytery's Investigating Committee, to whom he offers a paper, given back, however, to be substituted by one less convicting, but still replaced by another, informing the committee that he "proposes" to keep on just as before, and declaring that "it is susceptible of proof that the advocacy of this Christian union doctrine has been with the knowledge and by the permission of the Presbytery of Cincinnati and by the consent and with the co-operation of the Synod of Cincinnati, and that this advocacy is not in violation of any Presbyterian law whatever." Nor less marked was the public disrespect to the Presbytery and his brethren, by again the third time reiterating his views to the public in a formal protest against the action of the Presbytery, published October 17, 1876, in the Commercial, replete with such gross personalities, as would bar it from a place on the official records, yet published to the world before presentation of it to this body. I present it, Moderator, as unexampled in the history of our Church. May it please the Court, that "ten years" of such advocacy be the extreme limit of the indulgence!

The Presbyterian Church, stirred by Common Fame, and grieved at such persistence, comes into Court with a righteous plaint in her mouth, making solemn averment that

she receives but damage and demoralization, by such liberty, assumed either by ministers or elders. She pleads that she can not build while buffeted by her own sons, or maintain either her prestige or honor, while her name is denied, her distinctive enactments and organic law traduced, and her authority treated with contempt; and that the doctrines, principles, and views of Mr. McCune, like the manner of their advocacy, are not only at war with her standards, but, if generally accepted, would be subversive of her constitution and of her very existence as a distinctive denomination.

The prosecution does not dwell upon the law, but simply refers to it. Not one hour is allowed for such a license, not one moment, by our statute. It is disloyalty. Our Church requires her ministry "to teach and preach according to the form of sound words in the Confession and Catechisms, and *avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereto.*" Digest, p. 48 (II). To "traduce" her Standards is a call for "that salutary discipline which hath for its object the maintenance of the peace and purity of the Church under the government of her Great Master." p. 43 (3). They who can not accept her denominational laws are invited to "peaceably withdraw." p. 48 (I). Strong is the injunction of our Supreme Court, signed by the Moderator, the mentor of his day: "Let no doctrine inconsistent with the Sacred Scriptures, *as explained and summarily taught in the doctrinal Standards of our Church*, be promulgated or favored in any of our Churches" "He who teaches any doctrine, palpably and plainly inconsistent with the evident meaning of our excellent formularies, should be regarded as an *errorist* by Presbyterians, whom they ought not to encourage, but *discountenance*, *reject*, and *avoid*." p. 304 (8). This is our law. It remains to be seen whether our "Reunion" will respect it. I pass to the eleventh specification.

SPECIFICATION XI.

Common Fame.

This specification, with its proofs, establishes the fact of the Common Fame of Mr. McCune's disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church, loudly proclaiming that, in contravention of his vows, he was the public advocate of principles and views at war with our standards, and subversive, if generally accepted, of our Doctrines, Constitution, and very existence; a fame accompanied not only with strong presumption of its truth, but living demonstration, as already shown, during a period of "ten years;" an offense striking at vital truths of Divine Revelation, and the very foundations of the Presbyterian Church, and calling for action by this Court. The Court will note that of the many articles in the *thirteen* different secular and religious papers enumerated in Proof 1, under this Specification, some *forty* or more of which are editorial, most of them condemning in the strongest possible manner Mr. McCune's views, and some of them his course, not *one* was published *subsequent* to April 13, 1876, the date of the Presbytery's resolution at Glendale, when the views and course of Mr. McCune were, for the first time, formally brought to the notice of the Presbytery, and the following Preamble and Resolution were passed: "Whereas, for *some time past*, there have been *current rumors* in regard to the views and course of Rev. W. C. McCune, a member of this Presbytery, involving the question of his *loyalty* to the order of the Presbyterian Church, and whereas there seems to be some difference of opinion in regard to the subject,

"Therefore, resolved, that a Committee of three ministers and two elders be appointed to have a full conference with Mr. McCune, and to inquire into all the facts bearing on the case, and report to Presbytery at the next stated meeting." The Common Fame as to the charge was not only co-extensive with the jurisdiction of both the Presbytery and the Synod, not merely co-extensive with the bounds of neighboring Synods, but with those of the

Presbyterian Church itself, North and South, East and West, long before the Presbytery met April 13, 1876. The Court will also notice that all this superabundant evidence of Common Fame is only adduced by the prosecution as *additional* or *supplementary* to what is already manifest from the dates in the proofs already given. It is added to show the ample ground for action by the Presbytery. The Presbyterian Church, therefore, conducts her process properly on the ground of Common Fame, and this Court is abundantly justified in ordering up the prosecution for this reason. It will also be noted, by a comparison of dates, that the resolution of the Glendale Presbytery, April 13, 1876, was not taken until *five months* after the claimed and reputed organization of the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church, November, 1875. That part of the Investigating Committee's Report, which episcopally condemns the views of Mr. McCune, is quoted in Proof 3 of the specification, in order to show that the presumption of the truth of Common Fame was a true presumption, even apart from the documentary evidence spread broadcast in the editorial columns and public discussions antecedent to April 13, 1876. On that portion of the evidence the prosecution make no comment. Our Church recognizes that Common Fame may be common falsehood, and is ready to mete to it the condemnation it deserves. But that any Presbyterian minister should pursue such a course as, by his own acts, to intensify the truth of Common Fame, charging him with disloyalty to the Faith and Order of his Church, such that the scandal can not be removed without the action of the Court, and for the honor of religion, our Book accounts a "sin." Digest, pp. 521 (V.VI), 499 (IV.V).

Offense: Disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church.

CHARGE II.

The character of this Charge is that the Rev. W. C. McCune, for the avowed purpose of carrying into practical effect the doctrines, views, and principles specified under Charge I, bent his energies to the work of advising, promoting, and encouraging the New Anti-Denominational Association, called distinctively the "*Union Christian Churches of America*," and also the Anti-Denominational Organization at Linwood and Mt. Lookout, both these organizations being founded on the doctrines, principles, and views aforesaid. The gravamen of this charge is the same as that of Charge I, viz., that such course of conduct, if generally allowed, would totally subvert our Constitution and destroy the Presbyterian Denomination.

SPECIFICATION I.

General Association.

The first Specification calls attention to the means Mr. McCune has employed in this work. The Prosecution note that, immediately after the New York Convention, October 1873, met to "make immediate and prayerful preparation for the reorganization" of the whole "Christian Church," the "*Christian Unity*" appeared in Cincinnati, under the sole editorship of Mr. McCune, its first number bearing date Cincinnati, November 8, 1873. That number is herewith presented. Then began the work in earnest. "Life is short, and time is fleeting." The editor tells us "when he began the 8th of November to issue this paper, he, at the same time, began to deliver lectures on the subject of Christian Unity." His "most efficient instrumentalities" were "public oral addresses and the press." The tone of the editorials and addresses, together, reveal the fact that he was hopeful, and not in the least appalled by the magnitude of the undertaking. He saw "*a great host* of living Christian hearts, now separated by mere human sectarian

walls," who, "but for sectarian managers and place-men, would gladly unite to-morrow in the new movement!" With the zeal of an Apostle he addresses himself to the work. John in the desert crying, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," was not more in earnest. Proof 2, under the Specification, shows us Mr. McCune in the field; how by lecturing at large, traversing the bounds of the Synod, and outside of it, he discoursed on Organic Union at Butler, Boston, and Newport in Kentucky; in Goshen, South Salem, and at Parrott's School House, in Ohio; how Linden and Springfield, Urbana and Buck Creek, New Richmond and Hillsboro, woke their echoes to his voice; how Madison and Middleton hearkened attentive on Sabbath morning to the new "divine law of organization," and the afternoon bore the accents to Astoria, while the shades of evening that fell around Jacksonburg were illumined with the shimmering light of the advancing millennium! "Eighteen" different places within one month, between November 8 and December 13, all led listening to the music of Organic Union, as when Orpheus charmed the woods with his lyre—a zeal Apostolic, worthy of Loyola and St. Xavier! And so the work went on. Next comes the wide sweeping "*Address to all the Christian Ministers and Churches in North America, with a Basis of Union,*" issued from Cincinnati, October 1874, the topmost signature to which is that of Mr. McCune, calling on all sympathizing ministers and members, everywhere, to range themselves under the banner of the new Anti-Denominational Association, to be known as the "*Union Christian Churches of America,*" adopting the Basis and enrolling their names; how, in order to avoid the charge of forming a "new sect," they were to hold on and let go at the same time, if they "*do not deem it expedient to sever existing denominational relations;*" to remain as ministers and members in the old "extra-scriptural" organization and yet enter the new one "on a New Testament Basis," after the true Apostolic style; that ministers will be asked no questions except whether they agree to a few unexplained texts, "expressed in God's own language as commonly received," and which they are told constitute the

"common faith," "once for all delivered to the saints;" to be sure and send "*delegates*" to attend the impending General Convention at Suffolk, Virginia, on the first Wednesday of May, 1875, and, in particular, to advocate the principles of Organic Union as set forth in the Basis. (See Specification V, Proofs 2, 3, 6). What fortunes attended the call we know not. The Convention at Suffolk was held.

Temporarily suspended, the "*Christian Unity*" is again resumed, not upon the principle of non-enforcement, but upon the principle of re-inforcement, the paper appearing August 1, 1875, under the joint triple editorship of the Rev. W. B. Wellons, D.D., Thomas J. Melish, and W. C. McCune, issued both at Cincinnati, Ohio, and Suffolk, Virginia. A copy is herewith presented. Again the "project," "scheme," and "aim" are manifest. The ring of determination travels through the tri-editorials. The "*Christian Unity*," says Mr. McCune, "begins its career with fixed purposes and aims. It will earnestly contend that in *examining candidates for the ministry* all tests shall be laid aside except such as develope the faith *common* to the evangelical family of Christians." (Specification V, Proof 6). In the "Prospectus" Mr. Thrall is already taken to task for shrinking from a substantial, realistic, and bodily oneness of actual visible organization to the movement! The co-editor of Mr. McCune exclaims, "We must *organize, band ourselves together as ministers* and churches; *this* was what was meant in New York in October 1873, at Cincinnati, October 1874, and at Suffolk in 1875. *Let the work of organization go on!*" The kingdom of God was now to "come with observation." Some Texans meet in Convention at Somerville, April 30, 1875, and adopted the Organic Union plan. Dr. Wellons sweetly writes, "Lo there!" Linwood and Mt. Lookout loom in the horizon shortly after; Mr. McCune as sweetly murmurs, "Lo here!" Was it not part and parcel of the same movement?

And now, Moderator and Brethren, can there be a doubt on the mind of the Court that Mr. McCune is actually a member of a new anti-denominational association of ministers, organized under a Special Basis, for the express pur-

pose of striking at Denominationalism, and beginning a reconstruction of the Christian Church? I have shown you the first fact, under Specification V, Proofs 2, 3, 6, when exhibiting Mr. McCune's Plurality theory of membership, that a new independent church-organization does exist, "*known as the Union Christian Churches of America*,"—proclaiming that it is no "sect," because it receives all Christians, but is modeled after the apostolic type, on a non-excluding "divine law of organization," as Mr. McCune calls it, or on "a New Testament Basis." I have shown you the second fact, that "any minister" who "adopts" this Basis of independent association, and asks to be "enrolled," is "enrolled at his own request" into the new fellowship, and is henceforth an integral part of the new organization, and is known as a "Union Christian minister," ministerially identified with that body, and that "project," "scheme," and "aim." I have shown you the third fact, also, that Mr. McCune's name is the topmost signature in the list of names appended to the "Basis of Union" addressed to all the ministers and churches of North America,—a Basis "devised" in Cincinnati, and *adopted* and *signed* October 24, 1874, at the "Rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association, Cincinnati, Ohio," where the Convention met, and confirmed at the Suffolk Convention, May, 1875. Signed, W. C. McCune and others. The fourth fact is irresistible, viz., that Mr. McCune has been "enrolled" upon that list, "at his own request," because he has complied with the conditions of entrance into the new organization, viz., adoption of the Basis. He may have enrolled himself for aught we know, for the Basis hails from the Rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association, in Cincinnati, where it was unanimously adopted. He is, therefore, by his own act, a member of the new organization, for the purposes aforesaid. He has, by his own act, become subject to the jurisdiction of independent Councils and Conventions in general, an advisory jurisdiction, as is the case among all independent organizations, and, as I shall show, has become subject to the particular jurisdiction of an individual congregation, whose polity and creed he prepared for their

adoption upon this Basis, and in view of his own election as its pastor,—the minister being always, according to the independent polity, a member of the *congregation*, and eligible, by the congregation, to a seat in any Council or Convention, only as a "*delegate*" of the people. Having denied to the Presbyterian Denomination, as such, her right to be called "*a Church*"—that is, having denied the root principle of Presbyterianism, the right of one ecclesiastical rule over a plurality of Congregations organically bound under that rule, and having, by consequence, denied the right of all courts built upon that rule, and again, by consequence, the right of this Presbytery to say whether he shall accept a call or not, and be re-examined and installed or not, and whether he may belong to the new Anti-Denominational Association or not, he has flung his Presbyterianism to the winds, thrown our authority back in our faces, and chosen Independency as his polity. All this he has done, yet claiming his right to remain on the roll of this Presbytery for "indorsement" and "good standing." There is a bravery in all this, which could only be developed where a corresponding undervaluation or neglect by Presbyterians themselves exists in reference to their own Government and Discipline. The course of Mr. McCune is utterly unaccountable on any other hypothesis. He is, and has been, for years, an actual and active member of the new Association of Independent Union Christian Ministers and Churches in America. It is thus he has felt at perfect liberty, unchallenged, "unquestioned," while a member of this body, to carry on a crusade, even in its own bosom, and in the bounds of the Synod, as in the bounds of the neighboring Synod of Kentucky, against the doctrines and polity of the Presbyterian Church. Moderator, it is not true "*there is not much harm in all this.*" It is disloyalty to the Church, whose Standards of doctrine and order he has sworn to support, if his vows were not a mental reservation, "*Juravi lingua, mentem injuratam gero!*"

And now, Moderator, what avails it that Mr. McCune, only three days before this Court assembled, appears again, in public print four columns long, Commercial, December

30, 1876, to plead his case before the public, and, by desperate effort, seek to produce the impression, in advance, that he belongs to no anti-denominational association at all? that neither he nor the signers of the new Anti-Denominational "Basis of Union" are members of a distinct Association, designed to be permanent, with independent jurisdiction, under rules and laws and a creed and polity of their own construction and adoption? What avails it to say now, as judicial traverse comes on, that the "Basis of Union" was only a "tentative" platform for transient annual meetings, like Sunday School or Temperance Conventions, and nothing more was meant? Was, then, Mr. McCune's paper edited only for the sake of a Convention? Was his missionary propagandism in behalf of Organic Union, upon such principles as he advocated, only for the sake of a Convention? Sir, the apology is *too thin*, the disguise "too gauzy!" The "Basis of Union" is a Basis of church-fellowship, upon a special creed, upon a special polity, and for a special end, the reorganization of the whole Church of Christ, as the sounding language goes on. But now a metamorphosis occurs. Ovid tells us of Callisto changed to a bear, Actaeon to a stag, Jupiter to the form of Diana, and the sisters of Phaethon to weeping trees. Bossuet changes the dragon to a "milk-white hind!" Mr. McCune changes a Denomination to a "Convention," "a mere Convention!" Well, Sir, allow me to ask, when the Convention adjourns, where do the "Union Ministers and Churches" belong? Where is the "Union?" The Convention is expressly called "a Convention of the Union Christian Churches." There is an organization behind the Convention, and of which the Convention is a representative by "delegation" from the "Union." It is a vain excuse. In that Union Association, banded together upon its distinctive "*Basis of Union*," are two classes of ministers and members; those who have already severed their previous denominational relations, and those who "do not deem it expedient to sever existing denominational relations." Where, Moderator, when the Convention adjourns, do those who have severed their previous denominational relations belong?

They belong where Mr. McCune and the others who have not so done belong; they belong to the new Association of "Union Christian Churches and Ministers," into whose Organic Union bosom all the delegates retire upon adjournment. They are under the *dictio juris* of that Association, *i. e.*, under the jurisdiction of its creed, laws, polity, aim, and counsel. They have *one* jurisdiction in their Organic Church-fellowship. Mr. McCune has *two*, distinct and conflicting, a distinct "membership," a distinct "Church-fellowship." The organization is expressly said to be effected by "adoption" of a written "Basis of Union" and "enrollment" as members, the way in which every human organization is effected. Its "*initial step*" is expressly declared to be (1) the mutual voluntary reception of "each other," the first foundation, and (2) the reception of others. Is it only a Convention, with no Organic Union behind it of any Christian ministers, that presumes to posit a creed, a polity, and terms of admission into the visible Church? Is it a Convention that says, "We require no assent to any denominational peculiarity as a bond of *fellowship?*" And that "*we* will receive every Christian into *our fellowship*, and every Christian minister who teaches the common faith of the gospel." Who are the "*We* and *Our?*" Are they "delegates" simply to a Convention from no Association? "Fellowship" of what? Is it "fellowship" of a "Convention" whose members, after all, are *not* delegates? Is the "attempt to induce Christians to *unite* on the basis of their agreements" only an attempt to hold a Convention? Is the boasted Organic Union, after all, only the dissolving feature of an annual "Convention?" What, then, meant the cry, "We must *organize; organize!* Band ourselves together as ministers and Churches!" The desperate pleading of Mr. McCune only establishes with invincible demonstration the fact the prosecution assert and prove, that *he is, by his own act, a member of a new* Organic *Union Church organization*, whose purpose is the destruction of denominations, as such, and the reconstruction of the whole Church on a New Testament Basis. The prosecution submit that the proof is redundant to sustain

the specification before any Court in the world, that Mr. McCune has advocated and promoted the new anti-denominational association of independent "Union Christian Churches of America," of which he is a member, precisely as the specification sets forth—a movement utterly antagonistic in its principles to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church Mr. McCune has vowed to support.

The prosecution will not dwell on all the law points. They have already been quoted. The reference Digest, p. 304 (8), expressly forbids such conduct. The reference, p. 44 (II. V), asserts the right of the Presbyterian Church to have her own distinctive terms of communion, and her own polity, without subjection to a crusade against them by her own ministers. The references, pp. 411, 399, exhibit the vows of Mr. McCune to maintain the Standards, the truths, of the Gospel, and study the peace, unity, and purity of the church. The reference, p. 55 (6), requires him "to teach and preach according to the form of sound words in our confession and catechisms, and avoid and oppose all error contrary thereto," which he has not done in this new movement. The reference, Baird's Digest, p. 626, disqualifies from ministerial fellowship in the Presbyterian Church, the man who is "*confirmed and resolute in propagating his* (erroneous) *opinions among the people by a variety of methods*, to the great scandal of the church, seducing and perplexing the unwary and unstable," departing from the truth and opposing his church. The reference, p. 630, Baird's Digest, expresses the pain of the General Assembly "that novel opinions, or at least opinions presented in a novel dress and appearance, have been *openly and extensively circulated*, and excited unusual alarm, while at the same time *they have given rise to much contention*;" and takes occasion to declare its "uniform adherence to the doctrines contained in our Confession of Faith, in their plain and intelligible form, and its own firm determination to maintain them against all innovations," earnestly entreating that "nothing subversive of these doctrines *may be suffered to exist* or *to be circulated amongst the churches.*" Neither ministry, Presbytery, or Synod may indulge such license, or be guilty of such

departure from our denominational law, and no minister may plead in justification of his course the transgression of any of the courts of the church, or encouragement by any of their members. The reference, p. 638, bids us "consider the pernicious tendency of the present *disorganizing plan*" of those who, under the specious pretense of honoring the Sacred Scriptures, would persuade you to "*reject all written or printed creeds* and forms of discipline," and whose polity is that "Christians have no power over one another to *cut off*, or *exclude*, or *unite*." It is the scheme of Mr. McCune drawn to the life and condemned. The reference, p. 648, delivers the unambiguous judgment of the assembly that the propagation of such doctrines "ought to subject the person or persons so doing, *to be dealt with by their respective Presbyteries* according to the discipline of the church relative to the propagation of errors," especially, p. 651 (77), if either he or they "manifest a lofty mind and independent spirit that will not be controlled by authority." It is not possible, Moderator, for our church more thoroughly to condemn the course of Mr. McCune, nor is it possible for him more thoroughly to set at naught the Standards, or renounce the vows that bind him to subjection, and the study of the church's peace, unity, and purity. Such conduct generally allowed would be subversive of the constitution of the church, and destructive of its very existence. I pass to the second specification.

SPECIFICATION II.

Linwood and Mt. Lookout.

This specification unfolds for us the next important fact in the progress of organic union in our midst. It was not enough for Mr. McCune that the Synod of Cincinnati, in 1870, should authorize his peculiar views and principles to be circulated throughout its bounds, nor that its pulpits should welcome their advocacy before the people, nor that Mr. McCune should be enrolled as a member of the new denomination. A particular, visible incorporation of differing ecclesiastical views and differing doctrinal beliefs must be

experimented into organic oneness in the bosom of the Presbytery of Cincinnati. Undismissed members who belonged to five different denominations must *unite* under Mr. McCune's lead in a new organization, on Mr. McCune's Organic Union Basis, prepared by him for their adoption. The new organization is effected. The *fiveness* becomes extinct in the *oneness*, and the *oneness* emerges by organic evolution from the *fiveness*. The unity in which the flock dwells, is not an inward unity, for "local convenience," upon a *minimum quid* examination. It matters not, at any time, whether suppliants for entrance can bring certificates, or whether they do not believe the Bible infallible, or Christ properly human. If they have "Saving Faith" without this, all well. The undismissed members go in "*on profession.*" With most of them we have nothing to do. It is "outside our jurisdiction" as rulers in the house of God. It is with Mr. McCune, in this movement, we are concerned. The more we contemplate the movement, as it took shape under his hands, the more our wonder is challenged. It is a theological seminary and asylum. It trains and examines "*candidates for the ministry.*" Specification V, Proof 4. It receives "all Christians," and all "ministers" too. (Ibid.) It is liberal moreover. A candidate for the sacred office is not required to explain "the *sense* in which he receives *every verse* of Scripture *from the beginning of the Bible to the end of it.*" The exercise would be too long. Few would take orders at this rate! It is presumable, however, that those who do, like Ezra, the scribe of old, "*give the sense*" on the few texts submitted to their consideration, give it so as not to get outside the limits of the "common faith," *i. e.*, outside the points on which all agree as to personal salvation, while differing on everything else. Nothing more is needed. Theology is a dry subject. The day of "dogma" is gone. The hour of Organic Union has come. There is a slight departure here, a little inconsistent with the anti-creed rule that no "human deductions" are allowable, and that all that is needed is assent to words "*expressed in God's own language*," as that language is "commonly received." The new organization informs us that it is actually "about

to send out into the world" on a few well selected texts, or on the Basis of the Evangelical Alliance, either, the candidate may choose which, "those who are to preach the everlasting gospel," *i. e.*, the "common faith" as defined. It is evidently a parent society, though an infant yet! Mr. McCune's five in one have swept the whole compass of denominational activities, and gathered all the functions into unity. The whole "General Association" is mirrored in microcosm at Mt. Lookout. As to its officers, its polity speaks on this wise, that any one of them can be hopelessly turned out of office, without appeal, by a simple "request" of a "majority of the members voting at a meeting, *duly called for that purpose.*" This is one of the "Regulations of Expediency." As to discipline, the whole body simply "withdraw" from an offender. See Specification V, Proof 4. That Mr. McCune is the veritable father of this Linwood and Mt. Lookout "*Union Christian Church*," the preparer and publisher of its Declaration, Preliminary Statements, Basis of Fellowship, and Regulations of Expediency, that he "actively co-operated in organizing it," "desired" to organize it, and "agreed with others" to organize it, and for the *expressly avowed purpose of putting into practical embodiment* his Organic Union Principles, and that this was what he meant, among other things, in his editorial of Aug. 1, 1875, three months only before the organization, saying he had "fixed aims and purposes," and what his co-editor meant, among other things, saying same date, "we must *organize, band ourselves together as ministers and churches, Let the work of organization go on!*" and what the rebuke to Mr. Thrall meant, same date (Specification V, Proof 6), will, I think, become evident to the Court. Its Declaration and Regulations of Expediency all flowed from the ink of Mr. McCune's pen. If the preparation of these by Mr. McCune is denied, the prosecution will introduce and submit additional testimony, which, however, they prefer not to submit unless by necessity. The Linwood and Mt. Lookout Manual was sent to many members of Presbytery previous to the installation of Mr. McCune. It is here upon your table. It needs no signature. It is

one large signature itself. "Dr. Skinner," says Mr. McCune, January 12, 1876, six weeks after the organization, "seems to make a painfully elaborate effort to prove, by some rather confusing quotations, that the Church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout is responsible for the publication of the *Declaration and Preliminary Statements* which accompany the *Basis of Fellowship* of the Union Christian Church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout. Certainly; who ever thought otherwise? His ulterior object seems to be *to make me also responsible.* I will gladly relieve him of any further trouble in this direction. I hereby declare that I *heartily approve* of the Declaration and Preliminary Statements accompanying the Basis of Fellowship of the Union Christian Church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout, and respectfully *commend them* to the attention of the Christian public." I am sure every court would decide, especially a moral court, these words to be a veritable evidence of the Authorship of the Manual. The Prosecution is relieved of any doubt whatever. If the court, however, is not satisfied, we will introduce what will remove any doubt at once. Proof 4, Specification V, Charge I, reads thus: "We, giving to each other evidence that we are Christ's disciples, *propose*, by the help of God, to *organize* a '*Union Christian Church*,' in accordance with the precepts and examples of the New Testament." "We will, on scriptural evidence, cordially receive *all* Christians into this Church." "We will receive as ministers *all* who give us scriptural evidence that they are in fact ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ, etc." "*We* will; *we* will; *we* deem, etc." What can be plainer from all these utterances than that Mr. McCune did thoroughly identify himself with those who proposed to form a new church, and was as truly one of their number in this whole work as any other person in that number? He himself is one of the "we" who propose to do this thing, and the attempt to evade this identification by pleading that *he* did not organize the Church is utterly vain. If the "we" organized it, then *he* also organized it, for he was one of the "we." The installation over, and the charge being made that because no elders had been ordained, the society had no

ordained officers of its own, Mr. McCune exclaims, "Does he deny that I am an officer, then, or does he deny my ordination? which?" Proof 2, Specification II, Charge II. Our ordination of Mr. McCune *does not make* him an officer in that church. Installation over an Independent or Congregational Church does make him an officer in that church, and does bind him to the administration of law and order in the house of God according to the special rules of that congregation. He is himself under those rules, not above them. He is a *de facto* member of the Church itself. In a congregation organized from five different denominations, by the agency of a Presbyterian minister, expressly throwing the Westminster Standards overboard, as the whole Congregational Body in this country had now done, and denouncing all human-made creeds, and the enforcement of denominational laws and enactments as essentially sinful, and even dispensing with one or both of the sacraments, if any object to receive them, mere danger has already passed into open destruction of the truth and order of Christ's House. To plead *historic* congregational "usage" here, is to plead a nonentity. In 1871, in National Ecumenical Council at Oberlin, Ohio, the witness, Mr. Halley, tells us that congregational historic usage was thrown to the winds with the Westminster Standards for the sake of a "new departure" in the interest of the Oberlin platform of liberalism that would receive, tolerate and fellowship the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church, just as it is, with all its enormities. To such a church as this, organized on such a foundation, by Mr. McCune and others, Mr. McCune has joined himself. Repelling the charge, made by myself, that the spiritual government of the Church was in the hands of unordained committee-men, and that the Church had no ordained officers, and was, therefore, not scripturally *organized*, he exclaims, as I have said, "Does he deny that *I am an officer* then, or does he deny my ordination?" The question was not whether Mr. McCune was ordained, but whether that particular society had of itself, and claiming as its own, any ordained "officers" of the body. Mr. McCune comes forward, therefore, upon the fact of his installation, to affirm

the further fact that he is an "officer" of that particular society as well as an "officer" in his own. He is subject to its creed, laws, polity, and aim, such as they have been voted to be, and such as he specially prepared for the new "*Christian Union Church* at Linwood and Mt. Lookout." He is under that "*dictio juris*" of that vote of adoption by that society. He is bound by it, and must conform to it. He made the whole thing himself.

Proof 3 shows the time claimed for the so-called organization, and the distinctive title of the new society, as given above. The month of November, 1875, is the general date. The 7th, 8th, 10th and 24th are testified to as the special dates, by the Herald and Presbyter, the Presbytery's Investigating Committee, and a member of the organization whose testimony is given in the Presbyterian. It is expressly stated in that testimony, that although Mr. McCune was not a pastor, at that time, *i. e.* not acting "*officially*," yet he was present at the so-called organization "desiring" that just such an organization as it is, on precisely such a Basis as he made for it, "might be effected." How strong that desire was, and with what aims, we all know. Furthermore, upon his own confession, he was laboring a whole "year" among the people before the so-called organization took place, a people who were of various denominations, and who, for some time, had been holding union services, in the ordinary way, in such cases. It was a grand, a favorable opportunity, under the plea of uniting merely for "local convenience," to now venture the experiment of an "Organic Union Christian Church," on an anti-denominational Basis. It was "mutually agreed," he tells us, himself," that we would look toward the organization of a Union Church." So much the worse if *such* a Church, on *such* a Basis, was the meditation of his mind for a whole "year" before the so-called organization took place. Utterly beside the question it is, if he means to say, it was *some other kind* of "Union Church" than the one that finally emerged. Utterly beside the question, if he means to say that the Linwood and Mt. Lookout people are chargeable with the dangerous views and principles into which he indoctrinated them, or whether he inocu-

lated *them*, or they inoculated *him*. It is of no sort of consequence to this Presbytery, in this case, how many or how few worked up the movement with Mr. McCune. He is the preparer and the author of its Declaration and its Creed, its Basis and its Polity. He has been trying to do for Ohio what some others did for Virginia and North Carolina—organize a Christian Church for himself, on his own plan, and call it Apostolic! He says "I *approved* the movement," as though he were a bystander looking on and giving his opinion! He did more than approve it. He says "I *counseled* it," as though his advice had simply been sought. He did more than "counsel it." He says, "I *co-operated* with *those who did* organize this church," as though he did not organize it himself. This is his manner of statement. Moderator, he did more than "*co*-operate" in the organization. He "*operated*" the organization itself, if any organization took place before the Council met. Mr. McCune devised and projected the whole movement from beginning to end, in the shape it took. He molded it to his will. He organized it himself, as truly as, and more truly than ever did any committee of Presbytery organize any church within our bounds, if it ever was organized before the Council met. The *people* who *were organized* into the organization did not organize it. The material molded into shape is not the molder. The original constituent elements out of which a thing is composed is not the plastic hand that imposes the form. No, sir. This ecclesiastical protoplasm is the work of Mr. McCune alone as the sole *Organizer* of the Organic Union Church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout, if it was organized at all before the Council met. He told us, August 1, 1875, only three months before, that he meant work, he meant business! And he has kept his word. Mt. Lookout answered to the call of Suffolk, "*Organize!*" Listen to the testimony of an officer of the Congregation (Proof 3): "Mr. McCune acted *merely* in the capacity of a Christian, desiring that such organization might be effected, his position *only* giving him *somewhat* greater prominence in the matter than any other brethren." Oh, Mr. Moderator, it is a vain excuse, this word "*merely*,"

this word "*only*," this word "*somewhat*." And is the position of a Presbyterian minister of twenty years' standing, one who claims as an ambassador of Christ, by virtue of Christ's call to him, to bear rule in His house, only "*somewhat*" greater than that of unorganized individuals? "*Somewhat*" more "prominent!" Moderator and brethren, Mr. McCune is the creator of that organization such as it was. It is his workmanship, absolutely, so far as its ecclesiastical creed and form are concerned. It is the legitimate outgrowth of his Organic Union principles, the fruit of Organic Union Seed, planted a "year" before, his outstanding and embodied "project," "scheme," and "aim," the realization of his ardent hopes after long years of zealous advocacy and toil. It is the body of which Mr. McCune is the head, and it stands to-day, the creation of a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, upon principles destructive of his own and all other evangelical denominations. Mr. McCune's friends may seek to provide a shelter for his responsibility, by denying to this Presbytery, upon its Committee's request, the courtesy of the inspection of the records of their so-called organization, but that one fact will shine, in the trial of this case, as a demonstration, clear and convincing, that the Organic Union movement "co-operates" with ministers in disrespect of their own denominational laws and organic enactments, and secretes the evidence from the Court to which their pastors belong. That one act of refusing a courtesy, shall I not say a moral right, which no so-called "Sectarian" denomination would refuse to another, is sufficient ground for this Presbytery's order to Mr. McCune to cease his labors at that place. Were a foreign government to so act toward the United States, in the case of a civil minister, recalled to answer for transgression of the Constitution and laws, we know what the result would be. Such is the beauty of two jurisdictions, one for the pastor, another for the church! But the evidence is ample. And, as a Presbyterian minister, I solemnly aver, that no minister of the Presbyterian Church has any right to, either create, operate, co-operate, counsel, approve, or even lend his countenance for any plea, under

any consideration of any kind, to the organization or recognition of a church built on the principles Mr. McCune devised for the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Society.

The Specification alleges that, Mr. McCune having "co-operated" in this so-called organization, accepted a "call" to become its pastor, was examined, and installed by an irresponsible, because undelegated "Council," *without leave of, or dismission from his Presbytery, and* against advice, and is, at present, the pastor of the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church. The evidence of the acceptance of the call is taken from collaterals Nos. 3 and 4 of the Investigating Committee's Report, No. 3 being the statement of certain members of the "Council" that installed Mr. McCune, and from No. 4, being the statement of Mr. McCune himself, both affirming the fact. The evidence of the examination and installation of Mr. McCune by an irresponsible, because undelegated Council, is taken from collateral No. 3, being the statement of four out of "ten ministers connected with four evangelical denominations," also from the account of the proceedings of the installation service, published December 17, 1875, in the Cincinnati *Gazette.* The evidence that all this was done without leave of, or dismission from the Presbytery is taken from collateral No. 4, found in Mr. McCune's own words: "If there is any Presbyterian law requiring a minister to *first gain the consent of his Presbytery*, before accepting a pastorate *outside of Presbyterian jurisdiction*, I have no knowledge of it." "If there is such a law," he says, "I will plead ignorance and indifference!" Proof 5. The evidence, like most of it already furnished, is unnecessary, for the facts are officially before this Court already. The public indorsement by the Council of Mr. McCune, as "*an intelligent and thoughtful expositor of the Scripture, and a reliable teacher on all vital points of doctrine,*" is also given, together with notice of his installation, according to the programme of the Council. The advice given to Mr. McCune was advice given by myself in the letter which I addressed to Mr. McCune, upon receipt of his invitation, or the published invitation of the Committeemen of Linwood and Mt. Lookout, to be present and give sanc-

tion and encouragement to the undertaking. The evidence that Mr. McCune is pastor, at present, of the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church, is referred to as upon record in the Minutes of the General Assembly, put there by order of the Presbytery, and also to the Records of the Presbytery at Mt. Auburn, September 13, 1876, then inserting the omitted order of Mr. McCune's enrollment as "Pastor" on the statistical report of the clerk, April 13, 1876, at Glendale, to the then oncoming General Assembly, thereby giving official sanction to the installation of Mr. McCune by said Council, and to his present pastoral relation.

But, Moderator, before passing to the law of our church condemning this whole procedure of Mr. McCune, I must refer to the attempt of the defendant to shelter himself under the wing of Congregationalism, which, at Oberlin, Ohio, in 1871, abandoned the Westminster Standards in order to make room for just such doctrinal organizations as that of Linwood and Mt. Lookout. This we have had in express terms in the testimony before us from the defense. It is true, and can not be denied, that in the preamble to the resolution of the council, the church of Linwood and Mt. Lookout is carefully and precisely announced to the world as an "*un*denominational" church, and therefore not Congregational. It is true that Mr. Melish has testified that the Congregational body is a "sect," a "division" or "separation" from the "Body of Christ," one, among others, causing "an essentially sinful state of things." It is true that Mr. McCune himself is a member of another of these "sinful denominational divisions" and insists on standing upon its roll; but all this matters not in the desperate emergencies and exigencies of the defendant. If he can only show that the Linwood and Mt. Lookout church is what it is not, a Congregational church, a "sect," an "antiscriptural and sinful" separation from the "Body of Christ," he thinks he has saved his cause and can escape the charge that he is opposed to denominations, as such. I therefore occupy a little time in considering *the Congregational mode of organizing a church.*

This mode is based upon the fundamental principle of

Congregationalism, which differences it from bald Independency. That principle is, *ecclesiastical* affiliation, fraternity, and fellowship, not merely spiritual or moral. No individual church is a Congregational church. It stands alone, a pure and absolute separatist, without any church fellowship whatever. The word Congregationalism does not mean the association of individual members in any particular church. It means the ecclesiastical affiliation and association of many similarly organized *churches* by means of a council common to all. The word Congregational relates to the fact of a number of congregations in ecclesiastical fellowship. Congregational churches are congregated, "affiliated and fraternized" churches, not merely Independent. Dexter on Congregationalism, p. 344. Now, their whole law of organization is based on this principle, and no churches are lawfully organized Congregational churches that are destitute of this formal association. The assertion of this principle necessitates the following things as essential to a regularly organized Congregational church: 1. There can be no such church apart from a regularly organized council; 2. There can be no regularly organized council apart from direct authority delegated from affiliated churches; 3. A regular church organization is effected by, with, and through the instrumentality of a regularly delegated council only, whether that council consists of pastors alone, or of pastors and laymen. In Congregational usage and polity, to organize a church regularly there must be a "Letter Missive" from a committee of those proposing to form the church, directed, not merely to individuals, but to neighboring Congregational churches, to formally meet, appoint, and send delegates, bearing "full credentials," (1) to justify the existence of the *pro re nata* council itself, (2) to consult with the members as to the expediency of the movement, and (3) to form the church if the way be clear. This council, thus called, can not organize itself as a council except by reading the "letter missive" to the churches and the credentials of the delegates. The examination of the letters of dismission, the basis, and the suitableness of the parties, comes

next. If the way be clear, the council then votes to advise the persons named in the list to proceed to form the proposed church, not yet formed, and makes arrangement for public services by the council to promote this end—to wit, the sermon, reading of the basis, prayer of recognition, giving through the council the right hand of fellowship from the churches invited to the members about to form the new church, address to the church, prayer, and benediction. After the reading of the basis, the special act by which the new church is constituted, is the solemn public rising and assent of the parties named in the list to the basis read there and then in the council. *After* this, and not before, it is competent for the new church to elect its officers, and choose and call its pastor.

Such is the Congregational polity and usage, upon the authority which Mr. McCune and Mr. Halley present to this Court as competent testimony in the case. Dexter, pp. 162–166. Anything else than this is bald Independency. It is not Congregationalism because it lacks the fundamental principle of "affiliation" of churches, the existence of the Council, and the actual presentation and reception, by delegated authority, of the right hand of fellowship. Now, Mr. Moderator, a cloudless sun, in mid heaven, on the fourth day of July, is not more clear than the fact that the Linwood and Mt. Lookout organization was as gross a violation of Congregational polity and usage, as it was of Presbyterian law itself. That polity and usage are pleaded in its justification. I affirm that neither one nor the other lends a shadow of right to such an abnormal and nondescript performance as that was. Mr. McCune claims that the organization was effected before the Council met. I affirm that, when a Council is possible, Congregational polity requires the formation of the Church, its very inception as a Church, to take place at the time and in the very presence of a regularly delegated and regularly organized Council. I say that according to Congregational polity, every member of the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Council helped to organize that Church, on the very principles on which it was founded, Mr. McCune himself, and all the Presbyterians who were present.

I further affirm, on the very testimony introduced here by the defendant, that that Council was a usurpation in every particular, a novelty, an innovation, that even Independency itself would reject. It was an unauthorized, new thing under the sun, destitute of ecclesiastical authority throughout. It was a "voluntary club of men." I care not whether the organization is claimed to have been made either *before* the Council or *at* the Council, it was in the face of Congregational polity. There was no affiliation of Churches. No letter missive was sent to any Church whatever. No credentials from any Church were presented, and any right hand of fellowship that was extended was simply the right hands of the individuals of the Council, who, if they deem themselves to be each one a Church, are the strangest churches this world has ever seen, being pastor, people, committee-men, deacons, trustees, choir, sexton, and church-edifice, all in each person. Moderator, they have no right to offer a right hand of fellowship. They had none to offer. The ceremony was a delusion. And whether we regard Mr. McCune's relations to the "we" who proposed to form the Church, and who, he says, did form the Church, or to the Council, he is still, on the evidence adduced in this Court, one of the parties in that transaction.

But still further, while there is abundance to show that the organization of this Church was in violation of Congregational polity, there is enough to show also that the real organization of that Church, unauthorized as it was, did actually take place at the time of the Council, and not before. The special act by which a Congregational Church is constituted is declared by Dr. Dexter, who is one of the witnesses of the defendant, to be the public formal assent, before the Council, of the members named in the list, to their Basis of Faith and Covenant, read to them by the Council. Let it be carefully observed that the recognition of a new Church, and the constituting of a new Church, and the address to the new Church thus constituted, all occur during the same Council. Upon evidence in Court, these things did occur, viz., the list of members forming

the Church presented to the Council, the appointment of special services, the reading of the Basis, the recognition, the sermon, and the right hand of fellowship. Let it be further observed that the Preamble of the Resolution offered in Council states that the parties to be organized had "*now resolved to organize* themselves *permanently* as a Church of Jesus Christ;" that they had "resolved upon an *un*denominational organization;" that the members of the Council were present to give them "fraternal counsel and aid in the undertaking in which they were *about* to engage;" and the Resolution, as adopted, declares that they were thereupon recognized as a Church.*

Now, Sir, what have we in this matter? We have (1) the indubitable fact that the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church was not organized previous to the Council, and that all argument to the contrary is mere special pleading, and a vain attempt at escape. We have (2) the fact that the mere appearance of Congregationalism, without its authority and regular mode of procedure, was given to the petitioners, and that was all. To have called a Council regularly, and to have proceeded regularly, would have been "*denominational*," and this was just what this new movement proposed not to be in any sense whatever. The demonstration is complete that the Society was veritably organized at that time, and not before. But in either case, whether before

---

* It is notorious, as every member of that Council knows, that instead of the expression "*permanently* organize," the expression "*provisionally* organize" was used in the Preamble, as read to that Council, and that Dr. Morris himself, upon the insistance of Mr. McCune, erased the word "*provisionally*" and inserted the word "*permanently*" in that Preamble. This is proof conclusive that the Church had not been organized either "provisionally" or "permanently" before the Council met. Furthermore, the invitation I received from Dr. Morris, dated December 13, 1875, only two days before the Council convened, used these words: "I think we can safely take part in *the Council by which this Church is to be organized*, and as safely instal Brother McCune as its pastor;" adding that he intends to "preach at his installation, and *share in the work of organization.*" Further evidence could have been supplied, but the Presbytery, under the remarks of Dr. Morris, *denied to the Prosecution the right to introduce testimony rebutting the allegations of the defendant*, who gathered up his witnesses from day to day, as he needed them for his case.

or at the time, it is no organization at all, even according to Congregational polity, but simply an independent association of individuals, like any other independent society, whether medical, botanical, chemical, or agricultural. The defendant pleads that this is an exceptional case, and that the Congregational polity makes allowance for exceptional cases, and that the Church did organize itself before the Council met. The authority of Dr. Dexter and other testimony is relied upon to show that in an exceptional case individuals may organize themselves into a church, but this is no more Congregationalism than it is Presbyterianism or Methodism, for all these denominations allow the same thing. Does this mean that the exception is the rule? that a Church not Congregationally organized is congregationally organized, or not Presbyterially organized is Presbyterially organized? No, Sir, the exceptional church is not a Congregational church, and can not be, because it is the exception. It is a purely independent church. Moreover, what constitutes the exception? It is not peculiarity of views. It is not variety of views. It is not even the impossibility of having a denominational church. It is the *impossibility of calling a council*, arising out of the fact that no sister Congregational churches are near or within reach. In other words, that the persons to be organized are so far from the Congregational "aqueduct," as Dr. Dexter calls it, that the people have to "dig down" anywhere in the sand to find "living water." Dexter, p. 238. I quote him as Mr. Halley quoted him. It is only when the people are "grouped upon some far Pacific slope, hundreds of miles from any church, of any name, with communication almost interdicted by the distance and peril of the way;" when they can not "put themselves into communication with the rest of the world;" when they would be subjected "to delay, trouble, expense, often disappointment and dispersion;" when they are "abnormal and incomplete;" when they are "in some extreme border wilderness;" and when it is "impossible to secure the counsel and co-operation of existing Congregational churches in the act of their formation." Dexter, pp. 238, 239, and 162.

To what desperate argument is the defendant compelled to resort in his plea that the Mt. Lookout church is an exceptional case, that its peculiar organization was an independency forced upon it by necessity of position and circumstance impossible to be avoided? Could the defendant himself, so near the Vine Street, Seventh Street, and Columbia Street Congregational aqueducts, and so near so many other churches, plead that a "letter missive" could not be sent to those churches to convene and send delegates to organize his new enterprise? Will any one say that Linwood and Mt. Lookout, in the suburbs of Cincinnati, are like some isolated spot, some Sahara desert, or Pacific slope, or far off island in the sea, or extreme border wilderness, or Himalaya plain, utterly beyond the possibility of calling a regular Congregational council, and obliged by force of circumstances to extemporize an independent, unauthorized club of ministers and laymen to meet and form and recognize the new church? Moderator, the very nature of the defense is the strongest argument against it. Such was the common fame as to this new movement, in connection with Mr. McCune's name, and such the opposition of the best part of our community, that none of our churches would have answered his *letter missive* except by respectful negation. It was not an exceptional case. By no dint of argument can such character be adduced to justify the council, the formation of the church such as it is, or anything connected with it. It is a new type of Independency, a new movement, and nothing else—the assertion of extremest liberalism and individualism. It is organic unionism, in defiance of all scriptural polity, and of the polity of every organized denomination on earth. If our Congregational brethren choose to father, foster, receive, and fellowship the McCune enterprise, with its doctrines and its principles and its violation of even their own exception, it is their Lookout and not our Lookout. The Oberlin platform of 1871 will gain no credit by the addition.

But now, Mr. Moderator, the Prosecution cares not a farthing whether this entire performance was Congrega-

tionalism or not. Mr. McCune may have a *shadow* of Congregationalism over his church and over himself as its pastor; but if he had both shadow and substance, it would not help him in the least degree in the case before us. The true question is, not whether Mr. McCune has complied with Congregational polity and usage, but whether he has complied with Presbyterian polity and usage, in accordance with his solemn ordination vows; whether he has not advocated principles and doctrines, and put those principles and doctrines into practical form at Linwood and Mt. Lookout in each and every of the particulars specified, which, if generally allowed, would utterly subvert Presbyterian law and order, and destroy the Presbyterian denomination itself, and turn it into the new departure of the Oberlin platform of 1871.

That this whole procedure of Mr. McCune was in contravention of the organic law of the church, by which every Presbyterian minister is bound, is evident by reference to the standards. 1. *As to the organization.* No Presbyterian minister has a right to organize any church whatever, either inside or outside the jurisdiction of the Presbytery, without leave granted or permitted by the Presbytery. Organization of Churches is a function reserved to the Presbytery by the Constitution, and no minister may usurp that function upon any pretext whatever, nor for any reason. "The *Presbytery* has power to *form*, or receive, new congregations." Digest, p. 144. "Except in frontier and destitute settlements, where it is *made* a part of the business of evangelists to organize Churches without the previous action of some Presbytery directing or permitting it, etc., since in Chap. IV. (Form of Gov.) no mention is made of any such power being lodged in the hands of an individual minister." p. 173 (49). With the above exceptions, the rule is absolute. It is not limited to the formation of *Churches* merely *within* Presbyterian jurisdiction. If a minister may not usurp the Presbytery's function within her jurisdiction, he may not outside of it. The function of organization, inside or outside, does not pertain to the individual, in any case, by virtue of his ministerial office. Organization is the

exercise of a joint or several power, and only exercised, individually, by express delegation, for unavoidable reasons, like that of the Pacific slope, or extreme border wilderness. It is no part of *potestas ordinis*, but solely of *potestas jurisdictionis*. Even Presbytery can only exercise it where she has jurisdiction, and that jurisdiction is excited by "application" of petitioners desiring organization. But if a Presbytery may not organize outside of her jurisdiction, *a fortiori*, a minister may not, who has neither jurisdiction nor function to that end. Least of all may a minister organize, within the very bosom of his own Presbytery, and under the very eyes of his brethren, a society founded on principles destructive of his own Church's faith and order; much less morally approve, counsel, co-operate, or create such an enterprise. Palpable, in any case, outside or inside, the jurisdiction of the Church was the breach of comity and order in the manner of the organization. The general rule for procedure in organization is that, "at the time appointed for the purpose, after prayer for Divine direction and blessing, the presiding minister or committee should first receive from those persons to be organized into the new Church, if they have been communicants in other Churches, *letters of dismission and recommendation*; and next examine and admit to a profession such persons as may offer themselves, and may be judged suitable to be received on examination." p. 107 (6). And this is the very rule Dexter himself has laid down. Picture the scene at Linwood and Mt. Lookout, on the representation here brought in. A company of church-members undismissed, voting the paper "we, giving to each other evidence that we are Christ's disciples, *propose*, by the help of God, to organize *a Union* Christian Church, etc.," thus attempting to become, *ipso facto*, a Church of Christ, Mr. McCune, a Presbyterian minister, presiding, and then the Council afterwards again receiving these names and recognizing the transaction! The undismissed members "joining on profession!" Joining what? And Mr. McCune justifying his course because it was "outside of our jurisdiction." I will not trust myself, Moderator, to speak what I feel, or

what I think of such a transaction, so in violation of any decent rule in any so-called "sectarian" denomination, and so in the face of that apostolic precept, "Let everything be done decently and in order." But, then, it is "Organic Union," a gleam of the millennium! 2. As to *accepting a pastoral call.* No Presbyterian minister may accept a call to become a pastor anywhere, except by leave of his Presbytery. The wisdom of this rule, as well as of the first, is the shield of the Presbyterian Church. "The call" from any Church, inside or outside our jurisdiction, "shall be presented by the Presbytery under whose care the person or persons called shall be." "No minister or candidate shall receive a call but through the hands of the Presbytery." Digest, p. 409. "No minister shall be translated from one Church to another, nor shall he receive any call for that purpose, but by permission of the Presbytery." p. 410. The rule is absolute, without any exceptions. In every case, "Commissioners properly authorized" must represent to the Presbytery the reasons for the call, then Presbytery will judge whether it shall be placed in his hands. Inside or outside her jurisdiction, this is the law. It is not difficult to see why no application from any persons in Linwood and Mt. Lookout was made to the Presbytery of Cincinnati; nor is it credible that Mr. McCune, having been for twenty years a Presbyterian minister, should not well understand that, had any such application been made, it would have run at least the hazard of rejection. Besides, it would have been utterly inconsistent with the principles of Mr. McCune and his new enterprise to ask any favors of, or recognize "distinctive," "denominational laws." It was the same principle of resistance to such enactments, and whereby Mr. McCune was emboldened to usurp the Presbyterian power of organization, even where the Presbytery had no jurisdiction, that repeated itself in the acceptance of a call to a pastoral charge in the very bosom of the Presbytery, without her permission. Independency and Organic Union simply determined to treat with indifference and disrespect, the laws of the Presbyterian Church, as well as of the Congregational Church, in the

case of her own ministers. Mr. McCune was intelligent in all this, and acted consistently with his independent polity. His plan was indexed from the first. 3. As to the *Council*, *Examination*, and *Installation*. It was a purely voluntary, extemporized, and undelegated affair, convened not according to Congregational usage. The exceptional case had no existence here. It represented nobody. There was not a delegate in it. No sister churches sent or accredited any representatives to it. It was not countenanced by any duly organized or actually recognized Church whatever. The Linwood and Mount Lookout Church is, to this hour, without ecclesiastical recognition from any denominations or churches whatever. It was the expedient of Mr. McCune and his friends. Any company of ministers gathered on the street, at any time, and turning aside to any room, to vote and do anything they pleased, upon the personal request of anybody, would be as genuine a Church Council as was this. It was no Church Council whatever. It was an Organic Union "Convention," met to indorse Mr. McCune's enterprise, and give it the "right hand of fellowship," from nobody but themselves, as also to give Mr. McCune himself an indorsement, and form a pastoral relation between himself and Linwood and Mount Lookout Church. It was known, well known, that Mr. McCune had not obtained leave of his Presbytery, for it was a common conversation when the invitation to the Council and the Manual were transmitted to certain persons of the Presbytery. Our Standards, and our practice as a Church, recognize no such proceeding as that one of our ministers may, by indirection, secure an installation for himself in such a way. We have allowed our ministers, under special circumstances, to take part in orthodox Congregational Councils, when they are properly called, and in a rare case to be installed over an orthodox Congregational Church. What we shall do since the Oberlin "New Departure" remains to be seen. But we do not allow them to sit in Baptist, Methodist, Episcopalian, or Quaker Councils, much less in a Council called by no Churches, and extemporized for the purpose of giving the right hand of fellowship to an enterprise built upon a Basis

and a Creed so destructive as that of Linwood and Mount Lookout. Mr. McCune's resort to such an expedient, for the purpose of securing installation, was an aggravated violation of our law requiring him not to receive any call, anywhere, without leave of his Presbytery. The liberty that will allow Mr. McCune's course, in this matter, is a liberty that will allow any member of this Presbytery to go and organize with others, or co-operate in organizing, a Baptist Church, or an Episcopalian, or a Quaker Church, or any kind of a Church on any kind of Basis, just as well. There is no limit to such liberty. Any minister may be instrumental in calling any number of his brethren together, at any time, and to constitute themselves into a so-called "Council," do what they choose, responsible to none, and call themselves "delegates" or representatives of Churches, when they represent no Churches, because delegated by none. It is boundless license. Under such auspices, Mr. McCune was installed. The testimony is clear. "Those in attendance were not *delegated* by any ecclesiastical bodies, but came simply as individuals," upon the invitation of Mr. McCune's Church, organized out of undismissed members, and after its own fashion. This is *not* in "accordance with a familiar congregational usage." Congregational usage never knew of such an instance. Everything was done "*entirely on their own responsibility*," and the fact that members of that Council were "Christian men" does not help the matter. By a Council, composed in this way, Mr. McCune secured his installation, having first been re-examined, and then indorsed as "*an intelligent and thoughtful expositor of the Scriptures, and a reliable teacher on all points of doctrine.*" That Mr. McCune again violated the law of the Presbyterian Church is clear. If he may not accept a call, without permission of the Presbytery, he may not be instrumental in organizing a Church on a new Basis, and then instrumental in developing a new kind of Council to recognize that Church, and then again to re-examine and install him on a call he had no right to accept, a call made out by undismissed members belonging to other churches still. Mr. McCune was as much bound to ask

leave of his Presbytery to be installed as to accept a call. He knew this well in his experience as a pastor. If it belongs to Presbytery "to examine" and "install" ministers, it belongs to Presbytery to *permit* them, or *forbid* them to be installed by any Council, or by any court in the world. Digest, p. 144 (VIII). But it was all part and parcel of Mr. McCune's Organic Union scheme to act in this way. The conviction, in his soul, that the enforcement of "denominational laws" and "organic enactments" is an oppression of the conscience, and a deprivation of Christian and ministerial liberty, and his determination to exhibit his Organic Union freedom to the world, prompted him to violate the whole law of his Church in one bold movement, proclaim his doctrines, start a "Union Christian Church," receive a call, get up a council, be re-examined, re-indorsed, and installed over the church, all without dismission from or leave of his Presbytery. It was a bold move, an intelligent move. All that remained to be done, in order to make the triumph complete, was to officially enrol him as "Pastor," so affixing the imprimatur and sanction of the Presbytery to his installation, under all the circumstances, and so confirming his relation to the Linwood and Mt. Lookout church, an act formally done by the Presbytery at Glendale, April 13, 1876. And this, too, in face of the public discussion between himself and the Herald & Presbyter, the latter warning him in the following words, when speaking of what it calls his "project," "scheme," "aim," viz.: "We are at loss to understand how Mr. McCune can be willing to retain a connection with the Presbyterian Church! We should suppose that he would pass at once from an old organization that is unauthorized and extra-Scriptural to a new one on a New Testament Basis!" (Proof 6.) The Presbyterian Church of the Reunion, in the name of her Standards, lifts her voice of remonstrance against the course pursued by Mr. McCune herein. Boldly, Mr. McCune steps forth to say: "*I have violated no Presbyterian law whatever, in accepting my present pastorate, nor in anything I have done pertaining to the Union Christian Church at Linwood and Mt.*

Lookout !!!" He does more. He challenges the right of this court to call him to account for the propagation of his principles. Appealing to the progress of organic union views, and Oberlin Congregationalism within the last decade, and the encouragement received since his connection, ten years ago, with this Presbytery, he says: "This might have been a fair question *eight or ten years ago*, but it is certainly too late now!" (Proof 5.) Under cover of the plea that, because the Linwood and Mt. Lookout church is "*outside Presbyterian jurisdiction*," therefore, he, a minister of the Presbyterian Church, is not required to get permission from his Presbytery to accept a call and be installed, he says: "Any *petty question* about the formality of *first asking leave*, may interest hair-splitting ecclesiastical lawyers, whose vocation it is to tithe mint, anise, and cummin. If Presbytery says the *thing done is right*, I will be content. If she says I should have first asked leave, I will plead *ignorance* and *indifference*" (Proof 6); in plain Saxon, "I will say, I didn't know, and I don't care;" this shall be my plea. This was said, in the Presbyterian, February 12, 1876. The Presbytery's official enrollment of Mr. McCune as "Pastor" of Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church was April 13, 1876, just two months after! He judges that, because the church is "outside" of jurisdiction, he has a right to act as if he were outside of jurisidction also! that jurisdiction over the person and conduct of a minister *depends* upon jurisdiction over the particular church with which he is connected, whereas it rests upon these two facts alone (1), that he is himself a member of the Presbytery, no matter where his church may be, and (2), that the laws transgressed pertain to the *minister*, and not to the church. Mr. McCune can not divest himself, at pleasure, of his ordination vows, nor relieve himself of obedience to these laws on the plea that his church is "outside of Presbyterian jurisdiction," or on the plea of ignorance; *ignorantia juris non excusat.* Outside or inside, it is all the same so far as his membership and these laws, made for ministers, and not for churches, are concerned. Any dispute of this fundamental doctrine, he calls a "petty question." Any

defense of it, a "hair-splitting vocation of ecclesiastical lawyers, tithing mint, anise, and cummin." If arraigned for violating it, he says, "I don't know, and I don't care." Such is Organic Union!

Moderator, I am well aware that, as against the positions the Prosecution here take, and as against the organic enactments of the Presbyterian Church, the plea of "Usage" has been advanced, and may yet be advanced in the present case. I am aware the argument for non-enforcement of denominational law, and for the grant of liberty according to the "Spirit of the Age" is crowned with the argument of "Usage" in reference to the permission given some ministers, under rare circumstances, to be installed as pastor over orthodox Congregational Churches. Mr. McCune has made that plea. Others have made that plea. I deem it, therefore, a part of my duty to meet that argument, and vindicate the Presbyterian Church against its influence and effect wherever made. Especially do I deem it loyalty to our "Reunion" that, here and now, it should be met. It has assumed a latitude it never dared to measure any time before. I regard the use of that argument of usage as fatal to the peace, unity, and purity of our church. It is a dangerous plea to make. If usage consecrates the right of Mr. McCune to do as he has done, "usage" will consecrate the ruin of the Presbyterian Church. I concede that a continuous custom, or practice, grown up under an express law, is the best exposition of that law, for the law itself is the basis on which the usage rests. The usage has prescription to support it. I concede also, that where there is no law, usage may itself grow to a general law which it might be mischievous to abate. But neither of these cases is the case before us. Not the first, for the Presbyterian Church has no law, no prescription upon any such usage as that Mr. McCune claims is founded. There is no statute for such a thing to rest upon. Not the second, for we have express laws of our denomination forbidding the very things that Mr. McCune has done, whether as to propagating his Organic Union views, practicing an independent polity, organizing a Church,

accepting a call, or being re-examined and installed by an undelegated or other Council, without permission of his Presbytery. Moreover, before usage may be pleaded, where no law exists, it must be shown to be established well by time, without interruption, peaceably enjoyed, and consistent with the public good. But all these tests of usage are violated here. The practice claimed by Mr. McCune never was established by time; it never has been uninterrupted; it never was peaceably enjoyed; it never conduced to the peace and good of the Presbyterian Church. Apart from the Linwood and Mt. Lookout accompaniments, it began about the beginning of the present century, and was a compromise even with Congregationalism, it has been severely interrupted, it was never peaceably enjoyed, though acquiesced in for a period, and it produced only "harm" to the Presbyterian Church. With the Linwood and Mt. Lookout accompaniments, I think it may safely be said, it never was known in all the history of the Church on earth. It has no prescription. May it never become a precedent! The usage as to Congregational Churches, our allowing Presbyterian ministers to receive their call and be installed, never dispensed with jurisdiction over such ministers, nor allowed them to receive such call or be installed, but by permission of the Presbytery. The usage rested on the Plan of Union of 1801. It was a bad prescription, and was abrogated, as unconstitutional from the beginning, in 1838. All the force, and all the right, the usage had, in reference to Congregational Churches, and guaranteed by the Union plan of 1801, fell, when it fell in 1838. If the usage did once exist, it yet came from a prescription now gone. It grew out of that plan. Our Reunion has called us back again to the "old paths," the "good old ways" antecedent to the time of those sad controversies of which that bad prescription was the seed. We are cautioned not to make any "needless or offensive" reference to the past, much more not to revive the practices that gave the Church her trouble. "It is the duty of all our Church judicatories, ministers and people of the united Church," say our Concurrent Resolutions, "to avoid all needless and offensive re-

ference to the *causes* that divided us; and, in order to avoid the revival of past issues, *by the continuance of any* USAGE *in in either branch of the Church* that has grown out of former conflicts, it is earnestly recommended to the lower judicatories that they *conform their practice in relation to all* SUCH USAGES, so 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.*" Digest, p. 93. Those controversies began soon after the plan of 1801. Again, where any "usage" is thus related to the conflicts of the past, a "usage asserted and defended by some, denied and discarded by others," its "abolition" is demanded. And this Mr. McCune and this Presbytery have voted for. I submit, Moderator, that by the Terms of our Reunion, no man is entitled to plead Congregational "usage," and appeal to some few yet existing instances of it, as shown by our Assembly Minutes, much less under the Oberlin "New Departure." These are the remnants of a "usage" against which the assembly has advised our ministers and all our courts. Least of all can these cases be pleaded as an argument for Mr. McCune's course at Linwood and Mt. Lookout. The enterprise of Mr. McCune and his whole course herein is without prescription, and without a shadow of defense from "usage" of any kind whatever in our Body as to Congregational Churches. It is a pure inception, an innovation, a "new thing under the sun," a "sore evil" to the Church of Christ. It is without a parallel. It rests its claim on no analogy that can be cited, as allowed, in the whole history of the Presbyterian Church. It is a new development of the times. To lean for support on the "usage" of the past is to lean on a tree with its roots cut away, upon a custom that produced disaster and disruption. It is proposed that we fraternize with this Organic Union movement by the recognition of this enterprise, and by the plea that "usage" justifies the toleration, by this Presbytery, of the double, contradictory, anomalous, and anti-pro-denominational subscription and allegiance of its pastor. Moderator and Brethren, it is our bounden duty, not merely as Presbyterians, but as Christian ministers and elders, to

resist this bad inception. Soon, indeed, if not already, as Mr. McCune suggests, it may be "too late!"

"*Principiis obsta; sero medicina paratur.*" The course of Mr. McCune herein is utterly at war with all his ordination vows and the true deportment of all ministers. How can the Presbyterian Church allow a minister to have jurisdiction over all her churches, when even the inspection of the records of his own is formally denied? How permit one minister to ignore, in theory and in practice, our whole Form of Government and Book of Discipline, and even the fundamental doctrines of our system, and publicly teach contrary to the same? By what right send such a minister to our General Assembly "which represents in one body all the *particular churches* of this denomination" (Digest, p. 200), when he represents a church *not* of "this denomination?" Is it ingenuous to plead the "usage" of the past, now interdicted, for an enterprise that rests on no prescription; when such past usage *had* prescription and permission both? To plead that argument is vain. What has no prescription is an innovation.

The argument of usage may be, in these times, the ruin of our peace and unity and purity. It is another name for the non-enforcement of our Standards. It is the destruction of our true liberties and rights. Charles I pleaded usage for the exaction of money from his subjects. We know what came of that. Henry VIII did the same thing. We know what came of that. Usage made Magna Charta a dead letter, just as usage may make our Presbyterian Constitution here the same. Were Hampden, Cromwell, and Sydney wrong? Once the Presbyterian Church allowed corresponding members to deliberate and vote in our Courts. We know what came of that. Under the usage, grounded in the plan of 1801, a host of troubles came. It should be enough for us to know, when pleading usage, that no usage can be pleaded against a positive Constitution to the contrary. Nothing against the church's peace and welfare may be tolerated. "*Contra Rempublicam, priveligium non valet.*" And where a bad practice arises, it must be abolished. What in the beginning was vicious, does not

become valid by lapse of time. So is the maxim of common law as true, more true for the Church than for the State. Whatever is contrary to law may not be done by circumvention. No Court may decide against the Constitution. A bad usage never avails to bar the valid plea of a constitutional objection, or the welfare of the Church. We have no "*Toleration Act*" for Mr. McCune, no "Custom of the King" to plead, no "usage." To make usage, where it is a violation of law, an argument for its own continuance, is to make transgression its own defense. Brethren, let us stop this plea. "Stand in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest to your souls." "Sure I am," says Lord Bacon, "that *Stare decisis* is a good principle, and antiquity hath its wisdom. *Stare super vias antiquas*, stand upon the old ways. The very word and style of Reformation used by our Savior, *ab initio non fuit sic*, was applied to Church matters, and those of the highest nature." It will be our life, and strength, and peace, and unity, and purity, and historic glory, in future as in past, if we observe to do what our ordination vows bind us to do, not as oppressed, but as free, loyal, and loving Presbyterians.

And so may it please the Court! The prosecution present to you these charges and this argument, asking of the Court, in the name of the Presbyterian Church, a definitive judgment upon the allegations here made, and if regarded as proved, a definitive condemnation of those doctrines and that course, which are not only at war with the standards of the Presbyterian Church, but which—the one if generally accepted, the other if generally allowed—would be totally subversive of her constitution and of her very existence as a distinctive denomination. The prosecution ask, in the name of the Church, still more,—a definitive arrest of the propagation of such errors, and a positive injunction that they shall not be taught by any minister under our jurisdiction, nor allowed to be taught in any of

our churches. For what further action may be necessary in view of the present relations of Mr. McCune to the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church, and to the General Association of "Union Christian Churches" of which he is an active member, the Prosecution refer the Court to the law of our denomination, already so abundantly cited.

The hour is a momentous one for the Presbyterian Church, if the interest taken abroad in this case is any sign, and if the omens in the church at large are fraught with any lesson! Never before in all our history has there been such a disposition to put "Union before Truth" as there is to-day. Who knows not that times of Union are times of peril to the Truth of Christ? And what loyal minister of the Presbyterian Church is ignorant that the truth of Christ and the order of the heavenly house may not be sacrificed for any external fellowship, however great, nor for any considerations of expediency or economy? It is time the appeal to "conscience," "liberty," "private judgment," "usage," all perverted as it is, were hushed. Conscience has no rights against conscience. Liberty under law has no rights of disobedience to the law itself. Vows of allegiance to the Presbyterian Church have no rights of reservation, none of revolution, against the enforcement of her doctrine and her order. Truth in the inward parts, sincerity adopting and approving her standards as "agreeable to the word of God," has no right to traduce those standards as "sectarian." Private judgment has no rights of public transgression. Usage has no rights against the welfare of the church. Allow such license to go on "unquestioned," let Presbyterian ministers indulge it everywhere, and the muse of history, now in this Court, will write the epitaph "*Fuit Ecclesia Presbyteriana*" over the grave of the Presbyterian Church before this generation shall have passed away! We know the progress of error, and the arts she practices to twine herself around the human understanding. "*Toleration*" first, and only toleration, is all she asks. Grown to greatness, she next demands "*Equality of Rights*" with the Truth itself, and then the contest comes. Last of all, "Supremacy," the crown

upon her head, and Truth dethroned! Allow your ministers and elders to pursue the course of Mr. McCune, and claim subscription to your standards as a valid plea for resting on your roll, then measure, if you can, the march of error! So the Rationalistic Lutherans of Germany all signed the Augsburg Confession. So the Socinians of Geneva, after Calvin's day, all signed the Calvinistic Symbols. So the subscribers to the Heidleberg Catechism became Pantheists, Deists, and Unitarians. So Broad Church Anglicans subscribe the thirty-nine articles. So some Mohammedans subscribe the Nicene Creed. So Mr. McCune subscribes the standards and preaches the doctrines of Organic Union, invoking the cry of "toleration" in his own favor and "sectarianism" against his own denomination. Moderator, sectarianism and ecclesiastical denominations are not synonymous and identical terms. Presbyterianism is not "sectarianism." It is a Divine *Testimony*. The Presbyterian Church is not a "sect." It is a Divine *Foundation*. And well may it stand, if the best assaults of all its foes are found to be but misinterpretations of the Word of God, and vain theories spun from their own imaginations. But a worse than Galatian bewitchment has touched I know not how many ministers of Christ, I know not how many true Christians. "*Union before Truth*" is the popular accent of the day. The music goes sounding through all our Paradise. "*Down with dogmatism*" is the cry. It means unquestioned toleration. It is not hard to tell its source. If you will but follow Ithuriel and Zephon in their search, you shall soon find the lurking "spirit of the age," spotted with indifference to the Truth of God, whispering through Organic Union,

> "*Squat* like a toad, at the church's ear,
> Assaying by its cunning art to reach
> The organs of her fancy, and with them forge
> Illusions as it lists, phantasms and dreams,
> Vain hopes, vain aims, inordinate desires,
> Blown up with high conceits engendering pride."

God speed the day when the Presbyterian Church again, as of old, shall enforce her constitution and her laws! God

speed the day when all her ministers shall be loyal and true—priests whose "lips shall keep knowledge, and the people learn the law at their mouth," for they are "messengers of the Lord of hosts;" when, strong in the confidence of sound doctrine and a heavenly order, they shall be ready to confront with apostolic zeal those "whose mouths must be stopped," who "subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not;" when they shall "give heed to themselves and the doctrine, and continue in it, knowing that in doing this they shall "save both themselves and them that hear them." Such a ministry the Presbyterian Church has enjoyed before, in the days of her martyr-witness for the truth. May the genius of those hours return! when all shall "stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving for the faith of the gospel;" men "like-minded," "earnestly contending for the faith once delivered to the saints,"—the truth of Christ, "the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." And God speed the day, when, once more, the Presbyterian Church, in the "Reunion," shall not let down her colors from the mast, nor give her ministers the right to raise some tattered remnant of her faith upon the top of some new mountain; but lifting high her symbol to the gallant, unfurling it on every temple spire and on every court, to float in every breeze, shall rally round her own time-honored, battle-worn, and broad blue banner, emblem of the faith, believed in, loved, and felt through all her blood—the ensign of her glory and her strength!

THE FINAL MINUTE OF THE PRESBYTERY.

The Committee to whom was referred the matter of preparing a minute for the adoption of the Presbytery in the case in which Rev. W. C. McCune was the defendant, have not thought it proper to make prominent in the same their individual or even collective views. They have deemed it their simple duty, by a faithful and patient analysis of the different votes, and by an earnest endeavor to recall the differing opinions expressed, to make up a judgment and finding which should fairly and fully represent the mind of the Court. With this explanation of their conception of the task assigned them, the Committee beg leave to submit the following minute, viz :

The Presbytery has given patient attention to the whole matter. The trial lasted thirteen days. Both the Committee of Prosecution and the accused had the amplest opportunity to present their testimony and to comment on the same.

No rules of procedure were adopted beyond what were necessary to the proper and full investigation of the case.

The general charge of disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church was presented in two specific charges, the first having reference to the defendant's opinions, and the second to his acts.

On both of these charges the defendant was acquitted by the decisive vote of 29 to 8, and in the judgment of this Court his character and standing as a Presbyterian minister are unimpeached. He also carries away from this painful traverse of his case our commendation of him as a faithful and self-denying minister of Jesus Christ, as well as their respect for his manly and Christian demeanor throughout the trial.

The general offense of disloyalty was regarded as not substantiated by the proof adduced under the various specifications. The reasons for this judgment of the Court in

detail are as follows, looking first to the several items of the first charge :

Although these charges were presented by common fame, in the name of the Presbytery, it was decided by a vote of 32 to 5, with one to sustain in part, that the eleventh specification, affirming the existence of such common fame, had not been proved by the evidence adduced by the Prosecuting Committee. The basis of the action was thus, after careful hearing of the evidence, invalidated in the judgment of the Presbytery itself.

The tenth specification, as to the length of time, affirming that the defendant had persisted for many years in advocating his opinions, was not sustained, by a vote of 17 to 12, with 9 in part, chiefly for the reason that the statute of limitation forbids the instituting of process in the case of any person for such protracted period, "unless it (the crime) shall have recently become flagrant."

Of the nine specifications relating to the opinions of the accused, supposed to be at variance with our doctrinal standards, six were declared by decisive majorities to be not sustained. The first specification, affirming what the defendant taught respecting the "Divine Law of Organization of the Christian Church," was not sustained, by a vote of 25 to 8, with 4 in part. The second specification, "As to the essential sinfulness of the Presbyterian and all other existing evangelical denominations, as such," was not sustained, by a vote of 25 to 4, with 8 in part. The third specification, "As to the sinfulness of framing and requiring assent to human creeds," was not sustained by a vote of 28 to 5, with 5 in part. The fourth specification, asserting that the defendant taught that Presbyterian ministers might change old views of doctrine and polity, and still remain in the Presbytery, was not sustained, by a vote of 31 to 4, with 3 in part. The fifth specification, as to the defendant's alleged opinion that Presbyterian and other evangelical ministers might belong to two different denominations at once, was not sustained, by a vote of 32 to 4, with 2 in part. The ninth specification, asserting that the defendant

taught what was heretical as to the subject of saving faith, was not sustained, by a vote of 29 to 4, with 5 in part.

In the investigation of the evidence as to these specifications, it became apparent that the opinions of the defendant had been misapprehended, and that he did not hold these doctrines, as alleged. Some of the specifications were inferential, such as the idea of a plurality of official membership, and as to the right to remain within a denomination while pursuing courses intended to subvert it. On these the Presbytery was precluded from passing condemnation by the instruction of the General Assembly, in the Craighead case, 1824. (Digest 224.) The specification in regard to saving faith was thrown aside in view of the frank disavowals of the defendant (see same case, Digest, 224), and of the confidence felt by nearly all in his personal loyalty to the doctrine of our Church, as set forth in the Confession of Faith, chapter xiv. While the proofs under these above-named specifications disclose some things in language and expression which are to be deprecated, and some things which the Presbytery does not approve, there is not to be found in them, in the judgment of the Court, any support for the charge of disloyalty.

In reference to three of the nine specifications, the large majority of the Presbytery were agreed to sustain, or to sustain in part. The vote on the sixth specification, "As to the terms of ministerial fellowship," was to sustain, 17; in part, 17, and not to sustain, 4. The seventh specification, charging a denial of "Infant Church Membership," was sustained by the following vote: to sustain, 20; in part, 10, and not to sustain, 8. The eighth specification, having reference to "the admission of unbaptized persons to church membership," was also sustained, the vote being, to sustain, 23; in part, 10, and not to sustain, 5.

The teachings of the defendant on these topics are apparently corollaries of his theory of Organic Union, or the combination of all believers in one Church, without reference to differences in doctrine, order or worship. The Presbytery does not regard this theory as either established by the Scriptures or as warranted by the doctrine of our

Confession respecting the communion of saints. (Chapter 26.)

In the judgment of the Presbytery, the defendant has been led by his theory into extreme positions on the three special topics named. And while the establishing of these three specifications is not of itself sufficient to prove the charges of disloyalty, the Presbytery in sustaining these specifications does express a decisive judgment adverse to the opinions thus maintained. We believe that it would be dangerous to recognize exceptions to the rule that persons who will not submit to so plain and Scriptural a sacrament as baptism should not be admitted into the visible Church. We believe that, whatever difficulties may arise from the ambiguity of the term "membership," as applied to infants, there is a just and precious relation or connection established by the covenant in the Christian family as a divine institution, and certified by baptism, which ought never to be ignored or lightly regarded by the ministers of our Church. We hold also to the entire Scriptural legitimacy of separate denominations, such as our own, in which peculiarities of doctrine as well as the general evangelical doctrine, and also peculiarities of order or modes of worship, may be recognized and maintained without impairing the true spiritual unity of the whole Church of Christ. We consequently regard the limitation of ministerial fellowship, so far as organization is concerned, as being entirely proper, and as being eminently desirable. The views of the defendant on these points are not such as the Presbytery can approve.

In view of the teaching of our Confession of Faith as to the Communion of Saints and the Sacraments, we regard the expression of such views by the defendant as are set forth in these three specifications as calculated to excite anxiety and distrust in the minds of Christian brethren, and as furnishing ground for earnest caution against all teaching which tends to induce conflict and division either within our own circle or in the Church at large, and for solemn counsel to wait more patiently upon the leadings of

Divine Providence as to any more visible union of the people of God.

The second charge is one of disloyalty in conduct, and is made to rest upon two specifications, which may be briefly summarized as (1) confederating with others in advocating and promoting "the new anti-denominational association of Independent 'Union Christian Churches of America,'" and (2) actively co-operating in organizing the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church.

The Presbytery, by a vote of 25 to 6, with 7 in part, did not sustain the first specification. The court, as is thus manifest, failed to see any adequate proof of unfaithfulness to his own Church in the labors and fellowship of the defendant, with various other parties, in publishing papers, holding conventions, etc., in the interest of Christian union. The question whether such affiliations and co-operations were wise is very different from the question whether engaging in them is evidence of a spirit of disloyalty. Even though such a course be not approved, it nevertheless lies in the category of acts where individual liberty is allowed and ecclesiastical authority should not be invoked. It has not been shown that the defendant intended to break down the denomination to which he had honestly declared his allegiance; or that he had entered consciously on an enterprise the ultimate issue of which was the revolutionary subversion of all existing sects.

The second specification (relating to the course of the defendant in connection with the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church, his influence in its organization, and his installation as pastor of the same), received the following vote, viz.: To sustain, 7; not to sustain, 12; and to sustain in part, 18. The judgment of the Presbytery on this second point, therefore, is less decisively favorable to the defendant than in reference to the first. It is in evidence that the defendant was not the originator of this church, but, on the contrary, that such organization had been contemplated some time before he came to the field. It is clear also that the original intention was to provide for the religious wants of a growing community, where as yet no one denomination

was strong enough to maintain the ordinances of the Gospel. The enterprise had, in our judgment, no connection whatever, at least in its earlier stages, with what is called the Christian Union movement. Nor is there any clear evidence that the defendant intended to pervert or divert it into any anti-denominational use, or to make it the first step in a process of destruction of existing sects. In publishing the Basis of Fellowship, and accompanying papers, preceding the call of the Council, he did not intend to make the church responsible, nor did the church ever intend to become responsible for his peculiar opinions therein contained.

In regard to the defendant's acceptance of and entrance on the pastoral office in this church without the consent of the Presbytery, we are constrained to say that such a course can not be regarded in any other light than as an irregularity. He ought to have consulted with and obtained the consent of the Presbytery. The proper course for all members of the Presbytery who resign or accept pastoral charges, or who leave the ministry for any other profession, such as teaching or editing, or who practically devote themselves to any form of secular employment, should be obviously to obtain permission from that body to which primarily their official allegiance is due. This is a proper part of that submission to our brethren in the Lord which we have individually promised. It is an accountability to which every loyal minister will, on consideration, cheerfully submit himself, and while we regret the departure in this instance from a rule, the propriety of which is so obvious, we are obliged to temper our judgment with mercy in view of the fact that the rule has not heretofore been strictly enforced. Our own negligence so far condones the offense as to render it unjust in us to inflict censure on account of it in the case before us.

The second charge, therefore, of disloyalty in conduct, the Presbytery, in like manner as with the first, by the emphatic vote of 29 to 8, regards as not sustained; while the vote on the second specification of the same shows no disposition to approve the irregularities therein mentioned.

And, neither charge being sustained, the defendant stands acquitted at our bar, and is still commended to the churches as a brother minister of Jesus Christ, faithful and beloved.

In recording thus at length our judgment on all the points specified in the charges, the Presbytery has earnestly and honestly sought to know the truth and to do the right. And with the conviction that this, our finding, is, in every substantial particular, according to justice, both to the Church and to the defendant, we may express the hope and earnest wish that it will also be promotive of peace, and that the harmony of the Church at large may not be further disturbed by the appearance of this case in any form before the higher courts.

Respectfully submitted,

Q. A. Hills,
J. P. E. Kumler,
J. E. Wright,
Frederick Dallas,
John Kennett,
Committee.

As will be seen from the above minute, the Presbytery decided,

1. That there was no proof adduced, under any or all the Specifications, to show disloyalty to the Presbyterian Church, nor contravention of ordination vows, nor any impairing of our system of doctrine, nor any war upon the Standards, nor any Common Fame.

2. That Specification X, under Charge I, was *not* sustained, whereas it was *sustained* by a vote of 21 to 17.

3. That the Statute of Limitation could be applied to bar process against a continuous offense of ten years.

4. That the proofs under the Specifications "*not sustained*" were no competent proofs at all.

5. That the Prosecution "misapprehended" the opinions of Mr. McCune.

6. That some of the Specifications were "inferential," whereas there is not one such in all of them.

7. That the "Craighead" rule operates to "*not* sustain" the fact of proven language, whereas the Assembly used it only in mitigation of judgment upon the language proved, giving the defendant the benefit of his claimed interpretation, if deemed to be not an evasion.

8. That in all Mr. McCune has taught, there are only a few expressions to be deprecated, but nothing whatever to show any disloyalty.

9. That the Specifications which they did sustain are "corollaries" of "his theory of Organic Union," and at the same time voted that there was no proof to show that he held any such theory, and that there was no Common Fame about it. And yet again, that he did hold such a theory, while they voted down the Specifications which assert that he held it. And still, again, that his theory and corollaries merit a "decisive, adverse judgment" because they are "dangerous," and are "not such as Presbytery can approve," being "calculated to excite anxiety and distrust," tending "to induce conflict and division," and deserving "solemn counsel," and yet are no evidence of any disloyalty, and were allowed to pass without even an admonition.

10. That there is no evidence to prove that Mr. McCune was the originator of the Linwood and Mt. Lookout Church in the shape it took, as charged in the Specifications, and that in all his course herein he was guilty of only a little pardonable irregularity.

11. That he is a faithful, sound, loyal, unimpeached Presbyterian minister, worthy of commendation, and that the Presbytery's "own negligence" of its duty, for years past, makes it improper for it to censure anything he has said or done, and this it declares to be a finding according to justice, both to the Church and defendant, and promotive of peace.