

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE TURKISH MISSIONS.

Presented at the Annual Meeting at Detroit, October 3, 1883.

THE Committee appointed at the last Annual Meeting of the Board "to take into consideration the whole subject (of certain difficulties in our missions in Turkey), with power, if need be, to send a deputation to the churches and missions of the Turkish Empire, to examine to the bottom the ground of difference, and to suggest the needful remedies," consisting of Hon. William Hyde, Hon. J. B. Page, Z. Stiles Ely, Esq., Rev. G. Leon Walker, D. D., Hon. A. C. Barstow, Rev. Thomas Laurie, and Rev. Samuel Harris, D. D., have endeavored to perform the work assigned them, and respectfully present the following report.

The first thing done by your Committee was to send out circular letters, one to the missionaries in Turkey and another to prominent Armenians in this country and in Turkey, copies of which are herewith submitted:—

Dear Sir,—Though personally strangers, yet I trust we are members of one blessed family, whose head is Christ. It is one of the privileges of my life, which I never recall without thankfulness, that I was permitted to be present at the organization of the first evangelical Armenian church, of which the beloved Apisoghom was pastor; and one of my most delightful anticipations of heaven is to meet that great multitude which no man can number, redeemed to God by the blood of Christ, out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and spend eternity with them in beholding the glory of our Redeemer.

Dearly beloved brethren have gone out from us to make known the great love wherewith Christ has loved us, and you have received them as angels of God. Some of them are now worshiping along with some of your people before the throne of God and of the Lamb, but it grieves us to hear that other plants have sprung up in the garden of God along with his pleasant fruits, and that there is a coldness between some of your people and some of the missionaries.

The churches which sent out the missionaries grieve over this state of things, and, at the late Annual Meeting of the American Board at Portland, appointed the Hon. William Hyde, of Massachusetts, Hon. J. B. Page, ex-Governor of Vermont, Z. Styles Ely, Esq., of New York, Hon. A. C. Barstow, ex-Mayor of Providence, the Rev. George Leon Walker, D. D., of Hartford, Connecticut, the Rev. Samuel Harris, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Seminary at New Haven, Connecticut, and myself, a Committee to examine to the bottom the grounds of difference and to suggest the needful remedies. We desire to do all that in us lies to heal these wounds of the body of Christ, and in order to know best how to do it, we seek information on the subject from you and from the missionaries.

So we come to you as to a brother in Christ asking you to tell us all about it. We do not propose particular questions, but want you to tell us all that is a source of trouble to you, or, if you have nothing to complain of yourself, tell us what others complain about, and tell it fully, for we believe that the more thoroughly we search into the trouble, the better we shall be able to arrange for its relief.

We would like also to have our own idea of the best method for its removal; for though we have this treasure in earthen vessels, yet we also know that those who are in Christ have learned of Him who is meek and lowly in heart, and so we have good hope that one and all of them shall receive rest to their souls.

If in any way we can minister to your spiritual good, and that of the churches which God has planted among you, we shall thank God who gives us to enjoy a privilege so blessed.

Please excuse the printing of this letter, as my hands are full of work, and I send it to many others as well as to yourself.

In behalf of the Committee, and at its request, I write this, and subscribe myself, Yours, for Christ's sake.

Dear Brother,—You are doubtless aware that a Committee was appointed by the Board at its late meeting in Portland to examine to the bottom the grounds of the differences between the missionaries in Western Turkey and some of the Armenian brethren, and to suggest the needful remedies. That Committee has had one meeting, and appointed me to act for them in this correspondence. I need not assure you of the kind feelings of all the Committee, or our satisfaction in having the privilege of doing something that may tend to promote the kingdom of Christ in Western Asia.

In behalf of the Committee I write for information from you *as an individual* on the following topics, namely:

1. The origin and present condition of the trouble. Is it likely to pass away if treated judiciously?
2. The claims of the Armenian brethren in connection with the disbursement of missionary funds.
3. The methods and extent of mutual co-operation between you and them.
4. The exodus of graduates of our missionary seminaries, and of pastors, to other countries, and especially to the United States.
5. Does the alleged feeling of caste exist among our missionaries, and what has occasioned that imputation?
6. What is the prospect of the speedy completion of foreign missionary work among the Armenians, and how is it to be brought about?
7. In the present aspect of the matter, would a deputation from this country be desirable?

We should be happy also to hear from you on many other points which you deem it important for us to know in order to enable us to render the best possible service to Christ in this matter.

After you have written to us as an individual, we would like to hear from your station as such, on the same topics, and also from the Western Turkey Mission.

We shall also write for information to some of the Armenian brethren.

In behalf of, and at the request of, the Committee, Your fellow-servant.

In reply to these, and otherwise, a large number of important documents have been received, though comparatively few have been from Armenians. The following letter may perhaps explain this. Stripped of date and signature it reads:—

“*Dear Sir,*—I have duly received your printed note of December 28, 1882, and in reply beg to enclose a circular.”

The circular dissuaded Armenians from making a reply to your Committee, and is herewith submitted to the Board.

CIRCULAR TO THE EVANGELICAL ARMENIAN CHURCHES.—A printed letter, signed by Thomas Laurie on behalf of the Special Committee appointed at the last Annual Meeting of the American Board, has recently been communicated to various individuals, inviting them to make known to the Committee their opinions and views concerning the “coldness” which exists between some of the brethren and some of the missionaries, which the paper calls “another plant sprung up in the garden of God along with his pleasant fruits.”

The Executive Committee (of the Bithynia Union), whose official duty it is to care for all that pertains to the Union and the churches, is very glad and thankful that this benevolent society has turned its attention to this important subject and has been pleased to appoint a Special Committee to examine the state of affairs and report to it at its next Annual Meeting. But the language and tone of the printed letter do not accord with the opinions of the Executive Committee. The question which the Special Committee were to examine, and on which they were to report, according to our understanding, was one that pertains to the Union and the churches, one that relates to principles and policy employed by which both the churches and the Lord's work have been injured. Our churches and the Union respect and honor the missionaries as preachers and ministers of the word. The question raised is not anything brought against the missionaries personally, or their conduct by individuals, as would appear from the language of the letter. Our churches regard the missionaries as fellow-laborers in the great field of their evangelistic work. The question raised by the pamphlet is not a difference or dispute on personal matters which has occasioned a “coldness” between the brethren and the missionaries.

The Union and the churches are in all respects on good terms with the missionaries: they counsel, they pray, and they labor together. This language is often heard among us, “The griefs of our churches relate to the unsuccessful and unfortunate condition of the blessed work, and not to personal matters.”

The Executive Committee anxious lest the matter should be considered as a personal one, and the brethren be led astray and the evil results of personal questions arise, have judged it best to bring the following points to the notice of the brethren and the churches:—

1. Brethren should be watchful and careful lest they confound public and private questions, and be tempted to write things which have not been officially considered. The churches and the Union do not attach importance to communications made by individuals in an unofficial manner and can not be at all responsible for them.

2. The Executive Committee intend to invite the Union to hold its next annual meeting before May, in order that it may further consider this question and, in the name of the churches, officially communicate the state of things, the facts underlying the question, and the points of disagreement, to the Special Committee, through their representative, Mr. Minasian.

3. No unofficial, private communications or conferences can be regarded as a basis for the settlement of the question; the matter belongs to the churches of which the Union is the organ and alone can portray the churches' griefs.

(Signed)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BITHYNIA UNION.

CONSTANTINOPLE: January 20, 1882.

While waiting for replies to its letters, your Committee turned its attention to the well-filled archives of the Board, which were freely opened to it by the Prudential Committee. The foreign correspondence of the Board fills on an average four large quarto volumes annually, and the number of letters to Turkey equal, or exceed, all the

rest. All that we read bore witness to the broad views, the thorough investigation, and the patient attention to details, of the servants of this Board, and no one can study them without a deep impression of their wisdom and disinterestedness. So last year, at Portland, no sooner had Dr. Hamlin read a memorandum, printed, but not published, in 1881, than he pronounced it to be "characterized by great wisdom, an excellent statement of the principles that should govern the missionary work, and containing in itself the solution of some of the questions before us."

Desirous of performing the work as thoroughly as possible, your Committee voted, on February 21, to send a deputation to the churches and missions of Turkey, in conference with the Prudential Committee, according to our instructions; and Rev. A. L. Chapin, D.D., President of Beloit College, Rev. C. M. Mead, D.D., late Professor at Andover, then in Germany, and Z. Stiles Ely, Esq., of New York City, were appointed accordingly. The Committee also voted to request the Prudential Committee to appoint a separate deputation of its own to the Turkish Missions, and that Committee kindly complied with our request.

Mr. Ely having been detained by other duties, President Chapin sailed from New York without him, on April 5, and reached Constantinople about the middle of May, where he was joined by Professor Mead. The Board is highly favored in having obtained two men for this service, who have the confidence of the churches, and have won that of the Armenians. None could have been more patient and conciliatory in all their intercourse with the native Christians of Turkey, and if anything is to be gained in this perplexing trouble by gentleness and thoughtful consideration, we shall have gained it through their labors. Their report to the Special Committee is as follows:—

REPORT OF DRS. CHAPIN AND MEAD.

TO THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS, ON THE MISSIONS IN THE TURKISH EMPIRE:—

Dear Brethren,—In accordance with your appointment and the provision of the Prudential Committee of the Board, we met in Constantinople on the 10th of May last, much regretting that we could not have associated with us some judicious layman, as was intended. As a first step towards the accomplishment of our mission, a note was at once addressed through its secretary to the Executive Committee of the Bithynia Union, as follows:—

Dear Brethren in Christ,—With our hearty Christian salutations, we take this method to inform you that we are here, deputed by the Special Committee, appointed at the last Annual Meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, on the missions and churches of the Turkish Empire, to gather information respecting the difficulties which have seemed, for some years past, to hinder the prosperity of our Christian work on this field. We shall be pleased to meet you in free conference on the subject at such time and place as may be most convenient for you, only requesting that the opportunity for a first meeting be given us as early as practicable. Yours fraternally,

(Signed) A. L. CHAPIN.
C. M. MEAD.

The invitation was promptly accepted. Christian salutations were interchanged, and a kind welcome expressed; and the way was thus opened for seven protracted conferences with members of that Committee residing in the city, and others. There were present at these conferences Pastors Simon Eutujian and Avedis G. Asadoorian, Professor Hagopos Jejizzian, Mr. Hohannes Minasian, and Dr. Baronig Matteosian, of the Executive Committee of the Bithynia Union; also, more or less constantly, Hagop Effendi Matteosian, Pastors Stepan Eutujian, Mardiros of Harpoot, Terzian of Marash, Kazanjian of Aleppo, Alexander Peshtimaljian, Mr. Costikyan, Dr. Giragosian, and, as interpreter, H. M. Keretchjian; besides occasionally others, especially Mr. Kazarkos, a laborer in the evangelical work among the Greeks. The members of the Committee, at no little inconvenience and sacrifice, freely gave their time to these interviews, in which, agreeably to our request, they expressed frankly and fully their views concerning the difficulties and hindrances in the missionary work on this field. The conversations were

carried on in the English language, of which most of the brethren named have a good knowledge. We gave patient hearing to their representations, given at length and covering the whole ground.

While these conferences were going on, a General Conference of delegates from the several missions in the empire was holding its sessions in the city, having been called together by Secretaries Clark and Alden and Mr. Torrey, a delegation sent out by the Prudential Committee to gather information concerning the condition and interests of the Turkish missions generally. It was our privilege to attend several sessions of this conference, and to hear from missionaries and native pastors direct testimony bearing on the questions before us. It was impracticable for us to make tours far into the interior for personal observation of the several stations. For distinct and accurate information the reports brought before the conference were perhaps better than the casual and hurried observation of brief visits would have been. One of us did, however, spend a few days at the Bagh-chi-juk station, near Nicomedia; and the other visited Smyrna and its out-station, Manisa. Interviews were also held with several individuals, natives from different stations of the interior, from whom valuable information was derived.

After free conference with the Armenian brethren, and before the close of the General Conference, we met the missionaries from various parts of the field, and by special inquiries drew out from them facts, and their own views, on the matters which we were charged to investigate. We also carefully examined original papers respecting incidents in the past history of the Turkish missions.

To promote mutual acquaintance and a better mutual understanding, we invited five missionaries from different localities, and the five members of the Executive Committee of the Bithynia Union, to meet the Delegation from Boston and ourselves, for free conversation on these grave matters of common interest. The result showed clearly that, if distrust and suspicion can be removed, there are no insuperable difficulties in the way of the hearty and effective co-operation of all parties in labor for evangelizing the empire. A precious communion season was observed, and a special meeting was held for spiritual conference and prayer, in both which all parties participated, and the ties of Christian faith and love were revealed, needing but a fresh quickening from the Spirit of God to form a bond of perfectness which should unite all hearts and hands in the Master's saving work.

After the close of the General Conference, the business sessions of the Western Turkey Mission brought to view details both of labor and of difficulty attending the work, full of interest to us as showing the complications of this missionary problem.

Close upon this came also the Annual Meeting of the Bithynia Union, at which were present delegates from the other Unions of Evangelical Armenians; and in its deliberations the same practical questions were considered. Our ignorance of the language precluded our sharing in the discussions of this body. We were, however, occasionally present, and received from others reports of things said and done. To secure opportunity formally to present ourselves before the Union, as representatives of the American churches which form the constituency of the Board, and to offer a few thoughts of a conciliatory character suggested to our minds in the course of our investigations, the following note was sent:—

TO THE BITHYNIA UNION OF EVANGELICAL ARMENIAN CHURCHES:—

Dear Brethren in Christ,—As a deputation appointed to confer with missionaries and native laborers and churches in the Turkish Empire, respecting difficulties which seem to hinder the good work of the Lord, we shall be pleased to meet your body and make a brief communication at such time as may best suit your convenience. Waiting your answer, we are

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed)

A. L. CHAPIN,

C. M. MEAD.

The opportunity was cordially granted, and the accompanying paper was read to the Union in both the English and the Armenian languages. It was responded to by several, who expressed sentiments of personal regard for us, a high appreciation of what the American churches have done for the Armenian people, and a desire that the good work may be carried on more effectively than ever before by the hearty co-operation of all human agencies, with the added power of the Holy Spirit, to perfect and crown all.

Our stay in Constantinople was continued till the Union adjourned. We enclose a copy of the resolutions adopted by that body, and also those of the Western Turkey Mission and of the General Conference. In our report we speak almost exclusively of the missionary work among the Armenians in Turkey, because the difficulties we were charged to investigate were most manifest in that department of the work. In the Bulgarian Mission, and in the labors for the Greeks and Turks, we hear little of these embarrassments, perhaps because they have been recently commenced, and are less fully unfolded. So far as anything has been, or may yet be, developed in these spheres of missionary effort, what we say may, we think, be fitly applied to them.

Our protracted labor in the discharge of the delicate duty with which we were charged was spiced and cheered by kind demonstrations of interest and goodwill on all hands. Many very pleasant social courtesies were extended to us by our Armenian brethren, by the missionaries, by the President of Robert College, and the matron and teachers of the Home; and also by General Wallace, the Minister of the United States at the Ottoman Porte. These things will cause our sojourn at Constantinople to be remembered as one of the most delightful episodes of our life.

These preliminary statements will suffice to show how we endeavored to perform the duty laid upon us, and what were our sources of information for the facts, impressions, and suggestions, which we now proceed to lay before you.

In formally setting forth their views, the Executive Committee of the Union, after consultation with each other, adopted a threefold division of the topics to be presented. We report, in connected but condensed form, their leading thoughts as thus brought before us.

VIEWS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BITHYNIA UNION.

I. They first expressed their opinions as to the methods which should have been adopted in evangelizing this people, referring to historical facts. The work, they said, was begun by the missionaries with preaching Christ and him crucified to a people already Christian in name, who had the word of God and revered it. Their Bible was indeed in the old language of the nation, but the difference between the old and the modern languages was not so great but that their Bible could be read and understood by intelligent people. Superstitious ideas and usages had, however, corrupted the simple faith of the gospel in most minds. The missionary preaching took hold of men's hearts, and a reformation within the Armenian church began. This should have been followed up without causing a separation. For that church, unlike the Roman Catholic, is liberal, not disposed to take the Bible out of the hands of the people. It is episcopal in form, but the people have a voice in the election of pastors and in their ordination, in which some usages are like those of Presbyterian churches. It has a liturgy, but allows, and to some extent encourages, extemporaneous prayer, even in church services. Its creed is orthodox, being the old Nicene creed. There is nothing in the rules of the church requiring pictures, images, mariolatry, or any such corruptions of Christianity. Hence the way was free for the reformation to go forward. The missionaries, while professing to seek only the quickening of souls to spiritual life in the old church, seemed to labor for separation. The actual movement towards separation began with their setting up formal Sabbath services, against which action two choice young men protested. This gave occasion to persecution. The first persecution, in 1842, was tided over, the policy of reforming the old church being still maintained. The later persecution of 1846 might also have been borne without a break. But the missionaries favored separation, and when the converted Armenians objected to the step on account of their weakness and the necessity of setting up a distinct community to be recognized by the government, of building churches, establishing schools, etc., they were told that means would be provided for all those things. So the ill-advised step was taken; and it is greatly to be regretted that the separation was made so complete as to exclude some old Armenian hymns, evangelical and pure, and some unobjectionable usages of the old church which are attractive to the people. The main point of this statement was that foreign influence overruled the judgment of the natives; and that, while the separation must now be regarded as an accomplished fact, the Board and its missionaries are under obligation to fulfil the pledge given, and maintain the new community thus formed, by all necessary means.

After the step was taken, efforts should have been made to develop life in the separated church and to make it national. There was failure to do this on the part of the missionaries. All missionary efforts will be successful in proportion as they develop the moral and intellectual strength of the separate community. Hence the importance of drawing out native agencies and giving dignity to native work. The real work has, in fact, been carried on by native agencies, and it should be the aim of the missionaries to have it so. But they have kept the native agents in a subordinate position. They should have been prepared for independent work and had responsibility laid upon them. The national peculiarities should have been more regarded, and made to subserve the cause, and its foreign aspect relieved. The missionaries have kept things too much in their own hands, as chief movers, using the native force, not as advisers, but as helpers or employees, instead of developing their self-reliant judgment and ability for independent action. The missionaries have been disposed, moreover, to measure their success by the number of stations occupied. This weakens the forces by scattering them and multiplying feeble churches. The policy should have been to secure a few strong, central points from which the work would have been self-extending through natives thoroughly prepared. For this development of moral and intellectual life the higher education of the natives is all-important, and should have been carefully provided for.

2. The second topic taken up was the present actual state of the Armenian churches and community. The main fact is that the Evangelical Armenian churches have no organization that unites them to each other or that sustains the civil community so essential under the government of this empire. The missionary body is the only one that has life and efficient organization. Hence all questions pertaining to the interests of the churches are referred to the missionaries, and they direct all. Two attempts made, one in 1871 and one in 1882, to secure a general conference of Armenian churches to consider the question of a common organization, failed, in part because the missionaries seemed not to favor the movement. The lack of any permanent, strong, central church was further dwelt upon and illustrated by facts in the city of Constantinople. The means and forces have been scattered among several feeble churches, instead of being concentrated to make one strong one. The church at Pera was the first Evangelical church formed. Instead of developing it in strength, four other churches were formed in different parts of the city and all are feeble. In this capital of the empire there is now, after the lapse of forty years, nothing to indicate a place of worship for Protestant Evangelical Armenians. The feeble churches have been to some extent rivals of each other. The same policy has been adopted in other parts of the field. The fruits of revivals have been lost because not gathered into churches made strong in organization, with capable pastors. A similar changing policy respecting schools has been followed. Money enough has been appropriated from the treasury of the Board; but it has not been wisely expended. Hence the Protestant schools appear at disadvantage in comparison with those of the Gregorian Armenians, the Jesuits, and the Greek community. The consequences of all this appear in the following facts:—

(1) There is a want of high Christian life in the churches. Discipline is made difficult, and their power for extension languishes.

(2) Many churches have retrograded in the matter of self-support, and there is a loss of respect for the pastoral office.

(3) There is a prevailing feeling of despondency among the churches for lack, not of interest in the work, but of confidence in the policy.

(4) External enlargement has almost entirely ceased, especially in the neighborhood of the capital.

(5) Other ecclesiastical communities regard the Protestant community as declining. Protestants are still highly esteemed for their individual character; but the community, as such, has not the respect either of the government or of the people.

(6) Young men are left without proper education.

(7) Very few able, independent ministers are brought forward.

(8) There is a similar general lack of able men for teachers; for literary and for evangelistic work.

3. The third topic discussed related to the remedy for the existing evils,—the means to be adopted for developing life and strength in the Evangelical Armenian church. The views of the brethren were presented at length under the following heads, expanded and qualified in answer to questions:—

(1) There must be a general organization, ecclesiastical and secular, under the name of Evangelical Armenians. The name Armenian is necessary in order to rally the interest of the nation. A mixed organization would be injurious to all the races. The civil and ecclesiastical organizations should be distinct, the former framed to meet the requirements of the present Turkish Government, the latter to be general, on the representative principle, not strictly denominational.

(2) There should be a regular and defined relation between missionaries and the native churches. That is, they should be members of those churches, or otherwise ecclesiastically connected, so as to be in fellowship with them, and amenable to church discipline here.

(3) Funds drawn from the American Board, or other sources, should provide buildings and other necessary means for educational and literary work, the native churches engaging to do all in their power for the same end. An economical disbursement of funds on the present scale of appropriations would make the needed provision, if only the number of missionaries were reduced.

(4) All native independent institutions, such as schools, seminaries, orphanages, hospitals, etc., should be encouraged by pecuniary help and moral support.

(5) There should be established a central Theological Seminary, equal to those in America, with a strong native element as teachers and directors. Constantinople is the fittest place for such a seminary. The Bebek Seminary might have been developed into all that is needed. Its removal was a great mistake. The Marsovan Seminary is not satisfactory, especially as it does not give due attention to the Armenian language. Its course of instruction is defective, and fails to produce able men.

(6) Means should be provided for the higher education of our young men. Robert College is not to be regarded as a missionary college. Expenses in it are high. Every church should have a school for primary and common education, with higher schools within reach of choice young men. The schools of the old Armenians and of the Roman Catholic churches ought not to be superior to those of the Protestants.

(7) There should be a larger proportion of native laborers in the departments of evangelistic, literary, and educational work, with a gradual withdrawal of missionaries or their transfer to labor for other races. This contemplates not immediate changes, but a policy to be commenced and carried out as rapidly as fit men can be prepared. Missionaries preach but little now.

(8) In all the above-mentioned departments of work natives should have an equal voice with missionaries, as proposed by the Bithynia Union. This means equal numbers in the committees and councils to discuss and vote on all questions. There should be at Constantinople a general central council, composed of missionaries and natives in equal numbers, with equal voice, to direct the work in all parts of the empire; and similar local committees in the several districts for details of local interest.

REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING.

We thus lay before you a summary of opinions, expressed at great length and with much ability and earnestness by the Armenian brethren in our several conferences. The greater part of our statement was submitted to them as our understanding of their views, and by them approved. The Committee addressed us unofficially, but they subsequently reported to the Bithynia Union what they had said to us, and that body voted to accept the statement as the utterance of the whole Union.

Information which we secured from other sources would modify in several particulars this representation of facts, both of the past and of the present.

Thus the statement respecting the creed and character of the old Armenian church is no doubt in the main correct. Yet a pamphlet entitled "Agathangelos," put into our hands by a member of the Bithynia Committee as setting forth the doctrines of the early Armenian church and still to be respected as the exponent of its faith, shows, intermingled with many truths, ideas of baptismal regeneration, of the sacrifice of the very body of Christ in the Eucharist, of the saving efficacy of good works, of the intercession of angels and saints and the duty of offering prayers to them, of the authority and infallibility of the church, of honoring the cross and saintly relics,—which give a warrant to the false teaching and superstitious usages of the Gregorian church, and make it almost certain that the dignitaries of that church will bitterly oppose any reformation which tends to eliminate these corruptions of Christianity.

Again, we have before us original documents and the testimony of missionaries who were on the ground at the time, respecting the causes of the separation of the Evangelical community, the pressure and violence of persecution under the Patriarch Matteos, which make it evident that the step was taken, not mainly through the influence of the missionaries, but under the conviction of all concerned, that there was no alternative but either to violate conscience and accept doctrines utterly at variance with the Word of God, or to withdraw from the old church. We enclose copies of some of the documents referred to, and call attention to the evidence presented in communications to the *Missionary Herald* of that period and to the published narratives of Drs. Dwight and Hamlin, who were eye-witnesses of the transactions. To confirm their representations, the Committee of the Union brought into our presence six aged gentlemen, said to have been original members of the Pera church, the purport of whose testimony appears in a paper handed us by one of them, a translation of which we enclose. Without impeaching the veracity of these witnesses, we must say that their recollections, dimmed by the lapse of forty years, can hardly stand against the above-named positive contemporary evidence.

The statement that a distinct pledge was given by the missionaries, at the time of the separation, that the American Board or the American churches would supply all means necessary to the full and vigorous establishment of the new community, is not admitted by the missionaries present at the time. The most that can truly be said is that those who, with fear and trembling, under severe persecution and at great sacrifice of worldly goods, followed their convictions and withdrew from the old church, were encouraged by assurances that, as they went forth in the faith and fear of God, they would be sustained by the sympathy, prayers, and contributions of God's people—assurances which have been manifestly fulfilled in the subsequent history of this missionary work. The surest way to obtain further support is not to urge a formal claim but to show a pressing need.

The representation of failure on the part of the missionaries in this matter of sustaining the separated community seems to us, to say the least, much exaggerated. A disaffected state of mind has led to some misconstruction of facts. No doubt the missionaries have made some mistakes. This they readily acknowledge. Feeling their way along step by step as they did, without precedents to guide them, it could hardly have been otherwise. But they have lived and labored through all these years, simply and sincerely, according to their best judgment, for the prosperity of these Evangelical churches. And it stands out manifest to all the world that their labors have done very much, directly and indirectly, to develop life in the separated church and to lay foundations strong and stable on which it may rise as an enduring national church. In evidence of this we may point to the Bible House, Robert College,

and the Home, institutions at the capital, centres of Christian literature and education, established unquestionably through the influence of the missionaries, though not to any great extent by direct contributions from the treasury of the American Board. Still more significant are the fruits of this work in the interior of the empire, through which thousands have been gathered into churches, and schools, colleges, and seminaries have sprung up, it may be not yet complete in their equipment, but ready for a present necessary work and for a future unfolding to meet the needs of a progressive people. To this influence it is chiefly due, likewise, that a quickened intellectual life has pervaded all races and classes, and the old Armenians, the Greeks, and even the Turks, have been moved to special efforts for the education of the whole people. We must think that one of the greatest hindrances to the speedy attainment of the desired end is the disposition on the part of some of the Armenian brethren to depreciate the good already accomplished and to withhold from the honest efforts of the missionaries their sympathy and hearty support.

It seems to us also that similar qualifications should be given to the statements respecting the present condition of the churches. There has been, no doubt, during the past few years, a lack of that spiritual life and energy which characterized the earlier stages of the missionary work in Turkey, and made it singularly prosperous. In particular churches there has been evident decline, and some are ready to die. This is much to be lamented. The distrust and alienations which have sprung up, and which give special occasion to this investigation, must be regarded as both cause and effect of this condition. Yet the statistics show that, contemplating the whole field, there are not wanting signs of real progress which are full of hope for the future, if only the existing difficulties can be removed. In evidence of this we refer you to the accompanying comparative statement made up from actual reports. The mistake of the Armenian brethren has come perhaps from their taking the case of Constantinople, which appears for special reasons to be exceptional, as representing the general condition of things.

Thus the testimony which we received from other sources seems to require some modification of the strong statements made by the Committee of the Union on the points referred to. At the same time, we have to acknowledge that the Evangelical Armenian church and community do not stand forth in strength and efficiency as they should, to command general respect and confidence, and increase of numbers, and material resources. There is occasion for a careful study of this interest, and for the adoption of wise measures bearing upon this aspect of the cause. The historical questions involved are not in themselves the matters of chief consequence. The present difficulties and hindrances, with their causes and possible remedies, are the things of highest importance; and to the consideration of these we now turn.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE SITUATION.

To us the chief trouble appears to be a tendency to mutual distrust and suspicion between the native brethren and the missionaries. This was first developed at an early stage in the history of the mission, and has evidently been growing with the lapse of years. Without attempting to estimate the degree of fault on either side, we must say that the tendency was to us painfully apparent as existing in some degree in both parties. In the nature of things it must be so; for in such relations the manifestation of distrust on one side inevitably begets the same thing on the other side. The grave question now to be considered is, not with whom it began, nor who has been most in fault in the past, but how the tendency can be counteracted and the difficulty be eliminated. An apprehension of the causes originating the malady will aid the discovery of a remedy; and we venture, therefore, to offer the following general observations respecting the situation.

1. A certain amount of friction in the missionary operations has naturally resulted from the difference in nationality of the missionaries and those among whom they have labored. So long as the native converts retained the position of learners and novices in religion and ecclesiastical matters, feeling keenly their obligation to those who, under God, had brought them into the light, they would be little disposed to criticise the conduct of their teachers. But when they had grown to feel a strength of their own, and when many of the missionaries were themselves comparative novices in the work, they would be more sensitive to any failure on the part of the foreigners to pay due heed to the temperament, prejudices, and customs peculiar to the Armenian people. It would be strange if, with the best intentions, missionaries had not sometimes given offence by attempting too inconsiderately to introduce Occidental notions and methods among Orientals. On the other hand, the natives are liable, through unfamiliarity with the Occidental temperament and ways, to misinterpret the conduct and spirit of the missionaries. Without conscious fault on either part, misunderstandings might easily arise which could be relieved only by special endowments of grace and Christian charity on both sides.

2. A similar remark is to be made respecting the phases of domestic and social life introduced by the missionaries. It is indeed a part of their work, as the legitimate effect of Christ's gospel, to awaken in those whom they influence desires for a more refined culture in all respects. But they themselves

exemplify a style of living which is beyond the reach of most of their converts. The ideas and habits of their own country require them to adopt, in the matters of dress, furniture, food, and social recreations, what to the natives may appear to be luxury. It is not strange that the question should sometimes arise, why so much should be spent on the missionary and his family, while those for whose welfare he labors must live in great plainness and comparative destitution. The best of men fail to become indifferent to these outward and physical conditions; and it is not to be wondered at that this disparity in the domestic life of the two parties should give rise to jealousies and invidious reflections, and that the missionary in the midst of his comforts should be thought lacking in the spirit of self-denial which is supposed to belong to his character and office. In saying this, we would not be understood to pass judgment on the conduct of the missionaries in this respect. We know that it is a point on which the minds of many of them are exercised, and that all conscientiously desire to pursue the course best adapted to accomplish the main object. No doubt an attempt to conform their mode of living to that of the people around them would be disadvantageous, not only to their own health and that of their families, but also to their general influence. Pure Christianity prompts an improvement on men's material, as well as their spiritual, estate. The comforts of a missionary's Christian home present something for the natives to aspire to, and give him a higher place in their respect and esteem. Some regard must be had, also, in the missionary's style of living, to his influence with government officials. Yet, after the first impression of personal obligation to the missionaries becomes weakened, it is obvious that this disparity of condition may excite in the natives a feeling of discontent, as if it involved an assumption of superiority in violation of the full spirit of Christian love and equality. This feeling is likely to be intensified when, as is usual, more than one family has place in a station, and the missionaries, naturally associating most intimately with each other, seem to form an aristocratic circle among themselves.

3. We are inclined to think that the dissociation of missionaries from the natives in Constantinople more than elsewhere has been a fruitful source of evil. The separation has naturally, perhaps inevitably, grown out of peculiar circumstances. The most of the missionaries there are engaged in literary, not evangelistic, work. Their daily duties do not bring them into contact with the native families. Their fatigues after labor, the physical infirmities under which some of them suffer, the want of time for keeping up social intercourse with the natives as a whole, make it almost impossible to do what they really desire, and expose them to the suspicion of not caring to be intimate with the natives. This state of things is especially infelicitous after a feeling of alienation, from whatever cause originating, has begun to exist. We apprehend that this state of affairs in Constantinople has indirectly contributed to increase, in other parts of Turkey, a want of confidence in the thorough devotion of the missionaries to the personal interests of the people, and has given countenance to the impression that the missionaries hold the natives, their judgment in evangelistic matters, and their usefulness, in low esteem.

4. Another thing which tends to foster distrust comes from the pecuniary relations of the missionaries to the native laborers. The relation of employers and employees is everywhere a delicate one, made pleasant and harmonious only by mutual confidence and esteem. The missionary, as the agent of the Board, has to act as an employer. He must choose his assistants, and make pecuniary arrangements with them. As a rule, they receive much less than the missionaries themselves. It may, indeed, be as much in proportion to their previous style of living, and with reference to the condition of the country, as can wisely be offered. Larger compensation might serve as a temptation to hypocritical and mercenary men, and be likely, by the contrast between the native preacher and his parishioners, to occasion discontent on the part of the latter. But it would be strange if the parties should not sometimes disagree in judgment, and feeling should rise, even though unexpressed, that the services of the native laborer are inadequately paid and poorly appreciated. And when, as sometimes happens, the man employed develops little fitness for his work, and it becomes a duty to dismiss him from the service, it is obvious that the discharge of this duty must give occasion to sharp criticism. The man who is dismissed, with perhaps no other remunerative occupation open to him, feels aggrieved, and finds many to sympathize with him. We became cognizant of such cases, which illustrate the delicate responsibility devolved on the missionaries and their liability to severe censure for any indiscretion in its exercise. This pecuniary relation of the missionary to his co-laborer is terminated as fast as the native churches become able to support their own pastors and teachers. While it subsists, even the greatest care can hardly save the native laborer in all cases from an unpleasant sense of subordination and from the feeling that the missionaries, as foreigners, are exercising a lordly control over them, unwarranted by the spirit of the gospel.

5. This suggests a more general consideration. The missionaries, especially in the earlier stages of their labor, sustain a kind of apostolic relation to the churches which they gather. It is right, and inevitable, that they should assume, and that the churches should expect them to assume, an authority

higher than that of a pastor on the home field. Their superior education, their paternal relation to the churches which they plant, and their greater familiarity with religious and ecclesiastical usages in churches of a simple evangelical faith, lead them to act almost autocratically in administering the affairs of the infant churches. Their counsel is, as a matter of course, sought, and followed, by their children in the faith. So long as their personal love is undoubted, and their superior wisdom is gladly acknowledged, no trouble may follow from this apostolic relation; but this relation cannot be of very long continuance. Even Paul was sharply and irreverently criticised by many in the churches which he planted. How much more is it to be expected that the modern missionary, without the apostle's special call and inspiration, liable to errors of judgment and to the indulgence of personal animosity, should be exposed to the charge of lording it over Christ's heritage. In fact, this charge is brought against many of the missionaries in the Turkish Empire. But it does not seem to us justified, certainly not to the extent to which it is urged by some. In justice to the Armenian brethren with whom we especially conferred, we should say that they made few complaints against individual missionaries, nor did they accuse them, as a body, of desiring to rule for the sake of ruling. Yet we are of opinion that, in some cases, the missionaries have too long continued the apostolic method, failing to recognize, as soon as they ought, the change of attitude towards the native churches which the advance of the latter in Christian culture naturally calls for. In theory, all agree that the goal to be aimed at is the entire transfer of the evangelistic work, as well as the internal government and discipline of the churches, to the natives. But in the intermediate stage of the work there is a liability, on the one hand, that the missionary may err in continuing too long to impose his judgment upon the native churches and ministers, and, on the other, that the natives, when left to themselves, may err in the measures which they adopt. The growth from a condition of Christian infancy to one of manhood is a gradual one; and the missionaries might naturally sometimes fail rightly to determine when to readjust their relation to the churches by voluntarily relinquishing their leadership. It is almost inevitable that some occasion should be given for the complaint that the missionaries have too long exercised an authority which seems arbitrary.

In such a matter, it makes little difference whether the missionaries have really committed the error, or are only thought to have done so. If they are believed to transcend their prerogatives, if they seem to be denying to the natives that self-government which they have themselves taught them to regard as their right, it must be expected that in some a rebellious feeling will take the place of filial devotion. This feeling will be apt to spring up first in the more intelligent, who themselves have a natural aptness, and perhaps fondness, for exercising authority; and their animadversions may stir up discontent in some minds in which it would not otherwise have found place. To the missionaries, this disaffection seems like ingratitude; and, tracing it to the influence of a few leading men, they suspect their motives to be selfish, and are disposed to resist a tendency which seems to them fraught only with danger.

Now, whether or not the Armenian churches have been too ambitious to take the control of their own ecclesiastical affairs before the time for it has fully come, we are not competent to say. It is a question respecting which the missionaries themselves are not fully agreed. But it seems clear to us that the original apostolic authority of which we speak rests on a purely moral basis; it is founded on mutual love and trust, and can be profitably exercised only so long as it is recognized. Any attempt to impose it upon those who feel that they have outgrown the need of it must weaken its force, or even excite revolt. Though the revolt may be premature and lead to evil, anything like a violent assertion of missionary authority must work discord and disaster.—It is further to be observed that, officially, all missionaries, both the old man of long experience and the young man just arrived on the ground, are invested with equal authority, while among the native laborers are men of piety and superior ability, acquainted with the characteristics of the people and therefore much better qualified to judge concerning the best methods of evangelizing them than the young missionary who has barely begun to learn the language of the country. In such circumstances, only a few instances of too strenuous exercise of authority would suffice to produce an impression, more or less general, unfavorable to the policy of the missionaries, and to excite a feeling of distrust which would suspect evil even where none exists.

When the suspicion has once arisen of an undue exercise of missionary control, it is especially infelicitous to attempt to repress it by representing the natives as pecuniarily the beneficiaries of the missionaries or of the Board, who ought therefore to submit to the direction of the power from which the money comes. We found this to be one of the most urgent complaints made against the missionary policy. To remonstrances that are made against particular measures, the missionaries, it is said, reply: We furnish the money, and therefore we, not the beneficiaries, should decide how it is to be used. Some occasion seems to have been given for this complaint, though the statement, as indicating the course of the missionaries generally, would be unjust. Such a representation puts the native Christian into a humiliating position. It forces on him a sense of his weakness and dependence. It makes of him a mere tool for carrying on a work in which he is equally interested, and equally engaged,

with the missionary, while the latter assumes the sole responsibility of its direction. It presents this enterprise of extending the power of the gospel in the light of a purely business transaction, the control of which must be wholly with those who handle the capital. But in the true conception of the work, the native Christians are co-laborers with the missionaries. As Christians, they are their peers; as citizens of the country to be evangelized, they have a deeper interest in the work and a special fitness for it. The greater part of the labor must be performed by them, and they should be honored accordingly. Any indignity put on them as dependents, mere hired servants, must wound their feelings and be a hindrance to harmony and co-operation. The Saviour's rule makes the enterprise one of mutual service, and admits of no assumption of superior rights on the ground of the kind of service performed. The impropriety of any such claim is especially apparent, when we consider that the missionaries are not the donors of the money employed, but only the agents of the Board and of the American churches for its expenditure. There are obvious reasons why the missionaries should be selected as such agents; but there is no good reason why the counsel of the native Christians should not to some extent be sought, and accepted, respecting the expenditure of the money. Some such training is requisite to prepare them to take, in due time, the entire responsibility of the work. The refusal to do this, especially for the reason referred to, cannot fail to be a fruitful source of distrust and suspicion.

On the other hand, we have to notice with regret the fact that the native brethren, especially in the Western Turkey Mission, have too strenuously insisted on exact co-equality with the missionaries in the administration of the mission work, and have therefore rejected propositions for co-operation which would have given them substantially what they desire, with the exception of a decisive vote on estimates. That rejection was based on the ground that the question is one of principle, and that, the principle not having been conceded, they could not consent to co-operate on the proposed plan. To this it is obvious to reply: first, that, admitting the difference to be one of principle, compliance with the modified plan of co-operation would not involve a surrender of the principle. It could have been accepted and tried as a temporary expedient; and, if found successful, it might have become a step towards the full carrying out of the principle. The native brethren would certainly have been no worse off when working under such a plan than when refusing to do so. Still more is this rejection to be regretted in view of the fact that the missionaries conceded all that they understood themselves permitted to concede under the rules of the Board. But, further, it seems to us that our Armenian brethren erred in making their claim to co-equality in the administration of funds a matter of principle. It is a question of practical expediency, rather than of principle, who shall be intrusted with authority to disburse the funds. It is for the Board to determine who, all things considered, are best competent to direct in what particular channels the streams of Christian benevolence should flow. The nationality of those selected as agents is not an essential consideration. They might be all Americans, or none of them Americans; or any proportion of Americans and foreigners might be adopted. The paramount consideration is that of competency for the duty. If the proposed experiment had been faithfully tried, it would have brought together in friendly consultation men who, in consequence of the rejection of the plan, have been kept aloof from each other, and thus crippled in their work because of an unsettled difference which has been a continual source of mutual suspicion and distrust.

6. So we come again to the central difficulty which most embarrasses the mission work in Turkey. A claim made as a matter of right on one side, yet not conceded on the other, held in suspense for the lifetime of a generation, giving occasion for the charge of undue assumption on the one side and of undue lordliness on the other, leading to the misconstruing of motives and to something like personal animosities, has in many quarters undermined that mutual love, confidence, and respect, which are essential to the prosperity of the missionary work.

Nevertheless, even this evil has been, we believe, in certain phases, exaggerated. Some publications have produced the impression that there is almost a state of war between the parties. Facts do not justify this representation. We were indeed pained to see, on the part of some individuals, a disposition to condemn the missionaries generally as pursuing a policy that involves deceit and arrogance; and at times this distrust of their sincerity seemed too deep-seated to be relieved by any explanations or negotiations. But further observation and intercourse convinced us that those who take this extreme view are not numerous, and that even they are not so implacable as their words sometimes make them appear. In general, we found little disposition, on either side, to make serious criminations, and very few instances of personal alienation. Even the tendency to misconstrue motives does not go so far as to destroy friendly esteem and intercourse. The natives often excused the missionaries from blame for the things condemned, on the ground that they were only carrying out the prescribed rules and instructions of the Board. Thus, though feelings of distrust have been strongly moved on both sides, we are convinced that no such alienation exists between the parties as to make harmonious co-operation intrinsically unattainable.

At the same time, we apprehend that there have been positive efforts made to excite disaffection

where none had previously existed. It seems evident that the dissension which began so long ago in Constantinople, intensified as time ran on, has been propagated in other parts of the empire. The circulation throughout Turkey of documents relating to the controversy has had the effect of exciting or of aggravating unpleasant feelings towards the missionaries and the Board. Hence has arisen a disposition to ascribe the present unsatisfactory condition of evangelical work too exclusively to mistakes and errors of the missionary policy, and to magnify the darker aspects of the case for the sake of strengthening the charge of fault in that policy. It was said, with apparent reason, that some of the reports from the interior, presented at the recent meeting of the Bithynia Union, were one-sided, in bringing forward only the discouraging features of the work, and these too deeply shaded, and leaving out of view causes of spiritual decline which lie deeper than any external policy, in the lack of spiritual life and activity on the part of the churches themselves.

7. A few words seem to be called for respecting the education and ordination of young men in the United States. This in some quarters seems to be regarded as the principal question at issue. It was not, however, made prominent in our conferences with the Armenian brethren; and we do not consider it one on which there can be any prolonged difference of opinion. As to the matter of ordination, it seems to us strange that the Armenians should themselves desire to receive it abroad. It makes them neither more nor less ministers of the gospel than if ordained at home. Any supposed advantage of an American over an Armenian ordination would imply an acknowledgment of the subordinate and inferior condition of the home churches, quite inconsistent with the claim made by our Armenian brethren, and recognized by all, that their churches are co-ordinate in prerogative and dignity with any other churches of Christ. It is intrinsically proper, and everywhere customary, that ordination should take place where the candidate is known, and among the people with whom he expects to labor. The ordination of missionaries is for obvious reasons an exception to this general rule.

With regard to the foreign education of Armenian youth there is more feeling. What has been called "the American fever" indicates a strong desire prevalent among the young men to seek education in the United States. The missionaries have been charged with preventing some from doing this, or with sending letters after they are gone, designed to hinder their obtaining needed help. The recent conference of missionaries adopted a statement of their views on this subject which, we think, will commend itself to all candid minds as judicious and wise. We find no evidence to sustain the charge, sometimes made, that the missionaries are jealous of the advance of the natives in intelligence. The more candid and well-informed of the Armenians, we are sure, do not make this charge. In trying to dissuade many young men from going abroad to study, the missionaries have followed their convictions as to what is best both for the young men and for the general good. They are undoubtedly right in thinking that, as a rule, it is best that the native ministry should be educated at home, just as we regard it as best that American ministers should be educated at home, and not in Germany, even though the home education may not be so thorough as the foreign one. All readily acknowledge that there are exceptions to this rule, though it is a delicate matter to determine just when they occur. Certainly the missionaries ought not to be blamed for refusing a general recommendation to American friends for pecuniary aid to one whom they have felt constrained to advise not to go to America at all. If, however, the young man determines to go against such advice, he should not be hindered, if he is a worthy man, from working his own way or getting such aid as he can. In some few cases missionaries have, with good intentions, but indiscreetly, as we think, undertaken by private letters to dissuade their friends from too freely helping such men. The fact becoming known has been set down as a mark of unfriendliness. Probably the Armenians cannot fully appreciate the embarrassments which would result from encouraging an extensive resort of impecunious young men to foreign schools. But we cannot think that many of them are so unintelligent, or so uncandid, as to endorse the remarkable statement of an over-zealous apologist, that, while the missionaries allow Turks, Greeks, and others, to emigrate, they practically prohibit Armenians from doing so. All agree that the thing most desirable is that the schools and seminaries in Turkey be so improved as to take away the temptation to resort to foreign lands for education. Whatever may be their deficiencies, none can deny that they are constantly improving. But there is reason to think that our Armenian brethren are too impatient for the immediate realization of the result which all desire, and that this impatience leads some to depreciate the advantages already offered, instead of rallying around these institutions, and by their sympathy and patronage hastening their advancement.

8. Another important element to be considered is the revival of the national sentiment among the Armenians. In this respect they have only caught the spirit of the age. They desire to become a vigorous, united Armenian people, as distinguished from Turks, Greeks, and other nationalities of the Ottoman Empire. This patriotic feeling, in itself commendable, leads some to depreciate the important difference between the Gregorian and Protestant religions. Many of the Protestants look indulgently towards the old church; and some even express a readiness to return to its embrace, provided

they could be allowed liberty to adhere to their evangelical opinions and worship. Others cherish a hope that the errors will be so far dropped that the separated members can be reunited in one evangelical brotherhood. They look with something like envy on the superior numbers and wealth of the Gregorians, and the institutions which they are able to maintain, and regret the original act of political and ecclesiastical separation from the main body. — This kindling of the national spirit doubtless tends somewhat to intensify the jealousy which, for whatever reasons, has sprung up towards the influence of the foreign missionaries. A similar tendency, according to recent reports, is manifesting itself in Japan. — Then again, the civil organization of the Evangelical Armenians is incomplete; their civil head is not provided with the means necessary to sustain a proper dignity and to secure the political and civil rights of the Protestants. This puts their community at a disadvantage, as compared with those of the Gregorian, the Greek, and the Catholic Armenians. All this engenders a feeling of discontent; and some are disposed to hold the missionaries responsible for this condition of things, though with no just reason. We enclose a printed communication which sets forth the present unsatisfactory state of the Protestant community.

9. The general poverty of the Evangelical Armenians has an intimate connection with the difficulties under investigation. To some extent, no doubt, their fidelity to their religious convictions has brought them into this condition. Wars, famines, and the extortions of a despotic government, have aggravated it. While the influence of a pure gospel has awakened a laudable desire for social improvement and general culture, their means for gratifying this desire have been diminished rather than increased. It is no wonder that men who are smarting under destitution and see no chance for bettering their condition should lend a too willing ear to those who would persuade them that the missionaries, or the missionary society, are responsible for bringing them into this condition and are under moral obligation to help them out of it. If they had been able twenty years ago, with their own means, to establish the needed schools, to build the needed churches, and to provide for the needed ministers, — in short, to assume the whole management of their ecclesiastical and educational affairs, — there would have been little occasion for the present differences. But continued political oppression has deprived them of the power to do this. Their growth in material resources has not kept pace with their advance in intellectual and spiritual life. In many places the people are poorer than they were fifteen years ago; and under the present government no prospect of relief appears. They are still dependent on foreign pecuniary aid, and yet they have reached that degree of religious development which, in ordinary circumstances, would have made them quite independent. Those who do not suffer as they do should not be too quick to reproach them for chafing under their suffering, or for making mistakes in accounting for it, and in their efforts for relief, or, especially, for their expressions of alarm and grief at an intimation of the probable partial withdrawal of the aid now received.

Overestimating, perhaps, the importance of church buildings, schoolhouses, etc., as a condition of religious prosperity, and believing that there is wealth enough in the Christian world to provide those things for them, our Armenian brethren grow impatient of delay, and are moved to go forth in their own way, seeking means for such special objects by appeals to Christians in America and Europe. The missionaries and officers of the Board, better apprehending the after-effects of such irregular, sporadic appeals on the steady flow of Christian benevolence in its wonted channels, doubt the expediency of such efforts, and discourage them. It seems to them especially objectionable that good pastors should thus leave their flocks for months in order to solicit funds abroad. Their judgment and action is construed as unfriendly interference with the liberty and rights of the natives. From this source have come serious misunderstandings and disagreements, leading to such disaffection that some of the native brethren have even broached the idea of breaking loose from the Board altogether; and some aver that there is a better way for the American churches to do their part for the world's evangelization than through the intervention of a society whose energies are so much occupied with sustaining itself. In justice to the missionaries, we must say that, while often embarrassed by requests to favor by their influence particular measures which their candid judgment does not approve, they are disposed to encourage special applications for aid in any way and from any sources where there is a fair prospect of success without prejudice to the general interests of Christian missions.

10. Prominent, if not chief, among the causes of present embarrassment to the work among the Armenians is an evident decline in the spiritual life of the churches. This decline is perhaps due, in part, to the pecuniary difficulty just referred to, and possibly to errors in the management of missionary and ecclesiastical affairs. It is easy to fall into the habit of dwelling upon evils in external circumstances, and upon differences of individual judgment, and of looking to a change of methods as certain to secure the needed revival of religious prosperity. We apprehend that of late, in the Armenian churches, attention has been too much occupied with these secular matters, to the neglect of the more essential means of spiritual culture. When the warmth of Christian love and zeal is wanting, the spirit of worldliness is apt to creep in, and an exaggerated importance is attached to what is externally imposing; and there

springs up a disposition to attribute any want of prosperity to the faults of others rather than to the lack of personal piety. In this respect the Armenian churches are probably in no worse condition than a large part of our churches in the United States. But their straitened circumstances, and the delicate relations they sustain to the representatives of foreign churches through whom their help comes, make the evils of the spiritual depression more apparent. This, as an underlying pervasive cause of difficulty, enhances the effect of all other causes unfavorable to the missionary work on this field.

SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING A REMEDY FOR THE DIFFICULTIES.

Agreeably to our commission, we add a few suggestions which have occurred to us in the course of our investigation respecting the means of relieving the difficulties brought to view. We notice, in doing so, the propositions made by the Executive Committee of the Bithynia Union in our conferences with them.

1. Under the Turkish Government, which treats the adherents of each distinct form of religion as constituting a separate civil community, it is a simple necessity that the Protestants, whether church members or only avowed sympathizers with evangelical views, should be enrolled and organized, with a civil officer to represent them in all civil and political relations. Such an organization has been formed, and recognized by the government. But, as the paper before referred to shows, it is incomplete, and deficient in ability to secure for its members due respect and justice, and for the community the dignity and importance which it should have before the public generally. It is not perhaps within the province of the Board to labor directly for perfecting this organization by contributions from its treasury. But the missionaries may exert a moral influence which will be very helpful; and the manifestation on their part of hearty sympathies and readiness, in all feasible ways, to promote this important object will tend to remove distrust and to further co-operation in their evangelical work.

2. The cognate matter of a general ecclesiastical organization is a more vital one, and touches more nearly the legitimate work of the Board, though here too the ultimate action belongs properly to the natives. Some organization embracing all the Evangelical Armenian churches seems very desirable as a means of promoting fellowship, and developing activity and efficiency in the extension of the gospel, and as a source of mutual comfort and strength. To meet the peculiar conditions of the country and of the people such an organization needs probably to be more centralized and authoritative than the Congregational associations of our own country generally are. Yet we think there need be no violation of the main principles of our Congregational polity. However that may be, the Congregational idea of Christian liberty dictates that the Armenians be left free to determine the form of organization best adapted to their circumstances. We foresee that they may meet some difficulties among themselves in the attempt to effect such an organization, but these do not seem to us insuperable if only all parties, united in purpose and seeking the guidance of Divine wisdom, can join in devising a plan that will best subserve the main object. The missionaries, we know, favor the project; and we trust that through their encouragement and counsel they may help to hasten its happy realization, contemplating and representing it as a measure preparatory to passing over to the native churches the entire control of the evangelical work in Turkey.

3. The wise adjustment of ecclesiastical relations between missionaries and the native churches is a matter of grave importance. The Board has already expressed its decided judgment against the missionaries becoming members of those churches anywhere. And there are substantial reasons which sustain that judgment. The churches themselves need to be as far as possible independent of foreign elements, especially in case of difference of opinion among the members, when the missionary, if a member, would have to be counted with one party or the other, giving undue weight or exciting undue suspicion. His influence is most salutary when all parties can refer their differences to him as to an unprejudiced umpire having most at heart the general welfare of the church. An issue made between the missionary and the natives is liable to excite race prejudices, and the church to which he belongs could hardly be an impartial tribunal for his trial. It must be remembered also that the missionary, as such, is not expected to be the pastor of a particular church, but to exercise oversight of several churches; that his office is not permanent, but one to be dispensed with as soon as the churches are able to support themselves; and that, as an agent of the Board, he is in a peculiar way amenable to the body which he represents and serves. At the same time, it seems to us to be a question well worth considering whether it may not be advantageous for the missionaries to be ecclesiastically identified with the native Christians as members of ministerial associations which, in case of need, might act as a board of investigation when one of its members is charged with dereliction. We apprehend, however, that the demand for an adjustment of these relations springs mainly from that chronic state of distrust of which we have spoken, and that whatever tends to restore mutual confidence and hearty co-operation will be most helpful to the settlement of this matter.

4. The desirableness of substantial and convenient buildings for churches and schools, and of means for the establishment of native institutions, cannot be questioned. The amount which can properly be appropriated for these objects from the ordinary receipts of the Board is, however, somewhat limited. And it is, no doubt, best that the people should, so far as possible, provide these important equipments by their own energies and self-denial. While they are advancing toward a full ability to do this, some aid must be rendered. The missionaries, we believe, fully appreciate the value of these things for the success of their work, and are ready to do all in their power to secure them. The Delegation from the Prudential Committee, who were on the ground at the same time with us, saw for themselves the need, and will doubtless give it due consideration in their report and in the committee-room. On this point, therefore, we need say no more than to suggest that the missionaries should take pains to manifest their interest in the speedy procuring of these necessary adjuncts of their work, and, as far as practicable, endeavor to draw from Christian men of wealth special donations to be applied to these purposes. There is abundant opportunity for others to follow the example of Robert, and Otis, and Chapin, by setting up all over this Turkish mission field monuments of Christian devotion which shall be at the same time fountains of richest blessing for generations to come. We mention, as prominent among these objects, the erection of a church edifice in Pera.

5. The brethren in conference with us expressed the conviction that there would be money enough for the above-mentioned objects, if the number of missionaries should be reduced, so that the amount of their salaries could be appropriated to other purposes. While, as we suppose, all are agreed that the number of missionaries in the field should not be increased, it may be doubted whether a sudden withdrawal of any considerable portion of them would be advisable. Disability and death will probably reduce the working missionary force as rapidly as the exigencies of the case will admit; and it is certainly to be hoped that able men from among the Armenians will be brought forward fitted to take their place. During the period of transition, especially in view of the poverty of the people, we do not see how the appropriations from the treasury of the Board for this part of its work can be materially diminished. Rather, they need, if possible, to be increased. Whatever expense can be saved by employing native in place of foreign laborers may, we think, be advantageously applied to strengthening the things that remain, in the ways suggested.

6. The need of additions and improvements in the means for the education of natives for the ministry is admitted by all parties. But our Armenian brethren, probably more than they are aware, have fallen into a habit of underestimating the facilities already provided, and are impatient to see the things that are really desirable. Their young men, too, catching the same spirit, and moved by a prevalent desire for a foreign education, are inclined to hold back from the theological instruction open to them. The small salaries of the native pastors and their apparently subordinate position present the ministerial office itself in a repulsive, rather than an attractive, aspect; and there is not in the churches enough of spiritual life and self-denying devotion to overcome this influence. Hence many excellent Christian young men turn away from theological study, and give themselves to secular occupations. This evil can be corrected only by a correction of the general evils out of which it grows. We do not think it would be relieved by trying to establish a new seminary at the capital, as the Constantinople brethren urge. The location is too much on one side of the general field. Also, aside from the considerable expense which the founding of it would necessitate, it could hardly fail to weaken the older seminaries, and contribute to the evil of an overshadowing metropolitan influence in the ecclesiastical affairs of the nation. Attracting students from the interior, which, as our experience shows, furnishes the best recruits for the ministerial service, it would make their education more expensive than now, and would foster in them habits of living and of expense which would give them a distaste for the simpler mode of life to which, as pastors, they would have to return. Whether or not, the removal of the Bebek Seminary is to be regretted as a mistake, it is now an accomplished fact, and, according to the information we carefully sought, and received, concerning the seminary at Marsovan, it is well established and equipped for its work, better now than ever before, and with a fair prospect of further improvement, if the sympathy and interest of the churches can be gathered to it. At Marash also, and Harpoot, positions central to other portions of the field, good beginnings and a considerable development have been made for the same work. Even if, in course of time, it should be advisable to have a seminary at Constantinople, it seems to us that now the urgent need is that the existing ones be elevated rather than that a new one, superior to them, be established, and that to this end the missionaries and the native brethren join in counsel and share equally in the management of these institutions.

7. The providing of better facilities for the higher education of young men, so far as this has reference to secular education, in institutions analogous to our colleges, is, as the "Memorandum" of the Prudential Committee observes, not a proper part of the work of the Board. We ought to say that, in sympathy with this position, our Armenian brethren, in what they said on this point, expressed a

strong desire for distinctly Christian colleges in which the training should aim at the development of Christian character. The colleges already established need to be strengthened and made still more effective as sources of supply for the ministry, and of the diffusion of a liberal Christian culture. When additional ones are needed, it is to be hoped that, through the liberality of Christian men, special donations for this purpose may be obtained. Meantime, however, it is desirable that able men from among the natives should, as fast as possible, be trained for the posts of instruction in the colleges, as also in the other schools, so that gradually this work can be entirely transferred to native hands. To this end, it is advisable that chosen young men be sent abroad for perfecting their education in special departments of knowledge.

8. The effectiveness of all measures for remedying the existing evils must depend on securing a more full and hearty co-operation between the parties concerned. This matter has been agitated, especially at the Constantinople station, for thirty years, and yet the condition has grown worse rather than better. We have not the wisdom needed to solve this main problem, nor can we hope to say much that is new concerning it. It is our duty, however, to express the opinions to which we have been led; and we are encouraged by various convergent indications to hope that a new effort to remove obstacles and to harmonize action may not be in vain. Among these indications are the sentiments of the "Memorandum" above referred to; the action of the recent missionary conference in Constantinople; the general spirit of the members of the Bithynia Union, as manifested in their recent meeting; and the prevalent conviction freely expressed to us from both sides, that a crisis in the history of the mission has come, when this difficulty must be met and grappled with in the spirit of mutual love and of dependence on Divine guidance. All point to the need of a better understanding of mutual relations; and all point to the expediency of a larger participation of the Armenian brethren in the counsels of the missions.

The following preliminary observations on this point seem to us pertinent:—

(1) The lapse of time since the missions among the Armenians were begun, and the growth of religious intelligence in their churches, requires a modification of the policy originally pursued. In the evangelistic work on foreign fields there are three stages: that in which the missionary must direct everything with almost absolute independence; that in which natives share with the missionary both the labor and the responsibility of the work; and, finally, that in which the work is wholly turned over to the natives. The work among the Armenians has reached a stage intermediate between the last two. The final transfer of the work is delayed by the peculiar and unfortunate circumstances of the people. To prepare for that transfer, there must be devolved on the natives increased responsibility both for counsel and for labor. They need the training of actual experience. This is one of the oldest missions of the Board. It has developed men who are the peers of the missionaries in ability, zeal, and judgment. It is time that in a position of co-ordinate responsibility they receive the discipline and stimulus that will prepare them for the independent administration of the sacred trust.

(2) The present attempt to promote co-operation can only be hindered by dwelling on past grievances or mistakes. There is danger that, through a natural pride of opinion, a position once taken may be insisted on just because it has been taken. In so grave a matter as this, in which only Christian men are concerned, the Christian spirit of charity and mutual concession ought to prevail over opinionated self-will. They who are readiest to yield their judgment in the interest of peace, so far as truth and right allow it, are the men who gain abiding influence in the world and, much more, in the church of Christ.

(3) A long standing and growing disaffection towards the policy of the Board on the part of prominent Armenians must be recognized as a fact; and it should now be the aim of the Board by all proper means to remove that disaffection. It appears to us that it is not a local disaffection merely, confined to Constantinople and its vicinity, though, no doubt, it has been there longest prevalent and most pronounced. Evidence comes before us, from all parts of the field, showing that, even where the most pleasant personal relations are maintained, there is a considerable feeling of dissatisfaction because the opinions of the natives are too little admitted, or too little regarded, by the missionaries in deciding important questions. Nor can it truly be said that this disaffection is altogether unreasonable, instigated by a few for selfish ends. Even if this were true, and all the truth, there would still remain the problem how it can be removed. But this is not all the truth. There has been some occasion for this disaffection. We do not doubt that it has been purposely aggravated, when a better spirit would have sought to allay it. We do not doubt that, growing out of misunderstanding, it has been nurtured by unjust suspicions. Yet we have the testimony of some of the oldest and most judicious missionaries, that the native brethren have had real cause for complaint. So the fact stands. This dissatisfaction exists, not without reason; and the question is, How shall it be removed?

(4) In considering this question, we think the Board ought not to be closely bound by its precedents and rules. If necessary to the accomplishment of the end, let rules and precedents give way. At the best, they are but means to an end; if they do not subserve the present aim, let some measure be

adopted which will do so. The case is confessedly peculiar; let a peculiar remedy, if necessary, be applied.

*Our suggestion then is that, as a preparation for the withdrawal, in due time, of its missionaries from the work among the Armenians, the Board modify its rules so as to favor the instituting of station and mission conferences in which the native churches in Turkey shall be represented in equal numbers, and on equal terms, with the missionaries in all deliberations concerning the practical work of evangelization, education, and publication, including estimates for necessary expenses, reserving however to the mission, as the responsible agent of the Board on the field, final action respecting the distribution of funds drawn from the Board's treasury, subject of course to the approval of the Prudential Committee.

The advantages of such an arrangement are these: (a) It would tend to bring all into a common work and to cement the fellowship of the missionaries and the native laborers. It would secure a better understanding of each other's feelings and views, and tend to relieve the work of its foreign aspect.

(b) It would be a relief to the missionaries in the discharge of the more delicate and invidious duties of their office. In the appointment and dismissal of native laborers, the natives, having a voice would have also to share the responsibility of whatever might give offence to some; especially when there is a predisposition to distrust the wisdom of the missionaries, this arrangement would be a valuable safeguard. The missionaries would not be expressly blamed for that which had been ratified by the chosen representatives of the churches.

(c) It would give the missionaries the benefit of needed and helpful counsels. Experienced and judicious natives would, in many cases, best understand the needs of their countrymen and the advisability of particular measures affecting them.

(d) It would give the native brethren a fair opportunity to set forth and advocate measures which they deem essential to the prosperity of their churches and community. They would gain a candid hearing for whatever they might wish to urge as to their civil organization, centralization of forces for evangelistic work, ecclesiastical arrangements, the raising of funds at home or abroad, the appropriation of funds, the establishing of schools, the training and remuneration of pastors, and all similar matters. There would then be little occasion for the private or public advocacy of measures at variance with those adopted, or for severe animadversions upon the policy actually pursued.

(e) More especially, it would tend to remove and prevent mutual distrust. It would take away the ground for the complaint so often made by the native brethren that they are treated as subordinates and inferiors, unworthy of confidence, and of any share in the administration of important trusts most closely affecting their interests, and we believe that the demonstration of real wisdom and capacity in these brethren would relieve distrust on the other side. If heartily and hopefully entered into, this measure would, as we think, be almost certain to obliterate the unhappy state of feeling which is deplored by all. As was well said by one of the Armenians, the case is analogous to that of a father wishing to train his son for a share in his business. He must consult with his son, respect his advice, and lay on him a share of responsibility. There can be no better way to quiet his impatience to get everything into his own hands. We fully believe that the time has come for at least trying the experiment of such conferences, in the full expectation that they will result, not in continual disagreement, but in harmony and cordial co-operation.

We anticipate certain objections which may be urged against the proposal. (1) The scheme may be thought to be a concession to the Armenian brethren of all that they have ever claimed—to be therefore a surrender, not a compromise.

Well, if a surrender is better fitted than a compromise to accomplish the needed result, Christian men ought not to hesitate to make the surrender. Concessions for the sake of peace and harmonious action, where no truth or moral principle is sacrificed, are to be commended. But the scheme really involves no surrender. It recognizes the organic relation of the mission, as such, to the administrative department, which must ever be maintained in a function exclusively its own, and yet it brings the natives into a full and free participation in the counsels which influence the exercise of that function. As the time draws nearer when the whole charge of the work must be transferred to the natives, some change of policy in this direction must be adopted, and our plan does but define what is virtually recommended in the resolutions of the Missionary Conference.

The same reply substantially is to be made if any should object that we propose not only a one-sided concession, but one to be yielded to a demand ungraciously urged, rather than to a proper request. If the time has come when it is, on the whole, best to do the thing proposed, it is a false and unchristian pride which would lead us to hold back simply because we may think that our brethren have erred in their mode of asking us to do it.

* In this paragraph I have, though unable to confer with Professor Mead, substituted the word "conferences" for "meetings," and made such other changes in the language as, without changing the intent, would be in accordance with the established character of the missions as the immediate representatives of the Board.

(2) Some may object because the natives in their claim have ignored their proper relation as beneficiaries to benefactors. This is met by what we have said in another connection. The relation which supersedes all others is that of brethren, fellow-members of the body of Christ. In the truest sense all are mutually benefactors and beneficiaries. "Nay much more those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary. And those members of the body which we think to be less honorable upon them we bestow more abundant honor."

(3) It may be said that the plan proposed seems to violate the time-honored policy which makes the missionaries the sole and responsible agents of the Board on mission fields for the disbursement of its funds, inasmuch as the natives are called to participate freely in the discussion of questions pertaining to disbursements. But our suggestion involves only a modification of that policy and no violation of its principle. It only proposes to aid the missionaries in meeting their peculiar responsibility by the judgment and counsel of the native brethren freely asked and freely given. Mutual respect and confidence will be promoted by open and frank consultation and tend to harmony in carrying out the details of the common work.

(4) To some it may seem that this plan would practically obliterate an important distinction of the missionary office, virtually making the natives missionaries. We reply, a missionary is a man appointed by a missionary society, by which he is directly supported and to which he is directly responsible, to carry the gospel to a foreign people, there to plant churches and to foster them in their growth. The plan we suggest does not propose to make any of the natives missionaries in this sense. It is true that, as the evangelization of a people advances, the practical difference between the function of the missionary and that of the native preacher becomes less and less. It would be a poor testimony to the value of the missionary work, if the fact were otherwise. Many of the natives are especially fitted to give advice on all questions, including those relating to the use of money. The "Memorandum" recommends that such advice be informally sought. Will it not be more freely and more carefully given, and be worth more, if given statedly and formally under a sense of responsibility. We do not propose an identity of office as between missionaries and native laborers, but such an association as will promote a real identification of feeling, interest, and action.

(5) It may be said that the proposed scheme, by the very fact of associating natives and missionaries together in equal numbers would emphasize the distinction of race, and consequently lead to corresponding divisions of opinion which would necessitate a frequent reference of questions to the Prudential Committee for arbitration, and thus only aggravate the present difficulties. Certainly there is a possibility that old differences may come into the consultations proposed. But the plan contemplates that Christian men come together to express their opinions under a sense of individual responsibility. We do not apprehend that, in such circumstances, difference of judgment will, to any extent, run parallel with the difference of race. In no case would it be wise to carry measures by bare majorities. The freest interchange of views in a relation which inspires mutual respect would be most likely to lead to some kind of agreement. The working of the scheme can be properly criticised only after it has been fairly tried. It seems to us that the time has fully come for making the experiment. Some of the stations have already come as near to this scheme as the present rules of the Board permit, and with promising results. If it fails, for the reason now under consideration, it seems to us will indicate some sad defect in the work of evangelizing this people—a conclusion to which we should be slow to come, in view of these many years of earnest labor, marked by signal tokens of the Divine favor.

We may add that we confidently believe that the suggestions of the "Memorandum," respecting the agency of "local home-missionary societies" and "grants-in-aid," will fall in naturally and helpfully with the plan we have proposed.

The details in the working of the scheme, should it be adopted, and its adaptation to the differing circumstances of different stations and missions, may fitly be left to be adjusted by the parties more immediately concerned. We will only say that we regard as unwise and impracticable the proposal of the Armenian brethren that one Central Committee be constituted at the capital to take the direction of the work throughout the empire. The execution of it would meet many practical difficulties; it would involve an excessive centralization, and would lead to a hierarchical authority opposed to the spirit of the gospel and the best interests of the churches.

(9) After all, that which seems to us most essential, as a remedy for the difficulties on this Turkish field of our missions, is a fresh baptism of the Holy Spirit to touch the springs of spiritual life in all hearts. The missionaries need such a quickening, for, in the routine of their manifold, miscellaneous official work, there is a secularizing influence under which the glow of Christian love and devotion grows dim and cold. Many of them expressed to us their earnest desires for such a quickening. The pastors and leading men of the churches need it, for we apprehend that their dwelling much on external evils and external remedies has led them to lose sight of the fact that "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation," but is to be developed among them as a spiritual life within the soul. In their

conferences with us, this need was acknowledged, though it had not the prominence which its importance demands. And the church members generally need it, that the gospel of Christ may become in and through them the power of God unto salvation to all around them. A genuine revival of religion would, we believe, do more than anything else to remove mutual distrust and promote Christian love, to increase religious activity, to strengthen the churches by accession from without, and to incline young men, well endowed in mind and full of missionary devotion, to prepare themselves for the ministerial office. There would then be added to the churches new sources of pecuniary support and a fresh infusion of the spirit of benevolence and self-sacrifice. The best days in the past history of the work were the days of the manifestation in the human agencies of the Divine power. In some parts of the empire, particularly at Adana and Hadjin and Tarsus, this power has been recently manifested in a way to kindle hope and inspire prayer and encourage effort at all other stations. And a most hopeful phase of this recent work is that the fire kindled in a native preacher's soul appears to have been the spring of the movement, the signal instrument of the blessings bestowed. Then let the prayers of all who love the Master and his cause in Turkey, in the United States, and all round the world, be offered in fervency and faith for this best remedy to be applied to the sore evils we have been contemplating.

(Signed)

A. L. CHAPIN.
C. M. MEAD.

LUCERNE: Switzerland, July, 1883.

This is the report which the Deputation made to the Committee.

According to the vote at the last Annual Meeting, the Committee is now to make its report to the Board, and nearly a year of correspondence with missionaries in all parts of Turkey enables it to make some additions to the facts obtained by personal intercourse of the Deputation with Armenians at the capital.

It is not strange that our missions in Turkey should meet with trials, when the apostle, who ought to have been commended by his converts, had to defend himself from their accusations, and protest that he sought no lordship over their faith. No wonder he feared he had bestowed labor on them in vain. Even the Christian diaconate sprang from jealousies about the distribution of money to poor widows. If such facts did not prove apostles unfaithful to their high calling, neither do they prove unfaithfulness among missionaries now. If they did not disprove the genuineness of the apostolic work, neither do they disprove the genuineness of the work to-day. The work of grace among Armenians is no failure, "but he that troubleth (it) shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be."

As the policy of the Board is now the chief complaint, for all agree in disavowing personal dissatisfaction with our missionaries, we should know what is set forth clearly in the "Outline of Missionary Policy," presented to the Board in 1856, by the Prudential Committee, at the request of the Committee of Thirteen appointed in 1855.

This report formulated principles on which the Board had acted from the first, and has governed its action ever since. It says: "Missions are instituted for the spread of a scriptural, self-propagating Christianity. This is their only aim; civilization as an end they never attempt."

This principle is attacked by an Armenian writer, who says:* "I will point out the knot of the trouble. Here it is: The society which has undertaken to assist us *has for its sole aim the immediate salvation of souls.*" He adds: "We wish to cultivate our minds, educate our children, and, while they become children of God, to liberate them from the iron yoke of extreme poverty; we desire to be a well-to-do community, that we may do greater things for the glory of God. *If the missionaries would think like us on this point, the difficulty would speedily be overcome.*" And this last we believe is true. Now, missions sow the good seed of the kingdom in a nation, so that, quickened by Divine life, it may work out its own salvation from poverty,

* "Pamphlet," page 1.

ignorance, and every other evil, and we doubt whether the intelligent supporters of this Board are any more ready than missionaries to undertake to liberate any people from poverty in any other way than by letting the Word of God have free course and be glorified.

At a missionary conference in Lahore, in 1862, a paper was read by Rev. Golok Nath, a native pastor, on the topic, "How shall missionaries secure the largest sympathy and confidence of their native brethren?" and he said: "The root of the evil lies in native Christians making the cause of religion identical with that of civilization." Conflict is inevitable when the aims of missionaries and their converts differ on a point so essential.* A well-known missionary lady, equally noted for her pen and her labors, tells how an Armenian woman in Pera summed up their grievances thus: "Spiritually the missionaries have done well by us, we have nothing to complain of, but temporally we have been allowed to remain in the last degree of poverty. It is their duty to help us in our social position and support."†

And yet in temporal things missionaries have not been unprofitable to Armenians. In 1875, 1876, and 1880, they distributed the charities of England and America to those stricken by famine, dealing out impartially to all races and religions, though in some cases Armenians remonstrated against help being given to Koords. In the district of Cesarea about \$125,000 were distributed in 1876.

From 1875 to 1880, the entire outlay of the Board, in Turkey, was \$549,788.80.‡ Thirty per cent. of this went to objects outside of the preaching of the gospel, namely: church-building, \$24,120.80; printing, \$40,238; education, \$101,437.60; or \$165,796.40 in all; besides the daily advice and help given by missionaries in every conceivable form of secular assistance, "so that one can hardly imagine how they could do more, unless it were deemed helpful to put a sum of money at the disposal of every Protestant as his personal reward of faith."

The outline of missionary policy also affirms that, while the work of missions is simple, their ability is limited, hence economy is imperative.

The work involves: (1) conversion of lost men, (2) organizing them into churches, (3) giving them a competent native ministry, and (4) leading them up to independence and in most cases self-propagation; and all this is to be accomplished through the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

Education as an *end*, the report says, can never be promoted; as a *means* it is invaluable in reaching the point of self-propagation. As to churches, it says every one should have a native pastor as soon as possible, the members doing what they can for his support, and mission aid should be supplementary and temporary, the responsibility of both support and government being thrown on the church as rapidly as possible.

In the first instance, missionaries must form churches and ordain pastors; they have the power to do this because it is essential to their work; but the organization of the churches may be afterwards modified by themselves.

And then the report lays down a fundamental principle of great importance: "*The expenditure of money should always be the act of a mission.*" It can never be entrusted to any ecclesiastical body, however constituted, because in such an event there can be no just accountability. By our present system, the Prudential Committee are responsible to the Board for all moneys received into the treasury, and the missions are responsible to the Committee for all moneys sent to them. The Board, therefore, knows where to look, and the Committee knows where to look.

* "Romance of Missions," by Mrs. M. A. West, page 243.

† Annual Report for 1869, page xxvii.

‡ Letter of H. O. Dwight, who adds, "No missionary salaries are included."

Every dollar can be followed to its place of disbursement. Any other plan would be fatally defective."

This subject of co-operation and organic connection with the home society seemed so important to your Committee, that they wrote to leading men in the missionary societies of other denominations to know their practice on this point, and the following extract from the letter of a distinguished Presbyterian missionary in Beirut may serve as a specimen of the rest:—

"Our mission has just formed five presbyteries, composing the synod of Syria. Native pastors and one elder from each church, with the missionaries, form these presbyteries, *but they have nothing to do with America either ecclesiastically or financially.* The mission meets as a business body, to vote on the appropriation of funds from the United States, and is responsible to the Board here. The presbytery attends to local church matters, and may disburse funds raised within its own borders. Native pastors in Syria, being paid by the mission, are in a sense its employees; but, as presbyters, have an independent vote in presbytery on all ecclesiastical questions, as the equals of missionaries. Not being in any sense responsible to the Board in New York, *of necessity they cannot have any authority over funds sent to Syria. Every foreign board must entrust the disbursement of its funds to persons directly responsible to itself.*"

So much for the principles underlying the administration of this Board. The question now arises: Have we reached a point where the necessities of the hour demand a change? A measure of dissatisfaction exists in some parts of Turkey. How far should it lead us to change these principles? The question obviously is: How extensive is that dissatisfaction? Is it local or general? Is it dependent on the activity of a few agitators? or does it pervade the warp and woof of the native Christian community? Your Committee have received communications from all parts of Turkey, and the answers they give to these questions may be inferred from the following extracts. A writer in the Central Turkey Mission says: "Our best men in the field do not ask for a change. They make no complaints, and render most valuable assistance in the line of home evangelization." He says of the agitators in Constantinople: "They strain every nerve to drag preachers throughout the empire into their controversy. Every mail brings their letters and pamphlets. One pastor brings me their pamphlets, which he condemns in strong language. We have as yet no representative of their party in the field.* Both missionaries and native brethren are indignant that these men should claim to speak for our churches in Turkey. Here certainly is an important part of these churches which has no connection with them whatever." Well might he say that, when the membership of one church either in Marash or Aintab is equal to the entire church membership of the Bithynia Union.

Another in the Eastern Turkey Mission writes: "The feeling of discontent and criticisms of missionaries has always centred around Constantinople, and the Bithynia Union has nursed it. In other parts of the country, dissatisfaction has been in about the ratio of the influence of the Bithynia Union. That body has frequently spoken for all the Protestant Armenians of the country, but without authority, and has, I think, uniformly misrepresented the general sentiment. The demand for an equal voice in the disbursement of the funds of the Board never originated in the interior, and has found (there) but little support. Our Armenian brethren there have never been willing to take responsibility in fixing salaries, or in deciding who shall be employed, and where. A very large majority of Protestant Armenians would unequivocally confine responsibility for the use of mission funds to missionaries; but this opinion is, in its nature, quiet, whereas the opposite is loud and emphatic."

* The letter was written February 21, 1883.

This testimony of missionaries is endorsed by the following statements of the report of our Deputation: "There have been positive efforts made to excite disaffection where none previously existed. It seems evident that the dissension which began so long ago in Constantinople has been propagated to other parts of the empire. The circulation throughout Turkey of documents relating to the controversy has excited, or aggravated, unpleasant feelings toward the missionaries and the Board." Whoever, then, are the authors and promoters of this trouble, it is not our hard-working and poorly paid native helpers. All honor to them for the patient self-denial with which they prosecute their arduous work, and let none in this country do them the injustice of associating them with this persistent and unreasonable dissatisfaction.

We now come back to the question, What is the remedy for the evil as it is? It is evident that it must be sought along the line of full and fraternal co-operation between missionaries and native converts. In saying this, your Committee would not be understood as intimating that missionaries have been backward in such co-operation. There may have been cases where a missionary seemed to hold back, but in most instances it has been a misapprehension of their feelings and their conduct. In a very few cases the missionary may unconsciously have given some occasion for it. But these have formed the exception to a general rule. This is manifest from the testimony of the Executive Committee of the Bithynia Union: "Our churches and the Union respect and honor the missionaries. The question is not anything brought against the missionaries personally. The Union and the churches are in all respects on good terms with the missionaries. They counsel, they pray, and they labor together."

The spirit of the missionaries may be learned from the resolutions passed at the Missionary Conference in Constantinople, May, 1883, as follows:—

Resolved, 1. That we continue to recognize the Evangelical churches of Turkey as the chief agency for its evangelization, and ourselves as their helpers and co-workers in the gospel, and especially that we accord to the preachers and the pastors of these churches all fraternal honor and affection.

2. That, gratefully recognizing all that the Evangelical churches and committees in Turkey have accomplished in the prosecution of evangelistic work, we reaffirm the principle, for many years recognized by the missionaries, by which the right of control in church matters is left to the churches and the Unions, and we will aid, in every way in our power, the fellowship of all the churches among themselves, and in Christian work, recognizing the fact that the Evangelical churches of Turkey have all the rights and sustain all the responsibilities belonging to Evangelical churches in other lands.

3. That we approve of leaving to the churches and Evangelical Associations and Unions the entire care of evangelistic work in those cases where native contributions approximate one half of the expense of the work undertaken.

4. That, in all work, evangelistic, educational, or literary, the same weight is to be given to native opinion as to missionary opinion, and that the work be prosecuted so as to secure, as far as possible, the concurrence of churches or brethren directly concerned and competent to judge in the premises; and we recommend that, as soon as possible, the stations give to brethren whose relations to the work render it suitable, an equal responsibility and voice with themselves, as is now done in some cases in school boards, in literary works, etc.

5. That we desire to associate with ourselves qualified and representative men in such positions as instructors in seminaries, and editors, just as fast as suitable men can be found.

6. That we desire to pass our whole work for the Christian races, especially for Armenians, wholly into native hands, as fast as possible, so that we ourselves may pass on to other races, but that we shall cheerfully recommend to the Board that grants-in-aid of churches and schools be continued as needed by them.

7. That, while we unite in the utterance of these principles, we leave the practical carrying of them out to the several missions and stations, without any attempt or desire to secure absolute uniformity of method, and without formulating a set of rules.

8. Inasmuch as the practical application of these principles may require some modification of the rules of the Board, we respectfully request the Prudential Committee to take this whole subject into consideration, for such action as they may deem necessary.

We hail these resolutions as the dawn of deliverance, coming as they do spontaneously from our beloved missionaries; not a command laid on them from without, but a speaking out of what is, and always has been, in their hearts; sentiments also carried out in their lives, their critics themselves being judges.

The reasonableness of the seventh resolution is manifest when we consider the different character of different fields: the comparative density of population, the different facilities of communication existing in different communities, and the diverse stages to which the work of evangelization has attained. The method of co-operation best adapted to one place may be totally unfitted for another, so that the practical application of the principle must be left to those on the ground, and therefore best acquainted with its peculiarities.

This way or that, however, your Committee would insist that, if there is anything in any missionary station that gives color to the charge of holding down our Armenian brethren in an inferior position, or lording it over them, the flood-gate be opened so wide that the water shall rise over the whole area to a level so perfect that no spirit-level could detect a difference between missionaries and natives, save that ineffaceable difference between greater and less ability, and more or less of the spirit that seeks to serve all and esteems others better than self.

The eighth resolution also calls for some consideration, before we unite with them in passing the matter over to the Prudential Committee, for, having been appointed to examine the matter to the bottom, it will be expected that we say whether any change in the working principles of the Board is needed to attain the end. We remark, then, that there are two bodies employed in this work: (1) The mission, which is a body established by the Prudential Committee, and sustaining organic relations to that Committee which cannot be disturbed. No power can enlarge or diminish a mission, or alter its constituency, save the power that called it into existence at the first. Then (2) the station, a body formed by the mission after it has begun to grow, for purposes of local convenience. The stations in a mission may increase or diminish in number, as local exigencies demand, and the mission is competent to arrange this in the exercise of its own authority. Their organic relations with the Prudential Committee are not direct, but through the mission. It follows from these premises that the more appropriate sphere of co-operation between missionaries and native churches is the station and not the mission. In the former there may be any amount or form of mutual consultation and co-operation, without any interference with organic relations. The mission is the constitutional link which binds all to the Board, and must be kept intact. The station is the working agency, or hand, through which the mission reaches the people. Here co-operation cannot be too thorough or too cordial. It should be also constant, and every voice and vote should pass for just what it is worth, and be measured by truth and right, and not by race distinctions. Here is ample opportunity for native excellence of character and native knowledge of the people to be utilized to the utmost, without trenching on the organic relations of the mission.

Your Committee think that this distinction, faithfully carried out in practice, furnishes a key to the solution of the perplexing problem before us.

Now an equal voice and vote in the mission, on all matters relating to mission work, has been the one demand of the leaders in this disaffection for a quarter of a century.

Without going into the history in detail, look at one animating principle of the dissatisfaction. In the Gregorian, as in most state churches, a child having been, as they believe, regenerated by baptism, is received through certain forms into the church, without a reference to any spiritual experience. We need not point out how inimical this is to vital piety. The missionaries saw this, and therefore could not use their influence in favor of it. Then those Armenians who did not see how this mode of admission to the church worked against piety, having been accustomed to nothing else, looked on this position of the missionaries as an infringement of their religious liberty, and for that reason determined to secure a controlling power in the use of missionary funds. This explains many things in the history of the mission inexplicable to Christians in America. It was at the root of the Pera church trouble in 1861, when that church publicly proclaimed itself separated from all connection with the Board, and so hindered the erection of its house of worship. It explains the conduct of some in Sivas, who tried to wrest from the mission the chapel built by Dr. West, from the proceeds of his medical practice, and for years kept the matter in the Turkish Courts, both there and at Constantinople. Now when we remember that the churches of the Bithynia Union, from the first, have had absolute control of their own affairs, that they have formed churches, ordained pastors, and done all sorts of church work as they chose, have had Bibles and commentaries supplied them, with Hymn and Tune Books, in short, every requisite for Christian work, that they have been aided to build their churches, and support their pastors and school-masters, that even the traveling expenses of delegates to the annual meetings of the Bithynia Union have sometimes been paid, we fail to see cause for complaint, though we can understand the ground of their demand for an equal vote in the disbursement of missionary funds.

It may be said that Armenians have never made a demand in precisely these words; but that this is the real point at issue is manifest from the language of their demand, and the history of the efforts that have been made to meet them.

In one place they are formulated thus: "We therefore request that an arrangement be made whereby all the departments of the Armenian branch of your mission, both material, educational, literary, and evangelistic, shall be, equally with yourselves, under the control of representatives of the native churches." * Again: "The Bithynia Union requests that hereafter all business, whether it refers to material, literary, educational, or evangelistic labors within our borders, which relate to the Armenian work, be put exclusively in the hands of a mixed committee, to consist of an equal number of natives and missionaries, the natives having an equal voice, and enjoying the same authority, with the missionaries." † This was explained to mean "an equal voice with you *in everything*." ‡ Again it is said: "Let the entire work be committed to them." § Now it is very true that an equal vote in the distribution of the money of the Board is not specified, but that it is the thing aimed at is manifest from the following facts.

In the year 1858 certain Armenians proposed the foundation of a mixed council to be composed of equal numbers of missionaries and Armenians, which was to have "plenipotentiary power of absolute administration in all matters having a common relation to the two bodies," and over whatever funds might be obtained from other benevolent societies. The missionaries replied by proposing a plan identical in every respect, save that they proposed, in case of disagreement, an appeal to the annual meeting of the mission, and after that, if needful, to the Prudential Committee; but the omission of the "plenipotentiary power of absolute control" over funds caused the proposal to be declined. Similar efforts with the same results were made in 1866, 1867, and 1872. In 1880 the missionaries offered an equal voice in all missionary work, this control of funds alone excepted, and it was again declined. Even when two missionaries and

* "Pamphlet," page 8.

† "Pamphlet," page 9.

‡ "Pamphlet," page 9.

§ "Pamphlet," page 12.

two Armenians had been appointed, as a mixed commission, the Armenian members of the commission insisted, as the indispensable condition of their continuing to act, that the action of the commission have no connection with the mission; in other words, that their action should be final, and so the attempt failed again.

In view of these facts your Committee think that no one can charge them with drawing an unwarrantable inference, if they suppose that this demand is deemed very important by the leaders of this movement, and needs a careful and thorough consideration. We remark, then, —

1. The disbursement of missionary funds is no part of co-operation between missionaries and their converts.

Co-operation deals with permanent things: with preaching the gospel, and Christian education. These labors will go on after missionaries leave, and on a larger scale. The dealing out mission funds stops when the missionary departs. That a native may be a good pastor or preacher, teacher or translator, it is not necessary that he be an almoner of the Board. That contributes nothing to excellence in these good works. And this shows the fallacy of the illustration often used by Armenians, as if the case was analogous to that of a father wishing to train his son for a share in his business. Not so, for in that case the son goes on doing what his dead father had done before him, and that is true only of the permanent things, the preaching of the gospel and the like. It is not true of this bone of contention; for, the moment the missionary leaves, that ceases, unless our churches propose to sustain missionary churches indefinitely. As a missionary writes: "The work can fall into the hands of the churches only when they begin to assume its expenses, as well as supervision. The Central Turkey churches are making a noble beginning on this line. For several years our Home-Missionary Society has assumed the care and provision for one church, and now they take up the support of another out-station. They find no difficulty in making a wise use of their money, and the secret is their direct responsibility to the churches that contribute the funds." THIS IS THE TRUE WAY TO TURN OVER THE WORK TO NATIVE HANDS.

2. No one can claim to share the duties of an agent. The fact that another works for the same principal, however skilful he may be in his department, gives him no right to a share in the agent's duties. A man may be a home missionary, but that gives him no right to a seat on the Board of Directors of the Home-Missionary Society. Nor do they claim it.

3. It may be answered: Then let the Board make native converts its fiscal agents, and that difficulty disappears. But other reasons forbid that. The relations of the missionary are with the givers, and he is under their control. The relations of the native convert are with the receivers, and over him the givers have no control. Is it said, they have a *moral* control? But that is not enough. Who would leave money exposed, trusting to the moral influences only of even the most Christian city? Something more is needed to make it safe, and that is true in missions as well as elsewhere.

4. There is another reason deeper and stronger. A good man who knows his own heart would not act as judge where his pecuniary interests might warp his judgment, and a bad man ought not to do so.

5. Well-known and universally-received business principles forbid the concession. No business man would ignore these principles; and can a missionary society, seeking to lift up nations into the righteousness of the gospel, disregard it?

6. Some races are noted for their self-respect. Now, if this policy was based on peculiarities of race, the converts from that race might well demand "Are we not also in Christ?" But how can any race be jealous of a principle based on the human nature which is common to us all? The Secretaries of the Board are as much bound by this principle as the Armenians. They sit with the Prudential Committee. They furnish material for its action. They give all sorts of information. They are confessed to know

more about every matter that comes before them than the Prudential Committee, but they are not allowed to vote. Have our honored Secretaries ever demanded an equal voice and vote as the *sine qua non* of their service?

7. The concession is not essential to the *perfect* co-operation of missionaries and native pastors. The national conference of native Christians was held in Tokio, Japan, last May. There were fears that this matter of co-operation with missionaries would prove a root of bitterness, for sparks from this Turkish fire had gone seeking tinder in Japan, but Joseph Neesima, a native Japanese writes: "There is a *perfect* union between the native pastors and the missionaries. They are happily united in the Lord." Yet no equal vote in distributing missionary money brought about this result. The Japanese never asked it. It is doubtful even whether they would receive it. And the Board cannot act on one principle in one part of the world, and on a different one in another. If Turkey excited fears for and in Japan, Japan in turn shows Turkey a more excellent way of attaining this perfect union.

8. It would not be advisable to yield a fundamental principle of our own and other missionary societies, to conciliate a few dissatisfied men in one mission, when *even there* success was doubtful.

9. But it may be said that Turkey is an *exceptional* field, and principles that work very well elsewhere will not work there. Let facts give the answer. There is no portion of the Turkish Empire so barren in spiritual results to-day, as the field where the Bithynia Union has control. There *is* a portion of that empire, however, where we are told: "The annual meeting of the mission was a purely business meeting of agents of the Missionary Society." Again, "The general principle here has been for the missionaries to have entire control of funds received from the Board, and the churches entire control of their own funds, with frequent consultation between missionaries and churches as to the work." Now, according to disaffected Armenians, such a region ought to be spiritually dead. What are the facts? Let the revivals in Adana and Tarsus, Hadjin and Kessab, give the answer. For that region is the field of the Central Turkey Mission. And in these outpourings of His grace, we have the testimony of the Spirit that this principle is no hindrance to missionary success even in Turkey.

10. It may be said, the time has come for making the experiment. But does Christ leave us to doubtful experiments in his service? The principles that govern the missionary work may be evolved slowly, but *never uncertainly*. He who works for Christ shall *not* be left to walk in darkness. These principles are evolved, not like echoes, now on this side, now on that, but along one line that shineth more and more unto the perfect day. God has led this Board along this line from the beginning. Does he now call us to condemn his past leading, and try another?

11. We would not be puffed up with self-conceit, but we cannot shut our eyes to the honor God has put upon this Board. More than once has he called it to take the lead of other societies in the discovery and application of missionary principles. Its precedents have been followed in both hemispheres. Let us be sure that we are truly following Divine leading, before we proclaim to the world that from the beginning we have acted on a mistaken policy. It might be that only then should we begin to lead the world astray.

We come now to a delicate yet important inquiry: What is the character of this opposition to the policy of the Board? Your Committee have ample materials for an answer to this question; but, lest any should fear that our selection of facts was prejudiced, let us turn to the Report of the Deputation, for no Armenian questions their friendliness to his nation. That speaks of a disposition to ascribe the present unsatisfactory condition of the work *too exclusively* to mistakes of missionary policy, and to *magnify* the *darker* aspects of the case *for the sake of* strengthening the charge of fault in that policy. It was said with apparent reason, that "some reports from the interior, at the recent meeting

of the Bithynia Union, brought forward only the discouraging features, and these too deeply shaded."

This is a serious charge; and, as that Report is intended to conciliate the disaffected, we may be sure it does not exaggerate the facts.

We might produce some of these "too deeply shaded" pictures of the work in Turkey. Evangelistic work in Nicomedia for two years has been in charge of the native pastors with the missionary, and was prosperous till their prosperity was noticed in the *Missionary Herald*. After that, the Committee of the Bithynia Union made such representations that the pastors withdrew; and the only reason assigned by any one was, "Its continuance would hurt our cause in America." But here again we quote from the Deputation. They tell us the disaffected complain, that "the power of the churches for extension languishes," that "there is a prevailing despondency in the churches, not for lack of interest in the work, but of confidence in the policy;" and that "external enlargement has almost entirely ceased." The Deputation refer to "an accompanying comparative statement made up from actual reports." What says that statement that forms part of their Report?

It gives the record of churches and schools for four decades, from 1852 to 1882 inclusive, as follows:—

	1852.	1862.	1872.	1882.
Number of Churches	10	43	74	108 (Over 10-fold.)
Number of Church Members	261	1,564	4,032	7,490 (Nearly 30-fold.)
Natives Ordained	6	13	47	66 (Over 10-fold.)
Native Preachers Not Ordained	?	32	56	68
High Schools and Theological Seminaries	1	3	9	23 *
Teachers and Helpers	?	145	374	467
Pupils in High Schools and Theological Seminaries	44	52	153	711 *
Girls' Boarding-Schools	1	2	10	16 *
Pupils in Girls' Boarding-Schools	24	28	241	608 † (Over 25-fold.)
Common Schools	12	117	222	317
Pupils in Common Schools	398	3,473	6,391	12,896 †
Pupils in All the Schools	466	3,553	6,785	14,285 † (Over 30-fold.)

The increase in church members during the last ten years has been eighty-five per cent., and to-day there is more missionary work done at any one of the four stations of Cesarea, Harpoot, Aintab, or Marash, than in the whole Turkish Empire thirty-two years ago. And yet, according to these men, "*external enlargement has almost entirely ceased*"!

But we have another view of these men, also from the same Report, and its accompanying papers. Our Deputation was led out from one of the most intensely spiritual meetings held in Constantinople last summer, to meet six Armenians who testified that the missionaries had, contrary to their wishes, made the Protestant Armenians leave the Gregorian church. Over their signature they testify, that "they (we) were made to believe they (we) would have a definite organization, Presbyterianism or something like it, as we understood, but soon we found that we were being led into *something like Congregationalism*. *The Apostles preached no doctrine of this kind*." And in another place they speak of "the *mixed, indefinite religious doctrines* of the *missionaries*." Now it is not strange that six old men could be so sadly bewildered; but what is the spirit of those men who endorse them to our Deputation as "men of good standing and followers of the missionaries for the love of pure truth," in thus reviling the things most surely believed among us? Another question is, How shall we treat those who thus attack the truth which this Board preaches in obedience to Christ? Does

* In 1881. † Incomplete — Robert College not included.

it encourage us to give them co-ordinate power with our missionaries in disposing of missionary funds?

If your Committee do not enlarge here, it is not because the matter is unimportant, but only because time forbids it. The contempt poured on the faith and ecclesiastical polity of the churches that sustain this Board is very marked, and, taken in connection with the objection made by the Deputation to establishing a new seminary at the capital, "because it would *contribute to the evil of an overshadowing metropolitan influence in ecclesiastical affairs*," and their condemnation of the "*Armenian proposal of a central committee at the capital, to take direction of the work throughout the empire*," as "*unwise and impracticable*," "involving an *excessive centralization* and leading to a *hierarchical* authority opposed to the spirit of the gospel," throws light on the present tendencies in Constantinople, and the dangers that there threaten spiritual life. While our principles forbid our interference with the autonomy of the Armenian churches, at the same time we do not deem it wise to give this element equal voice and vote in the direction of the missionary work.

The veteran Dr. Hamlin says: "I would never give centralized power to Constantinople or to the Bithynia Union. It would be a second Patriarchate, and as much worse (than that) as Congregationalism is better than Orientalism."

In conclusion, we beg leave to remind the Board that we must not only ask what will pacify Armenians, but what will satisfy Americans, the self-denying men and women who from small incomes make large gifts to Christ. Why do they give to him through this Board, while the claims of our own country are so urgent? One reason is *general*: the last command of our ascended Lord. Another is *particular*: because through the admirable system of the Board every cent is made to tell, and not one is lost. Let this reason abide in all its force; for, should this proposed change be made, we tremble for the consequences. But if we hold on to the wise principles of our fathers, notwithstanding the shadow cast on some minds by recent publications, notwithstanding the honest diversity of sentiment that appears here to-day, "the living evidence of the blessing of God on our missions in Turkey was never so clear, and the outlook for the future never so bright, as at this moment."

Begging pardon for detaining you so long your Committee recommend the passage of the following resolutions:—

Resolved,—1. That, in accordance with the suggestion of the Visiting Deputation, as a preparation for the withdrawal in our time of its missionaries from the work among the Armenians, the Board favor the admission of representatives of native churches in Turkey in conferences concerning the practical work of evangelization, education, and publication, including estimates for necessary expenses; reserving, however, to the mission, as the responsible agents of the Board on the field, final action respecting the distribution of funds drawn from the Treasury of the Board, subject of course to the approval of the Prudential Committee.

Resolved,—2. That there is pressing need for a large-hearted, and even generous, co-operation with our native brethren everywhere, its particular form and method being shaped by the circumstances of each locality, but such as may assure them of our Christian love, and fit them most speedily to assume the entire support and management of the evangelization of their respective fields.

Resolved,—3. That, for a complete and abiding deliverance from these present troubles, we are shut up to a larger outpouring of the spirit of God upon our missions in Turkey, and we hail the present work of grace in Central Turkey as the beginning of a Divine deliverance.

WILLIAM HYDE, *Chairman*.
THOMAS LAURIE, *Secretary*.

In presenting the foregoing Report, the Secretary of the Committee, Rev. Dr. Laurie, stated that the matter relating to the separation of the Evangelical community from the old Armenian church, in 1846, the Committee had not referred to, but had asked Rev. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin to speak upon that subject. Dr. Hamlin spoke as follows:—

ADDRESS OF DR. CYRUS HAMLIN.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND DEAR BRETHREN:—

I have had the great and responsible duty of working thirty-five years in the Turkish Empire. I have been interested in all the missionary movements there for forty-six years, and have studied them through and through. I know the genesis of these churches. I was present and had part in all those initial movements out of which sprang these one hundred evangelical churches in the Turkish Empire. I was perhaps regarded as having too much sympathy with that native party that has claimed so loudly "co-operation" in the work of missions; and it may be for that, I was not appointed on this commission, but, while I have sometimes differed from missionaries and Prudential Committee, I have never made factious opposition, and on all missionary topics I can look both friend and foe serenely in the face, and say that I have tried to do what I believe it was my duty to do toward Christ and his church.

I left Boston in 1838, having received my instructions in Park Street Church from Rev. Dr. Anderson; and one item* in those instructions directly conflicts with the testimony now given by those "aged veterans," to whom I may perhaps refer again, who were called up in the presence of the Deputation from this country at the late conference at Constantinople to make me out a liar. At the commencement of the missionary work there, who were your missionaries? Goodell, Dwight, and Schauffler. These are the men who are now accused by this party of having deceived the Armenians to forsake their church by the trickery of promising a good organization, glorious churches, hospitals, etc. I have it here in this Armenian newspaper. Did any church in the United States, or any ecclesiastical council, ever ordain missionaries to go into Turkey and bribe the nominal Christians to leave their church? Did the Prudential Committee ever instruct their missionaries to persuade as many as possible to leave the old church and come out into a new organization and promise that they should have everything they wanted? That is implied in the accusations now made. Suppose those three planters of the church, Goodell, Dwight, and Schauffler, were base enough to do it,—let it be that they were traitors to Christ and his church,—were they fools enough to do it? For, above all things, it would be the most foolish thing that foolish men could ever have wit enough to conceive of.

Now, these men who accuse us of having deceived them into Protestantism by these great promises which we never performed, and of having preached "mixed and indefinite doctrines"—what do they mean by that? What "mixed and indefinite doctrines" did Goodell, Dwight, and Schauffler preach? They preached the doctrines of the cross, of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, of repentance and faith; and those are the doctrines which these men now stigmatize as "mixed and indefinite." The worship they taught, they say, was a worship that was "unnatural." Well, what worship was "natural" to the Gregorian church? The missionaries taught them to worship God in spirit and in truth, and these men confess that that worship was not natural to them; at any rate, they do not want anything to do with it.

There is another point to be considered. Admitting the truth of these accusations which are now spread through all Turkey, printed in this Armenian newspaper and sent out in circulars, what does

* Extracts from Dr. Anderson's instructions, given in Park Street Church, December 2, 1838:—

"Our object is not to subvert them—the Oriental churches—not to pull down and build up anew. It is to reform them; to revive among them the knowledge and spirit of the gospel. . . . We are content that their present ecclesiastical organization should remain, provided the knowledge and spirit of the gospel can be revived under it," etc.

It was in this spirit that the mission labored, until the Armenian hierarchy assumed the position of fixed and violent persecution, sending men to prison and to exile on false charges, breaking up families, separating husbands and wives, parents and children, evicting men from their stores and shops and cutting them off from all the means of livelihood. Patriarchal persecution was no new thing: Patriarch Yeprem, in 1700; Sahog, 1708; Hohannes, 1714; and Garabed, 1828,—had all perpetrated deeds of cruelty belonging to the Middle Ages.

It was the infatuated cruelty of the Patriarch Matteos and his powerful coadjutors that compelled the formation of the Evangelical church, and introduced the glorious struggle for religious and educational freedom; and this immediately made the press a power in the empire. Those Protestants who now attack this grand movement are equally blind to the meaning of God's providence and to their own honor. Let those who sigh for the leeks and onions of Egypt go there and be quiet.—C. H.

it make of the Protestant Armenian church itself? Why, they confess themselves all to be utter poltroons! They were bribed; they betrayed their church, the old venerable Gregorian church; they betrayed their St. Loosavoritch; they betrayed their nation, — for a bribe. They accuse the early missionaries of being bribers and deceivers and false promisers; and they show that they did not shrink from the holding of bribes, but they betrayed their church and nation and did not get even the thirty pieces of silver that they say we promised them. And now they mourn for those thirty pieces of silver!

Well, Mr. President, I do not like this representation. I never would make such a representation of these brethren, for many of them are honored and dearly beloved brethren; but as for these six men who were induced to sign that declaration, — well, there is one of them that I have had great respect for, and a second one, perhaps; but I will not speak of individuals who confess to have been bribed and whose testimony is, therefore, worthless.

I now wish to notice briefly some of the attacks industriously circulated in Turkey, without rebuke or protest, but less boldly advanced to the churches in America. I hold in my hand a widely-circulated Armenian newspaper, the *Manzoomick Evkior*, in which an "Evangelical Armenian" warns his people beforehand against the delegates to whose admirable report we have just listened. I will summarize some of the points in this scandalous letter.

"First. This is not an impartial committee.

"Second. This committee is not from a disinterested power.

"Third. The money given in the name of Christ and humanity, the missionaries use for themselves and their satellites.

"Fourth. There is a strong suspicion that there will be no justice done by this committee" — and so the Armenian people are warned not to trust it beforehand.

"Fifth. They separated us from our church and nation by promising us a high education, splendid churches and hospitals, and everything necessary to a nation; and these promises they have never performed.

"Sixth. Nothing worthy has been done for education. Robert College, Harpoot, Aintab, are not colleges of the American Board; and besides the education in these colleges is ruined by the despicable and contemptible influence of the missionaries of the American Board," — and throughout the missionaries are spoken of in these publications as "base," "selfish," "tyrannical," and "contemptible."

You can see where the missionaries will go if they could have control of the funds. How many "contemptible missionaries" would they support among themselves? How much "contemptible influence" would they pay for in the matter of education?

"The missionaries formed the church," it says. Who did form it? It is necessary for the friends of the American Board now to review their knowledge of the formation of that church and know who did form it. The missionaries did not form that church; they could not do it. If they had offered ever so great a bribe to any Armenian for leaving his church, he could not have left it. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the "Great Ambassador," as he was called, could not take one individual member out of the Armenian church and put him into another. The Sultan himself could not do it, for the Gregorian church existed under a *berat*, — a diploma, — whatever you call it, which was given by Mehmet the Conqueror, in 1453, by which he constituted the Greek and, afterwards, the Armenian church under the authority of the Patriarch; and the Sultan never interfered with any of the spiritual duties of the Patriarch, and he would no more attempt to separate an Armenian from his church than he would think of destroying the sacred decrees of Mehmet the Conqueror. The man, be he Armenian, American, or Englishman, is either destitute of common sense or common honesty who says that the missionaries induced the Armenians to leave the church. They could not induce them, and they could not leave.

Who then did form that church? Archbishop and Patriarch Matteos, the archpatriarch of all the Armenians in Turkey, formed it, by expelling them from the Gregorian church. He thrust them out, some of them in the night time. Some thirty or forty individuals once came in the night, driven across the bridge that separates Constantinople from Galata; and the English missionary to the Jews, Mr. Allen, having an immense empty building that he was fitting up, received them all for that night into that building: and so those refugees from the Armenian Patriarch did not pass the night, as he intended they should, in the streets. There was the formation of that church. And why did he thrust them out? Because they would not sign a new confession of faith, in which all the evangelical doctrines they had been taught were rejected, and acknowledge most faithful obedience to, and belief in, all the requisitions, ceremonies, rites, etc., of the Gregorian church, including the worship of pictures, the saints, and many other things which I am sure you will say an enlightened conscience could not receive. Bishop Southgate was there at the time, from the Episcopal church. He did advise them to remain and tried to persuade them to remain, and he wrote home to this country that they ought to remain in their church. Professor Greenleaf, the Dane professor of law in Harvard College, wrote

to me asking me to translate from the authorized books of the Armenian church—from their book of rites and ceremonies and from whatever other authorized and received books they had—sufficient specimens for his consideration, to show just what those books teach and what worship was prevalent in the Armenian church. I think I covered some two hundred or three hundred pages with translations from three books: one called the *Mashdots*, or book of ceremonies and rites, another *Sharagan*, or hymn-book, and the other the *Aghotakirk*, or prayer-book. These are books that have been authorized by all the authority that the Armenian church has ever exercised. They have been universally used in the church, printed and reprinted, for centuries, by the authority of the bishops and patriarchs; and so they are of the highest authority. Fortunately, I have a few and only a few specimens of those hymns and prayers and forms of worship which these persecuted men were required to subscribe to, or they were thrust out of the church. First, as to the worship of pictures. The following is a part of the canon for the anointing and consecrating of a new picture for a church or chapel:—

"Amen Hallelujah! Hallelujah! Let the forehead [that is, the forehead of the picture] be blessed, anointed, and sanctified, by the sign of the Holy Cross and by this Holy Oil; and let it be a ready help to those who trust in the Lord, a defender of travelers, a helper of the tempest-tossed, a refuge of health to the sick, of expiation to sinners; and let it make fearless the doubting, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, now, always, and forever. Let this [the bishop here naming the part] be anointed and sanctified with divine blessing; and be there given to it power to heal the sick, to chase away devils, to offer intercession for men, to build up families, to bestow health upon body and soul, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. May this right hand [here anointing the right hand of the picture] strengthen our nation, set free the captives, bring forth the prisoners, crush the infidels, protect the believers, in the all-holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now, always, and forever. Amen. Then shall they offer incense to it, and kiss it [the anointed picture], and shall sing suitable hymns to it, and preach a sermon about it, and close with the Lord's Prayer." (Page 215.)

The intercession of the saints appears in almost every page of the hymn-book. I now quote from the hymn-book: "In thee we trust, all-holy queen, most excellent and marvelous, the bestower of favors, a fountain to the thirsty and rest to the weary." (Page 30.) "Intercede with Christ our Lord to save us; thou art ever the intercessor of the world." (Page 33.) Such addresses to the Virgin are innumerable. She is called "Mother of salvation," "Mother of light," "Mother of God," "Hope of men," in this hymn-book, and also in the prayer-book.

The saints are addressed in this way: "O holy father Anthony, pride of the church and joy of angels, present our supplications unceasingly to the Holy Trinity." The prayer-book is full of this sort of stuff:—

"O mother of God, the church catholic confesses and worships thee, for thou didst bear intact and incorrupt Him upon whom cherubim and the fiery thrones and six-winged seraphim dare not look. Intercede thou with the Incarnate to save our souls." "Through their supplications [that is, of the martyrs] spare thou, Lord, and save thy people." "O holy Gabriel and Michael, great archangels of the Most High, who ever stand before the throne of the Deity, be our constant intercessors with the Lord, and take us all up to the kingdom of heaven to dwell with you."

"By the intercession of the Holy Mother of God, and of St. John the Baptist, and of St. Stephen the proto-martyr, and of holy Gregory the Illuminator, and of the fathers and doctors, and of the martyrs and kings, and anchorites and virgins, and of all the saints ancient and modern, known and unknown, who are this day celebrated, give us this day peace and heavenly mercy, gracious Lord."

Then, with regard to transubstantiation; there is the strongest assertion of it. Also of the power of the church to forgive sins, and everything which we regard in the catholic church as being idolatry. After this excision from the church, the Patriarch published a letter called the *Tookht Huradagan*, or a monitory letter to his people, in which he quoted a great many passages of Scripture to show that the church was all right. He then goes on to enumerate the doctrines which they must receive in order to be faithful members of the Gregorian church. Now, it is said that the Armenians left not willingly but because we persuaded them to. As soon as this letter was published by the Patriarch the Evangelical Armenians prepared a reply to it. The chief author of the reply was Pastor Apsoghon, the first pastor of the church, which, however, was not yet formed. With him was another, who was afterwards pastor, known as Pastor Muggerditch. There was also a helper named Bedros, and others. They had to flee to Bebek Seminary largely for safety and quiet, and this reply they prepared in the Bebek Seminary, then under my care. I had continual consultation with them; and fortunately I found among my old papers some notes of that reply, from which only a few things appear. I endeavored to get that reply from the rooms of the Board at Boston, but as no one there reads Armenian they could not find it. It was called "The Answer of the Evangelical Armenians to the Patriarch's Letter." I do not remember very particularly about it, and if I had not found these notes I could not have made these statements.

According to my notes the native brethren replied to the Patriarch on these seven points: first, confession to the priest and priestly absolution; second, on fasting; third, on honors to the holy relics; fourth, on honors to be given to the holy pictures in the churches; fifth, on the intercession of the saints; sixth, on the efficacy of the sacraments to atone for and remove sins; and seventh, on transubstantiation. Now, it would seem as though those first members of the Evangelical church had something to do about faith and belief in Divine truth, and that they had something to do with the errors of the church, and that they had left the church because they regarded these errors as soul-destroying. Why were they formed into a church? What could be done with them? They were outlawed; they had no rights; every permit which they had to labor, to practice any handicraft or any industry, whether it were in mechanics or in trade or in commerce, was taken away from them.

In the first place, the missionaries found that something must be done for their spiritual instruction and edification; and we had a council of missionaries of other boards,—the Scotch missionaries and English missionaries to the Jews. We consulted with the chaplain of the English Ambassador, and with Sir Stratford Canning himself; and they all agreed that there was no other thing to be done but to organize them into churches. There they were, out of the church, out of the pale of civilization; and from that time forward, from 1846 to 1856, I gave the whole of my spare time to the endeavor to get these persecuted Armenians into some way of supporting themselves. I can say honestly that I labored night and day. I taught them trades by which they could work under my protection, for they could not work for themselves. I don't know how many trades I taught them, but it was a good many, and a good many I had to learn myself in order to teach them. I went into the mechanical trades, into commerce, into agriculture,—I even established a great laundry and became a washer-woman for their sakes!

Well, I have to confess a great disappointment. I am disappointed in the result. They are disappointed in the result. The hoped-for reward of industry and enterprise and self-support has not come. In agriculture there has been as great a failure as in the mechanical arts; and all these nascent organizations upon which I looked with such interest as destined to go forward into a grand future are in the most disheartening poverty. Why? Are the missionaries to blame for it? Has the American Board thrust them into it? Are they, the Armenians, themselves to blame for it? No; neither the missionaries, nor the American Board, nor they themselves, are responsible for the poverty and the discouragement under which they now labor. But the fiscal system of the empire is such as to destroy every industry. I ask anybody to name an industry that can now live in Turkey, except it be just those industries that cannot be reached by foreign manufactures. Foreign manufactures come in there every day the same as free; and every industry, one after another, has struggled and struggled for a while and finally given out. Well, then it was hoped that in exports there would be a field of successful operation. But foreigners only can manage exports, not the natives. They do it under the shelter of treaties which protect them but do not protect the natives. They cannot do anything in that line. It was hoped that agriculture would be a refuge; but as nothing is derived now from the custom-houses, the government has resorted to taxation; and the single sheep-tax gives the Turkish Government a greater revenue than all the custom-houses of the empire. Fruit-trees are taxed until they are cut down. Their olive-trees are taxed, until they cut down their olive-trees. Their Angora goats are taxed, until they kill their goats. Everything is taxed. I have heard the saying that "everything in Turkey is taxed to death but cats and rats and Englishmen." Do you blame these Evangelical Armenians for their poverty? So long as this system continues they will be poor. By industry they get a bare subsistence, and that is all that you can hope for them until this scheme of things shall pass away. God hasten the day!

What can be done for them? Can we do what they would like to have us do? Can we make them comfortable and rich? Can we support a community in comfort when they are under such circumstances? There they are by God's all-wise and mysterious providence; and they will suffer, and must suffer, so long as this state of things continues. They do not well understand it; they do not see the causes of this depression and this poverty of the empire. I have looked upon it all, and seen the process from beginning to end, and I do not know of a single industry that I endeavored to establish (except, perhaps, the single one of bread-making) that has been anything like a permanent success, or can be; and nobody is to blame but the system of things which there prevails. Others suffer as badly. The whole empire suffers, the whole empire is in poverty, and all I hope for is that the poverty will speedily become so great that it cannot become greater, and the whole thing will end. That poor empire is now paying, according to the last fiscal report, \$30,000,000 more for its imports yearly than all its exports of every kind amount to, and it has no foreign carrying-trade and no foreign capital to fill up that \$30,000,000. And, to finish the matter, England now comes in and claims the right, with her multitudinous little steamers, to do all the coasting-trade and all the internal carrying-trade in Turkish waters. That will destroy an entire industry that supports a great many, and thus add another

item to the terrible poverty and final break-up of the Turkish Empire. Our "noble old mother England" is not always merciful in fiscal matters with foreign nations!

What, then, can be done? These brethren are in a grave error to accuse the missionaries of being deceivers and bribers; and these men who do this,—these men who are part and parcel in this accusation—I would not trust with a single piastre. They are not the men to have control. But I do not think the Bithynia Union is so much involved as Dr. Laurie seems to imagine. There is a part of it, an element in it, that has not conducted as I think it should have done. Although I was not a member of the Committee for searching into the origin of these things, yet I felt very desirous that the Committee should get to the bottom facts; and I wrote to Dr. Laurie, advising him to get the impartial statement of all the individuals possible,—the native pastors and helpers, the men engaged in missionary work and not engaged in missionary work,—and to send out a circular and get as many expressions of individual views as possible. That was done, and immediately the Committee of the Bithynia Union sent out a circular which I have in my hand, warning them not to reply, and claiming the right to control this question themselves, and to see for themselves what reply should be given to the Committee. Thus the members of the Committee of the Bithynia Union rose up in Constantinople and just stood between the Committee of Inquiry and the Evangelical churches, and prevented them from rendering their testimony and warned them not to do it. The American churches cannot stand that. They do not want any Bithynia Union, or any two or three members chosen by the Bithynia Union, to stand there in Constantinople and examine all the mails and take out everything that they do not like, either way. I protest against that domineering spirit of a certain element of the Bithynia Union. It is certainly un-American—I won't say it is not Oriental; but it is what that "mixed indefinite" thing called Congregationalism will never endure.

Now, sir, I have a word to say about the accusation that the missionaries preached "mixed and indefinite" doctrines, and offered a system that was "unnatural." What was *natural* to the Armenians? It is true, the worship of the Armenian church was such as we could not offer to them. When I first went there, sir, what was the worship of the Armenian church? I have been inside the door of an Armenian church and seen the worshipers come in. They would generally approach a picture on the wall, make the sign of the cross before it, bow down to it very low, perhaps pray to it, listen to the liturgy for five or ten minutes, and then go out; and there was this going and coming continually, some offering this worship and some not. Now that is a worship which Congregationalism knows nothing about. It has no pictures, it has no incense, and it has none of that bowing and prostration and making the sign of the cross to any visible thing. It is true, the missionaries did not offer that worship. They worshiped God in their usual way. They never invited the Armenians away from the communion of the church. We had no communion for them, we had no separate services for them, because we could not have, and we were afraid to have them. It was so soon after the war for the independence of Greece, and the government was so jealous of "societies," that we had to be careful of having any assemblies in our house. We would not have thought it safe to have twenty natives visit our house at one time, and they were afraid of doing it. We did not invite them to separate services. The first Bible-class that I formed had only five or six attendants; and that grew, in the course of the year 1839-40, to perhaps a dozen or fifteen, which was about as large as it was safe to have. There was a little organization of about twenty persons, called the Evangelical Association,—a secret organization of enlightened souls. But that was no church; it was an association which they had formed for the purpose of corresponding with all enlightened persons around the country in various places, and promoting a knowledge of the Scriptures. That was no church; it was not known, and its records were all kept secret. I had some share in secreting them once, when they were sought for by the agents of the Patriarch, and twice these records came as near as possible to falling into the clutches of the Patriarch, and were rescued only by my prompt and decisive action. Can that be called a church,—an association to promote the knowledge of the Scriptures? There was no ecclesiastical office whatever in it; and there was no church formed and no communion service established for the natives until Archbishop and Patriarch Matteos compelled it to be formed; and the responsibility of there being a church in Turkey at the present time rests upon him. But it was a glorious arrangement of Divine Providence that it should be thus formed; for, out of that formation which is now so despised by some of our brethren, and which is trampled in the dust by them and stamped upon as an innovation upon their rights, has arisen all the educational and spiritual freedom in Turkey. From that has come forth the work of the press and the formation of the one hundred evangelical churches and all that degree of educational and spiritual freedom which is now enjoyed under that miserable despotism of the Turkish Empire. In the providence of God it has all come out of this, which they say ought not to have been done, but which was a mistake, an error, and that we induced them to leave their church; whereas, if they had remained in their church, they could have done a great work! That was what Bishop Southgate advised them to do, and what these men, if they had had a Bishop South-

gate to lead them, would have done. But you have seen how they would have worshiped, and this is the worship that they must have offered.

The accusation, then, brought by these disaffected Armenians upon the first missionaries, I denounce as utterly and entirely false. I know it to be false by my own personal observation, being part and parcel in it. I know it to be false by the character of some of those who offer this miserable testimony. I rejoice in the report which Dr. Chapin has given. I believe this thing will rectify and purify itself. If need be, let it cast off a portion of the Evangelical church. I have no fear, sir, of calling those brethren into consultation about money; I would as lief consult them about money as about anything else. I always advocated co-operation, trust, and confidence in those brethren; I always practised it; I never repented of it, and I believe the true theory of missions is for the missionaries to trust the native converts, to be one with them in the work, and to consult them about the use of funds as about the use of everything else. I would not give them the power of the disposition of funds by a vote, but I would get their opinion, and I would go hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder, with them into all the work of the Lord as far as they would go. And when they would not go, I would go on alone; and I would work on that principle. Amen.