

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XVI.—NO. 4.

---

MARCH, MDCCCLXVI.

---

ARTICLE I.

## PURITANISM AND PRESBYTERIANISM.

Puritanism is one of those great historical facts about which men have differed ever since its rise, and will doubtless continue to differ for a long time to come. Some denounce it as the embodiment of all that is narrow, bigoted, and intolerant, whilst others exalt it as the source and champion of all true civil and religious liberty. These denunciations have acquired a fresh bitterness and frequency from the great events that are going on around us. Regarding, as many do, that form of Puritanism which is found in New England as the grand agency that has produced the terrible conflict through which we have just passed, there is no form of condemnation too severe to be applied by them to Puritanism in general, and to every thing that is supposed to have any affiliation with it. Hence the Puritan, without regard to past or present, is denounced, ridiculed, and condemned by orators, editors, preachers, and talkers, without stint and without discrimination, and in many cases without knowledge or reason. Nor is this all. Every thing that is

VOL. XVI.. NO. 4.—85

hearted; to make ignorance, superstition, and vice spread their dusky wings, and vanish with the vanishing twilight of man's day. So shall my sleep be sweet, and my life fruitful; so shall my blessings be as royal as my Master is divine."

---

ARTICLE V.

NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN VIEWS OF THE  
PROVINCE OF THE CHURCH.

The last time we had occasion to express ourselves in these pages on the subject of instructions from the courts of the Church to her members relative to their duty to the government, was when we took occasion to retract, in some sense, a previous utterance. In July, 1861, immediately after the breaking out of the war, we had maintained that the General Assembly, which met that spring in Philadelphia, was not only at liberty to speak of the war, but was bound to declare itself respecting such a great wrong, pregnant with so many and such sins and curses. The error of that body, we said, was not its speaking, but its speaking in the wrong way; for it condemned whom we judged it should have justified, and it justified whom we judged it should have condemned. But we insisted that it must justify and must condemn, when such appalling sin was in process of commission. Further reflection, however, carried on as best we might in the midst of all the excitements of that period, led us in the ensuing October number to modify this language, and we then confessed (using Calvin's expression regarding the doctrine of election,) how "involved and intricate" we found the question of the Church courts' power and duty in the premises.

There seems, indeed, some inherent perplexity in this subject,

arising out of the fact that behind the moral question of duty, there often lies a political one which yet may seem to the fallible court to be no question at all. The duty of obedience to government is a clear one, and every Church court is bound to enforce it, just as it must enforce the duty of children or servants towards parents or masters. But there the proper parties to whom obedience is due are always and easily known, whilst it is not always clear who is the Cæsar that has a claim on our loyalty. But it may appear clear to the members of the fallible court; and in such a case it would seem to follow that the court has a right, nay, is under obligation, to testify to the duty that flows out of this lawful authority which it thus clearly recognises. For how can the Church forbear to warn and to exhort her children to do their whole duty, as well of the second as of the first table of the law? She may not handle anything political, but here the political requires no handling. It is obvious and plain. That is all settled before she begins to consider the case. And the matter which she takes up and handles is a clear case of duty to magistrates which is not political, but ecclesiastical and moral. If, for example, the General Assembly at Philadelphia, in May, 1861, perceived nothing doubtful in the claims of the United States government upon the seceded States; if those States and their people were in its view all in rebellion against just authority justly exercised, then such rebellion being sinful, that Assembly could not but regard it a just subject of ecclesiastical censure. The case was as clear in this sense to the whole Assembly, except Dr. Hodge and those who protested with him, as any case they had ever decided. Nor did they undertake to handle any political question at all. They verily believed that they were deciding only what was ecclesiastical in the highest and truest sense. It was, in their apprehension, just as when a church member is adjudged to be guilty of adultery or theft. In such a case, the court that so judges him acts upon a previous judgment, which may, however, be incorrect, as to the lawfulness of the claim of those against whom it concludes him to be an offender. That previous judgment is upon the secular question whether those persons were indeed the one of them his wife,

or the other the owner of something stolen by him. Synods may not handle secular matters; yet, when they lie thus at the bottom of things ecclesiastical, it is very difficult, and might almost seem impossible to avoid acting upon previous conclusions respecting them.

If, on the other hand, in secession decreed already with one voice by the people of South Carolina, and lacking only the formal vote of the Convention, the Synod of South Carolina, (met at Charleston in November, 1860,) discovered a movement in defence of the sacred rights of constitutional freedom, which duty to God, to the nations, and to posterity, required should be defended from the dreadful hazards to which they seemed to be exposed—if all this appeared to the Synod to be only a moral and religious question, a question of duty on the part of the members of their churches to the State which sheltered and protected them, as well as claimed their first allegiance, then it became to them an ecclesiastical matter of the greatest moment, clearly within their province for decision and for action.

Now we say, these courts, being fallible, are always liable to err in supposing that to be only a religious and moral question which is yet a doubtful political one, outside of their proper sphere of action as courts of Jesus Christ. And this is all the more likely to take place in times of profound excitement of the public mind, when the passions of all are roused to an uncontrollable height.

It is the universal conviction, we believe, of Southern Presbyterians that the General Assembly met at Philadelphia in 1861, did thus err; for its action in the "Spring" resolutions took for granted as correct a certain political theory of the Constitution of the United States, which yet had been denied and rejected by thousands of American citizens all over the country, from the very formation of the Constitution. This doubtful theory taken for granted, a declaration of political sentiments was made, and made for the whole Church represented by the Assembly, and thus, practically, a new term of church membership and communion was enacted and set up, so far as the Assembly could do such a thing. But the record of that As-

sembly's political deliverances did not end, but only began here. In 1862, Dr. Breckinridge's paper, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority, undertook to instruct the government respecting the policy it ought to pursue towards the South; decided the question of the structure of the government as "national"; and made the Church a subject of the State by its language concerning the "loyalty of the Church" and the "loyal Presbyteries and Synods," as if the Church of Christ owed loyalty to any but to her sole Head. Again, in 1863, the Assembly, by another overwhelming majority, proclaimed to the world its union with the government, declaring, on behalf of the Church, that the United States, one and undivided, was its country; their rulers, its rulers; their government, its government; and their flag, its flag. Moreover, in accordance with this declaration about the flag, they allowed and encouraged the trustees of the church where they were meeting to raise the United States flag over the building. Again, in 1864, the Assembly, with almost entire unanimity, decided what was the object of the war on the part of the South, viz., to found an empire on the corner-stone of slavery; and also gave judgment that emancipation was necessary for the preservation of our own liberty and independence. And finally, in 1865, the Assembly set up new terms of Church fellowship and ministerial communion, applicable, however, not alike to both North and South, but only to the latter. The body placed its own opinions of the war and of slavery on a level with the rules of Christ concerning admission into his fold. Having, in 1863, declared itself the creature of the government, and so dethroned the Lord Jesus, now, in 1865, it seems disposed to make disloyalty to its new head, viz. Cæsar, the synonym of all sin.

Thus we find this Church court, through a series of years, persevering in the utterance of political decrees, and reiterating and intensifying, as the war rolled on, its testimonies of loyalty, not to Christ, but to a head upon the earth. The thing is not done once, in the heat of passion, or through inadvertency, but it is done over and over, deliberately, and of set purpose.

When we turn to the Synod of South Carolina, and undertake, after an interval of over five years, to examine the deliverance it gave in 1860, which has been so much criticised,\* we think it must strike every candid person that it was the *intention* of the Synod not to handle any thing but what was ecclesiastical. An express disclaimer is made of any right to take up political questions. And what was said by the Synod relative to secession, was spoken expressly in regard to the religious aspect of it, as that step was demanded, in the Synod's judgment, by duty to God, to our slaves, and to posterity. If the Synod erred, it was in conceiving of secession in that aspect; there certainly does not appear in the deliverance any manifestation of the intention or the claim to handle what is secular or political. Nor do the subsequent Minutes of the Synod, in the following years of the war, record any reference at all to political questions, or exhibit any handling of secular affairs.

And how has it been with the General Assembly set up in the States which seceded? At their first meeting in Augusta, they set forth articulately their views of the necessity of a "rigorous exclusion of the questions and passions of the forum from the halls of debate," and they traced to the neglect of this clear and plain duty by the Assembly at the North, the necessity which had arisen for the ecclesiastical separation. And every direct act of that Assembly, since that time, has been in accordance with the principle thus enunciated. It is true that twice in the narratives, there are expressions which some might signalize as inconsistent with the principle of rigorous exclusion above referred to. One of these cases was in 1862, at Montgomery, where the narrative speaks of the fact that our congregations were in "cordial sympathy with the people of the Confederate States" in their great struggle, and that the churches generally in our connexion "were deeply convinced that this struggle

---

\* NOTE. It is due to historical truth to state here, in contradiction of many statements made on the subject at the North, that Dr. Thornwell was not present at this meeting of Synod, and of course has no responsibility whatever for its action now under consideration.

was not alone for civil rights and property and home, but also for our religion, for the Church, for the gospel, and for existence itself," and then proceeds to say, "The Assembly desires to record, with its solemn approval, this fact of the unanimity of our people in supporting a contest to which religion as well as patriotism now summons the citizens of this country, and to implore for them the blessing of God in the course which they are now pursuing." Here was a solemn testimony encouraging Church members to persevere in what the Assembly believed to be the course of duty. These Church members were supporting the government under which they lived, and the government of their choice and affections, during a most fearful assault upon it from without, and to the Assembly at Montgomery it seemed to be proper to stimulate the zeal and hopes of their people in the arduous duty due from these people to their Cæsar. There is surely nothing political or secular here—no committing of the Church represented by the Assembly to the policy of any administration; no instructions or advice to government respecting the course it should pursue; no decision of the true nature of the government, or of any other constitutional or political questions; no declarations about the Church's loyalty to Cæsar; no adoption of any flag for the Church; and no setting up of any new terms of Church or ministerial fellowship, based upon conformity to any merely human notions about politics or other secular affairs. Upon the plain question of duty to the powers that be, this Assembly uttered itself, as it supposed was proper, in giving instructions to its flock.

The other case was in 1864, when the Assembly at Charlotte, speaking in their narrative of *the spiritual welfare* of our slaves, and the duties we owed to them, expressed its "conviction of the divine appointment of domestic servitude." Is their anything strange or unheard of in that sentiment? Is that a new idea amongst those who receive the Christian Scriptures? "We hesitate not to affirm," proceeded the Assembly, "that it is the peculiar mission of the Southern Church to conserve the institution of slavery, and to make it a blessing both to master and to slave. We could not, if we would, yield up these four millions

of immortal beings to the dictates of fanaticism, and to the menaces of military power. We distinctly recognise the inscrutable providence which brought this benighted people into our midst, and we shall feel that we have not discharged our solemn trust until we have used every effort to bring them under the saving influences of the gospel of Christ." Was there anything very bad in all this? And this is every word which the Assembly said. Slavery, as opening to us a missionary field of four millions of souls, to whom we were bound to preach the gospel, was an institution having moral and religious aspects of the most conspicuous and manifest importance. In reference to this sense of the term *alone* was the Assembly asserting anything respecting it. Fanaticism was dictating that the tie which bound us to this people and them to us—which tie constituted the peculiar obligation that rested on us, and also gave us the peculiar opportunity we enjoyed of discharging the obligation—fanaticism was dictating to us that that tie should be dissolved, and military power was threatening to enforce the dictate. The Assembly, considering that tie the institute of a beneficent, although mysterious Providence, which had brought already, and was still bringing great good out of this relation; and considering it simply and purely an utterance of infidelity thus to denounce as essentially and necessarily evil what God's word clearly sanctioned; which infidelity, however disguised, the Church of Christ was bound to oppose;—the Assembly, so considering, testified at Charlotte in her narrative, that we had no right voluntarily to cast off the obligations God had imposed on us in this relation, and yield up to every kind of injury and suffering these people committed to our care. In this aspect of their language, which is manifestly its true and proper aspect, it was no political, but a religious utterance. And in this aspect of the institution, slavery was to the Church, indeed, a sacred and solemn trust, as the Assembly represented it. God, in his providence, did commit this trust to the Southern Church, to take care of it, to "conserve" it, that is, as the dictionaries define that word, *to keep it sound and safe*, nay, to improve it, and make it more and more a blessing to both master



and slave, and never to give over our efforts to bring all these immortal beings under the saving influences of the gospel of Christ.

Besides these two utterances, made thus incidentally in two of its narratives, there is absolutely nothing in the whole proceedings of our Assembly, during all its five sessions, which at all resembles a "handling of what is not ecclesiastical."

As to the proceedings of other Church courts at the South, we have very little positive knowledge, except that a member of the Synod of Georgia, quite competent to speak, informs us that his Synod have carefully abstained, all through the war, from touching anything political or secular. We will take it upon us, however, to say that it is not probable any of these Synods or Presbyteries have erred in this manner, for it is fair to judge those from whom we have not heard directly on this subject, by the Presbyteries and Synods of South Carolina and of Georgia, about which we are well informed. And without any such specimens to judge by, we might reasonably suppose they would all alike take especial pains to avoid the very error which led them to break away from the Northern Assembly, and set up a Church of their own.

Such is the true history, so far as we are able to give it, of the conduct of Southern Synods and Assemblies touching non-ecclesiastical affairs. Dr. Hodge, in the October number of his Review, makes very strong charges against us relative to this matter. Speaking of ecclesiastical bodies which had freely expressed themselves, "Even the special advocates of the spirituality of the Church," he says, "who professed to have washed their hands of all secular concerns, have been the most pronounced in their opinions, and the most vehement and pertinacious in advocating them." (P. 627.) "Synods pledged themselves to the support of the new Confederacy, and in short the whole Church South was possessed and animated by what its members regarded the spirit of patriotism and loyalty, to the almost entire exclusion, as it appeared to their Northern brethren, of the spirit of the gospel." (Pp. 646, 647.) And in the July number, "Southern Presbyterian Synods and General

Assemblies, to the great sorrow and chagrin of their Northern brethren, have been among the foremost in the assertion of extreme Southern doctrines, and in the manifestation of sectional jealousy. \* \* \* \* Such is our poor human nature." (P. 506.) Now, we do not lay claim to any exemption for our Southern Church from the frailties of our poor human nature, but we have to acknowledge sins and imperfections enough that really do belong to us, without having fastened upon us what are not truly ours. And seeing that, so far as we know or believe, the Southern Church courts have been free from this particular fault, whilst Northern Synods, by Dr. Hodge's own showing, (October number, p. 644,) and the Northern Assembly, according to his own protest, have flagrantly erred in this particular, it does seem rather too bad that we should be held up by Dr. Hodge as shocking our immaculate Northern brethren with our excesses in this regard. This brings to our recollection how the Doctor, in his eulogy upon President Lincoln, solemnly declared that "Since the death of Christ, no such dogma stains the record of any ecclesiastical body" as the statement we quoted above, from our Assembly's narrative at Charlotte! Alas, for "our poor human nature," when a great and good and wise man, and minister, could allow himself, carried away by the fervor of his political zeal, to say of such a statement as that, "It is enough to humble the whole Christian world to hear our Presbyterian brethren of the South declaring that the great mission of the Southern Church was to conserve the system of African slavery"! (July number, p. 439.) Surely it is not worthy of Dr. Hodge to visit upon his Southern Presbyterian brethren this injustice of isolating a particular expression, and forcing upon it a meaning contrary to that of the whole passage which they wrote. And surely it is equally unworthy of him to commit so great an injustice upon truth, as to hold up to the scorn of the Christian world a paragraph expressing sentiments so sound, so true, so Christian, as this whole passage sets forth.

It is very strong language which Dr. Hodge employs. What our Assembly at Charlotte said, is not only not sound, nor true, nor Christian, but it is a stain upon our records, and a stain

unparalleled by anything in the records of any ecclesiastical body since the death of Christ! Dr. Hodge is somewhat given to this kind of *dicta*. He loves to speak for the whole Church in all ages, and by broad and sweeping assertions of this sort to crowd down opposition to his views; although it is not often that he has allowed himself to be quite so extravagant. There was a council that decreed the refusal of the cup to the laity. And there was another that established seven sacraments, auricular confession, and the apocrypha. There were councils which enacted image-worship, and denounced penalties on all who should maintain that adoration is due only to God. And there were councils which decreed the extirpation of heretics with fire and sword, and carried their decree into execution in numerous cases. All these, and others like these, were dreadful stains upon the records of the Church. But not one of these was equal to the stain which disgraces the Assembly at Charlotte, in its conservative declarations respecting the relation of master and slave: that solemn trust which was not to be voluntarily surrendered, but on the contrary was to be maintained, and also kept from degenerating into a curse, nay, to be improved and made a blessing, while in the use and employment of all the advantages it afforded, untiring efforts were to be made on behalf of those immortal beings, to bring them all under the saving influence of the gospel! Surely Dr. Hodge, the judicious, the moderate, the sober, was under some strange hallucination, under some mighty spell, when he could express himself with such inconsiderate heat!

But how stands the matter of the Christian Church's relation in all past ages to the particular subject of slavery? Is this the first and only time that the Church of Christ was ever known to assume the conservative attitude regarding slavery? Does Dr. Hodge intend to be understood, in this very strong expression, as saying that the Church of Christ has in all ages set herself in unqualified opposition to that institution? We could not have supposed it possible for Dr. Hodge to forget so completely what of course he knows so well, that the very contrary is the truth. One high authority tells us, "Slavery subsisted a

long time in the bosom of Christian society, without any great horror or irritation being expressed against it.\* Biot, in his prize essay, says "No Christian writers of the first three centuries speak of the abolition of slavery as a consequence of Christianity."† Babington, in his Hulsean prize essay, says, "It is evident that the early Christians did not consider servitude as in the abstract improper. This, indeed, scarcely requires proof, inasmuch as it has just been remarked that even martyrs possessed slaves. \* \* \* \* \* Nay, more, the infant Church gave little encouragement to manumission. (1.) The apostolic constitutions distinctly assume that a Christian will retain his slaves in his service. (2.) Ignatius tells bondmen and bondwomen not to wish to be made free at the expense (of the Church) lest they be found the servants of lust."‡ The same writer says, "It must occasion no surprise to discover that all civil and ecclesiastical authority from the time of Constantine downwards, sanction slavery."|| He says of the first two centuries of the Christian era, that "the propriety of slavery was not called in question, nor were manumissions even encouraged."§ He quotes Theodoret as "maintaining that slavery has been on the whole beneficial to man in his fallen state," and naming in connexion with Theodoret, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Basil, Ephrem the Syrian, Leo the Great, and others, he says, "Not one of the writers above mentioned even hints that slavery is unlawful or improper."\*\* Isidore of Pelusium, not giving his own counsel, but paraphrasing the apostle Paul, advises slaves if they might be made free, nevertheless to prefer slavery.†† In like manner Chrysostom says,

---

\* Guizot, *Civilis. en Europe*, Lect. vi., p. 14, ed. 1828.

† *De l'Abolition de l'Esclavage ancien en occident. Examen des Causes Principales, &c.* Paris, 1840: p. 26.

‡ Babington's *Influence of Christianity in promoting the Abolition of Slavery in Europe*. Cambridge, 1846: pp. 22, 23.

|| *Ibid.* p. 25.

§ *Ibid.* p. 179.

\*\* *Ibid.* pp. 26—29.

†† *Lib. iv. : Epist. 12.*

“On this account the blessed Paul, when giving them (slaves) the best counsel said, ‘Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather,’—that is, abide in slavery.”\* And Jerome, Theodoret, and others of the fathers, took the same view of the apostle’s meaning. Indeed, as Babington remarks, this sense, it must be confessed, suits the context admirably, not to add that the original particle commonly signifies not “if” but “although.”†

But what we have referred to so far, are, for the most part, but the sentiments of individuals in the early Church, while Dr. Hodge’s strong assertion relates to “ecclesiastical bodies.” Let us point, then, to the Council of Gangra, in the fourth century, which deposed Eustathius for “teaching slaves, under pretext of religion, to withdraw from their masters’ service,” and pronounced “anathema upon all such.” The Magdeburg Censurators say of this case, “To alienate slaves from their masters was judged to be a sin, and worthy indeed of excommunication; witness the case of Eustathius, who was deposed by the Council of Gangra, because he took away slaves from their masters.” They quote Socrates thus: “Under the pretext of piety, he also seduced slaves from their masters.”

Let us refer to the Council of Agatho, in the sixth century, which decreed that “The slaves of monasteries might never be emancipated, since it was unjust that the monks being obligated to daily toil, their slaves should enjoy ease and freedom.”

Let us refer to the Council of Jena, in the same century, which decreed the same law in the same words.

Let us refer to the Council of Seville, in the seventh century, which said “The freedmen of the Church, becoming proud, are ordered to be remanded to slavery.”

And let us refer to Canon 70, of the Excerpts of Egbert, Archbishop of York, “To an abbot or monk, it is not lawful to set free a slave of the monastery. For it is impious that one

\* Chrysostom’s *Introduct. to Homily on Philemon.*

† Babington, p. 15, note.

who has not conferred wealth upon the Church should bring her loss."

The originals of these quotations may be found in the note.\* These are a few specimens of the ancient Church's action respecting slavery. They have cost but little research, and, we are sure, could easily be multiplied. We submit that Dr. Hodge's allegation does not bear examination. He spoke too fast, and his words were over strong. He was unjust to his brethren in distorting their language, and then exaggerating the crime he had constructively fastened upon them. But he is not sustained in his loose declamatory condemnation of us by the records to which he has himself appealed. The Christian Church did indeed contribute powerfully to the abolition of slavery; but it was indirectly, and still more, it was slowly and gradually. Her position always was *conservative* on that question, as was our Assembly's at Charlotte, for which Dr. Hodge now joins with radicals in their hue and cry against us. Babington says it took *one thousand years* of the constant influence of Christianity upon society to cause strict personal slavery to *begin* to

---

\* "Si quis docet servum pietatis prætextu dominum contemnere et a ministerio recedere, et non cum benevolentia et omni honore domino suo inservire, sit anathema." Concil. Gangr. Can. 61. Binius, Tom. i., fol. 158.

"Servos ab heris suis abalienare, peccatum judicabatur et quidem excommunicatione dignum. Testatur id exemplum Eustathii, qui a synodo Gangrensi ideo quod dominis servos abstulisset, depositus est." Hist. Eccles. Magdeb. Cent. iv. Cap. vi. 260 F.

"Mancipia vero monachis donata, ab abbate non liceat manumitti. Injustum enim putamus ut monachis quotidianum rurale opus facientibus, servi eorum libertatis otio potiantur." Concil. Agath. Can. 56. Binius, Tom. iii. 716 E. See also Concil. Epaon. Can. 8. Binius, Tom. iii. 726 B.

"Liberti ecclesie superbientes ad servitium revocari jubentur." Spalensis Concilii ii. Actione 8. Hist. Eccles. Magdev. Cent. vii.

"Abbati vel monacho, monasterii servum non licet facere liberum. Impium est, ut qui res Ecclesie non contulerit, damnus inferat." Excerpt. Ecqb. Archiep. Ebor. Can. 70. (A. D. 750.) Spelm. Concil. Tom. i., p. 265.

disappear in most parts of Europe.\* One may discover the proofs of the Church's moderation upon this subject scattered every where along the track of her records. And when we ascend to the very beginning of her history, we find the inspired apostle, in 1 Tim. vi., writing about slaves and slavery in the same conservative strain, and indeed commanding Timothy to withdraw from communion with all who would not consent to "wholesome words," that is, his *conservative* teachings upon this subject. We submit now to Dr. Hodge, whether the Church of God, the Bride, the Lamb's wife, as represented by the Assembly at Charlotte, being chargeable with no other fault than expressing herself after Paul's conservative fashion on this subject, he was warranted in accusing her, before God and man, as having uttered a dogma, the like of which stains the records of no ecclesiastical body since the death of Christ.

As to the statement of Dr. Hodge, made upon "credible information," that the "pulpits of the South rang perpetually with political harangues, *i. e.* harangues designed to fire the Southern heart in the great struggle," (October number, p. 646,) we are free to say that we are satisfied Dr. Hodge has been misinformed. There may have been some political preaching by some few of our brethren during the war, but we believe there was far less of it in the case of any one of them than Dr. Hodge's information would signify. For be it remembered that all sides agree that the duty of loyalty to acknowledged government may be enforced by the pulpit as also by the Church courts. And so, if our brethren were led to hold up before their flocks the duty of obeying and supporting the *de facto* government under which they lived, and which they acknowledged to be also their government *de jure*; if they preached patience under privations, and hope in God amidst discouragements, and patriotic zeal in defending homes and firesides against the invader; if they expounded God's word as it sanctions slavery, and taught their people to commit the cause they were maintaining against a radical infidelity in humble prayer to his wise, and

---

\* Hulsean Prize Essay, p. 180.

sovereign, and merciful arbitrament; we do not see that any part or all of this can be condemned as a preaching of politics. Speaking, however, of the Southern Presbyterian pulpit in general, we feel very confident that it did not ring with any other sound than the preaching of the Cross. To what extent could this be asserted with truth of the Presbyterian pulpit at the North? Has not the good Doctor been too ready to judge the Southern pulpit, of which, personally, he could know nothing, by what he knows to be true of the Northern? We make no assertions, but we very strongly suspect that just by so much as his account of the Southern pulpit is a very gross exaggeration of what perhaps existed to some degree amongst us, by so much does it fall short of describing the fiery and bloodthirsty spirit of a large part of the Presbyterian ministry at the North. How many of them could plead that the nearest approach which they ever made to political preaching was to urge their people to defend their country from invasion, and support their government in a purely defensive war?

There was one error, however, into which we acknowledge that some Southern ministers sometimes fell, not so much in our own, as in some other churches. It can not be doubted that Southern ministers, as well as other Christians, for the most part, believed honestly and earnestly in the justice of the Southern cause. The error of some was in allowing themselves to receive the popular idea, and to encourage that idea amongst all Christian people, that God must surely bless the right. They forgot how frequently it seems good to his infinite wisdom and sovereign pleasure to suffer the righteous to be overthrown. This lesson, taught by all history, both sacred and profane, they could not receive in its application to a cause which seemed to them so pre-eminently just. Here, in their view, was a cruel, unjust, and wicked war of invasion upon free States, and they sister States also, urged on, in great part, by an infidel fanaticism. They took it for granted that the Almighty would never allow such a cause to triumph. They prayed fervently for the success of the Confederacy, and they never doubted that their prayers would be heard. They stimulated the hopes and the



zeal of their flocks in the service of their government, and in preaching, as they were authorised to preach, this plain duty, they left no room for any to question but that, faithfully performed, God must and would crown all with success. It was an error. God had revealed no promise on which faith could rest. The patriotic duty to be done, was to be done under the distinct acknowledgment that the result was with God alone, who called to that duty, but had not revealed his own plans or purposes. The consequences of this error have, we apprehend, in many instances been hurtful. Many, both in the army and at home, both male and female, both professors and non-professors of religion, have been tempted to doubts about the whole doctrine of divine providence. They know there was earnest prayer, and united prayer, and importunate prayer, and that there was also confident trust and expectation. Yet all has been disappointment inexpressibly deep and dark. The sad heart turning away from man, is tempted sorely to turn away from God also, as one who hath mocked. These are distressing consequences of a serious error, which may God mercifully forgive and overrule to his glory.

Returning to the main topic of this article, we think it appropriate just here to remark, as evincing the perplexity which appears to be inherent in the question, that Dr. Hodge now seems to make it the only fault of the Assembly of 1861, in the Spring resolutions against which he protested, that the body did not act as became the representatives of a divided constituency. He quotes (*Review for October*, p. 636,) what he had said on the Assembly's floor, viz., that he would cheerfully vote for that paper if offered in the Synod of New Jersey; and declares (p. 644) that most of the signers of his protest had voted, in their respective Synods and Presbyteries, for still more stringent resolutions, because the people there had no political question to decide, and all which the Synods and Presbyteries required the people under their charge to do, was what the word of God commanded them to do, viz., to be loyal and obedient to the government. He adds that when, in 1862, the Assembly represented the loyal or non-seceding States, it was perfectly competent for that body to

adopt the paper presented by the Rev. Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, and it was perfectly consistent in him to present that paper, although he had severely denounced the action of the preceding Assembly. "All this," says Dr. Hodge, "seems to us so perfectly plain, that it is a matter of surprise that it ever should be called into question."

Now we are well aware the distinction is just, which is drawn here betwixt the Synod and the Assembly. What in the former is only the inculcation of the duty of loyalty to the acknowledged Cæsar, may yet be in the latter the setting up of new conditions of Church fellowship where the members of the body are divided betwixt two Cæsars, whilst the Assembly undertakes to speak in the name of all who belong to it, and to put into their mouths the language of loyalty to one Cæsar. But what does not "seem to us so perfectly plain" is how Dr. H. could be willing for the Synod of New Jersey to use the language of the Spring resolutions, and declare its obligations as a Synod to perpetuate the integrity of the United States, and to uphold the Federal government in the exercise of its functions; or to profess as a Synod, its unabated loyalty to the Constitution. Nor does it seem to us perfectly plain how he can consider it altogether proper for the Assembly of 1862, although entirely homogeneous, to give instructions to government about crushing the rebellion, or to decide the question of the government's being "national," or to put the Church under the State by talking of her "loyalty."

Another illustration of the perplexity which seems to belong inherently to this question is, that we find a profound and learned writer like Dr. Hodge, after all that he has spoken and written on this subject, now maintaining (Review for October, p. 647,) that he may "heart and soul" embrace the "national cause," and advocate "national principles," not only in the pulpit and in the religious journals, but also in the Church courts; also that it is a "new theory of the Church," and a "false principle," which would deny his right to do this; and still further, that this new theory of the Church is the twin sister of secession; is as dead as secession is, and that both may be

allowed to pass into oblivion together. Dr. Hodge's zeal against what he calls the "new theory" is very lively, and leads him to make some curious statements regarding it. For example, on page 645, he says, "In opposition to the principles above stated, Dr. Thornwell, in the Assembly of 1859, presented a new theory"; and on the next page, that this new doctrine as to the office of the Church was originated to keep slavery out of the Assembly, and was so fiercely advocated after the war began, to keep the Church from throwing herself on the side of the government and the Union. Moreover, as above intimated, he ascribes this new theory to Southern men, and says it would be very difficult to find a single advocate of it who is not a pro-slavery man, and an ardent sympathiser with the South. But if the reader will turn to the *Princeton Review* for 1848, pp. 424-6, he will find recorded there a full and articulate statement of this "new theory" as adopted by the General Assembly of that day, and as the *Review* also tells us, "on motion of Dr. Krebs, unanimously." Nay, the reader need only turn to his Confession of Faith, chap. xxxi., sec. 4, and he will find the new theory, so called, there written down by our fathers briefly, but with full and complete distinctness and force.

This "new theory" of Dr. Thornwell's, as the *Princeton Review* itself records his remarks spoken in the General Assembly at Indianapolis in 1859, was "one upon which he had long acted and deemed of immense importance. It was that the Church of God is exclusively a spiritual organisation. Her mission was to promote the glory of God, and the salvation of men. She had nothing to do with the voluntary associations of men for various civil and social purposes that were outside of her pale. Ever since he had been a member of the Church he had believed this, and contended for this, and had steadily resisted associating this Church with outside organisations. The Lord Jesus Christ had never given his Church a commission to be identified with them. She had no mission to become entangled with the kingdoms and the policy of this world. The question of colonization is a question of worldly policy. It is a question upon the merits of which he wished not to speak, but no man

will say that Jesus Christ has given to his ministry a commission to attend to the colonization of races, or to the arrest of the slave trade, or to the mere physical comforts of man. It is not the business of the *Church* to build asylums for the insane and blind. Her mission is to bring men to the cross—to reconcile them to God through the blood of the Lamb—to imbue them with the spirit of the Divine Master, and then send them forth to perform their social duties—to manage society and perform the functions that pertain to their social and civil relations. The Church has no right, no authority to league herself with any of the institutions of the State, or such as have for their object mere 'secular enterprises. 'Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,' but let the Church of God lend her energies directly to the accomplishment of her own high and glorious mission. He was willing that Church members should try to do good through any agencies that their consciences may approve, but he wished the Church, as such, to keep herself to her specific work. As the Church of Christ, he desired her to know neither rich nor poor, high nor low, bond nor free, to know neither east nor west, north nor south. 'Let the dead bury their dead,' was the mandate of our Lord to his Church, and the very moment you undertake to implicate this Church with any of the powers of the earth, you endanger her efficiency. At this very General Assembly, we have declined identifying ourselves even with the American Presbyterian Historical Society. We had voted it out. We had voted out the Temperance societies, and he would have the Assembly vote out all the societies of this world, and keep to her proper sphere, and let the societies keep to theirs, and do good in their own way, without asking the Church's co-operation. It is this principle that he deemed absolutely indispensable to the Church's purity and success in her peculiar mission." Dr. Thornwell proceeded to describe the glorious spectacle which our Church was at that hour presenting to the country and to the world. She was "standing pre-eminent, the great conservative power of this land, the great bond of union, and witness for the truth, because the only voice she uttered was the word of God. Sir, the salt that is to save

this country is the Church of Christ—a Church that does not mix up with any political party, or any issues aside from her direct mission. Like the ocean, she purifies even by her agitation, whilst acting within her bounds and banks. But like the ocean, too, if she break beyond them, nothing can be more destructive or desolating. Let the Church work on at the very foundations of moral and spiritual influences, which are the foundations of society. Let her do her appropriate and appointed work, and she will sanctify the world. But let her go out of her sphere, and affect interference with the temporalities of men, and she will fail. Whenever she forgets that her mission is to bring men to the cross and to salvation, she comes down from her high vantage ground. Whenever the Church speaks at all, she must speak in the name of the Lord, and she must speak what the Lord bids her.” “Show me,” said he, “that the Lord Jesus Christ has commanded the Church to engage in the business of transferring men from one place to another, and I will yield and unite in the effort. But until you convince me that this is the business that the Head of the Church hath committed to her, I must earnestly resist any proposal to identify her with such business.”

Such was this “new theory,” *so-called*, of the Church’s sphere which Dr. Thornwell propounded in the Assembly at Indianapolis. Of course, it is manifest that when he speaks of “the Church,” he means the Church courts. The doctrine is, (as expressed by the General Assembly of 1848,) that these courts were “ordained by God for spiritual purposes, and must not be made subsidiary to the schemes of any associations founded in the human will, and liable to all its changes and caprices. These societies must make their appeal, not to Church courts, but to Church members.”

Now, this clear and just statement of the true nature and functions of the Church, Dr. Hodge asserts to be a new theory. He pays too high a compliment to secession and the Southern mind, when he declares it to be the twin sister of the one, and the child of the other. It is the offspring of eternal truth, the revelation of God in his holy word. Would God that the Church

to which Dr. Thornwell addressed such words of wisdom and of truth, had held fast by these ancient moorings! Would God that his prophetic warnings to her had not been so fully and so sadly realised!

Dr. Hodge makes bold to assert that the "new theory" is "so palpably unsound and untenable, that it was rejected by a unanimous vote in the Assembly of 1860"—the very first one after that into which Dr. Thornwell had succeeded in introducing his "new and startling doctrine." Let the reader compare with this allegation, the official record of the Assembly's action referred to. (See p. 44, Minutes for 1860.) It is as follows:

"Overture No. 32, several memorials and overtures referred to the Committee relating to Colonization, Temperance, the Slave Trade, &c.

"The Committee recommend the adoption of the following resolution, viz.:

"*Resolved*, That while the General Assembly, on the one hand, disclaim all right to interfere in secular matters; and on the other, assert the right and duty of the Church, as God's witness on earth, to bear her testimony in favor of truth and holiness, and against all false doctrines and sin, wherever professed or committed, yet in view of the often repeated action of the Assembly in reference to the subjects above referred to, it is inexpedient to take any further action in relation thereto. Adopted unanimously." Here the Assembly "votes out" as Dr. Thornwell expressed it, all secular affairs. This is one part of the "new theory." Here also, the Assembly asserts its duty and right to be God's witness on earth to testify for all his truth, and against all false doctrine, for all holiness and against all sin. This was the other part of the "new theory." So that here we have the whole of it, set forth in plain words. Yet Dr. Hodge has the hardihood to assert that this was "a unanimous rejection of the new theory as palpably unsound and untenable." Because the Assembly, (inconsistently perhaps,) refers in a general way to its past deliverances as harmonious and sufficient, Dr. Hodge ventures to declare roundly that they rejected as "palpably

unsound and untenable" a doctrine articulately expressed in both parts of the very overture they adopted.

This is very similar to his other allegation, that the doctrine of the Church's spiritual nature was held and stated by Dr. Thornwell in such a "restricted" sense as to prevent her from testifying against all sin, and for all righteousness. (Review, October, p. 645.) The reader can judge for himself how far restricted was the sense Dr. Thornwell attached to the term *spiritual* on the occasion of his speech at Indianapolis. Were it needful, we could easily prove, from his other writings, that Dr. Hodge's representations on this point are altogether unjust. Dr. Thornwell's doctrine was none other than what Dr. Hodge himself frequently declares, but the latter is not at all times consistent with his own positions.\* He has no fixed principles upon the

---

\*NOTE.—For example, Dr. Hodge in one place says :

"The limits assigned to the power of Church courts are all determined, directly or indirectly, by the word of God. Deriving all their authority from that source, they can rightly claim nothing but what is therein granted. As they are Church courts, their authority is confined to the Church. It does not extend to those that are without. It follows, also, from the same premises, that being Church courts, they must be confined in their jurisdiction to Church matters. They have nothing to do with matters of commerce, agriculture, or the fine arts, nor with the affairs of the State. They can only expound and apply the word of God to matters of truth and duty, and to the reforming of abuses, or to the discipline of offences. They may make orders for the conduct of public worship, and the administration of God's house.

"With regard to the proper sphere of the Church's action, we have the plain and easily applicable rule derived from the nature of the Church, and the design of its institution. It is the company of God's professing people, together with their children. It was instituted to teach, maintain, and propagate the truth. Every thing, therefore, which is without the sphere of the divine teaching, is foreign to the Church. Every thing to which that teaching applies, is within her legitimate cognizance. Whatever may be proved to be false by the word of God, the Church is bound to denounce as error. Whatever the Scriptures declare to be truth, the Church is called upon to urge on the faith of all who can hear her voice. And in like manner, she is authorised and bound to press upon the consciences of men, whatever the law of God pronounces to be morally right, and to warn them against whatever the same authority declares to be morally wrong." Review for October, pp. 642-3.

Here Dr. Hodge himself very fully and clearly enunciates the "new theory." But a few pages afterwards, excited by his zeal against the "originators and advocates" of this same new theory, he declares they had been "forced to abandon it," for Dr. Thornwell himself, and the pulpits of the South generally, had preached politics, and the Southern Church papers

subject, but veers about with the varying winds which blow upon him. His position has been one of great difficulty, having, as he once wrote to a Southern friend, "an audience at the North also, to please." To speak to two different and differing congregations, one before, and the other behind a man, gathered together at the same time, and yet address both acceptably, is indeed a hard task; and it has exceeded all Dr. Hodge's acknowledged powers. We believe he will be held responsible, in great part, by posterity, for the Church's swinging loose from her former safe and sure ground. His celebrated "Assault upon the South, and Defence of Anti-slavery and Abolitionism," as Dr. C. C. Jones well termed it, published first in his Review for January, 1861, and afterwards distributed by thousands of copies in pamphlet form, had all the importance which its author claims for it, (Review for October, pp. 628-9,) in dividing both the Church and the country. He has, time and again, of late years, sowed plentifully of the seeds of radicalism, and already begins to reap his harvest.\*

---

and Synods had erred in the same way. Then, (forgetting in his great earnestness, what he had written a few pages before,) he proceeds:

"We do not blame those brethren for violating a false principle, and disregarding their own erroneous theory, but we protest against their condemning in others what they justify in themselves. If they may preach and write to prove that slavery is a 'divine institution,' we may endeavor to prove that it is a 'low state of civilisation,' from which the slaves should be elevated and delivered as soon as possible. If they may, heart and soul, embrace the Southern cause, and advocate Southern principles in the pulpit, in Church courts, and in the religious journals, we may do the same for the national cause and national principles. There is, however, no room for debate on this subject. This new theory of the Church is as practically dead, (except for the purpose of faction,) as is the theory of secession, and both, as Siamese twins, may be allowed to pass into oblivion together."

\* NOTE.—We append here, by way of note, for the gratification of our readers, another comprehensive and beautiful statement of the doctrine of the province of the Church, as held by Dr. Thornwell, taken from a report which he presented to his own Synod in November 1851. A comparison may thus be made conveniently with Dr. Hodge's statement of it in part first (but not part second) of the preceding note, and the complete identity of the two statements discovered.

"What, then, is the Church? It is not, as we fear too many are disposed to regard it, a moral institute of universal good, whose business it is to wage war upon every form of human ill, whether social, civil, political, or moral,



We have freely criticised Dr. Hodge's October article. He made very free with us, Southern men and Southern Presbyterians, our opinions, conduct, situation, prospects; very free with one of us, especially, who, though dead, yet lives and speaks, whose immortal teachings can never die, and whose name and memory are all the dearer to us, for the injustice and the unkindness which he has received from the Northern Presbyterian Assembly, and the Northern Presbyterian press. But, at the same time, this October article of Dr. Hodge, on some points, attracts us strongly to him. We agree very cordially with much that he says upon his fifth topic. The contents of pp. 642-3, and also of pp. 647-651, we very heartily and earnestly approve. And so we also cordially accept what he declares about the union of the churches, pp. 651-53. But, besides these points of agreement betwixt us, the general character of

---

and to patronise every expedient which a romantic benevolence may suggest as likely to contribute to human comfort, or to mitigate the inconveniences of life. We freely grant, and sincerely rejoice in the truth, that the healthful operations of the Church, in its own appropriate sphere, react upon all the interests of man, and contribute to the progress and prosperity of society; but we are far from admitting, either that it is the purpose of God that, under the present dispensation of religion, all ill shall be banished from this sublunary state, and earth be converted into a paradise, or that the proper end of the Church is the direct promotion of universal good. It has no commission to construct society afresh, to adjust its elements in different proportions, to rearrange the distribution of its classes, or to change the forms of its political constitutions. The noble schemes of philanthropy which have distinguished Christian nations; their magnificent foundations for the poor, the maimed and the blind; the efforts of the wise and good to mitigate human misery, and to temper justice with mercy in the penal visitations of the law; the various associations that have been formed to check and abate particular forms of evil, have all been quickened into life by the spirit of Christianity. But still, it is not the distinctive province of the Church to build asylums for the needy or insane; to organise societies for the improvement of the penal code, or for arresting the progress of intemperance, gambling, or lust. The problems which the anomalies of our fallen state are continually forcing on philanthropy, the Church has no right directly to solve. She must leave them to the providence of God, and to human wisdom, sanctified and guided by the spiritual influences which it is her glory to foster and cherish. The Church is a very peculiar society—voluntary in the sense that all its members become so, not by constraint, but willingly; but not in the sense that its doctrines, discipline, and order are the creatures of the human will, deriving their authority and obligation from the consent of its members. On the contrary, it has a fixed and unalterable constitution; and that constitution is the word of God. It is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is enthroned in it as a sovereign.

the article is such as excites our sympathy. He is on trial by his own brethren. He has been "widely and severely censured," (p. 656,) and this article constitutes his apology and defence. Dr. Hodge has enemies in his own Church, (also the most bitter foes we have,) who have even threatened his ejection from the chair he has filled so long and so ably, and who would like to destroy his Review. It pains us to hear him compare the latter to a "ball and chain" which he carries, and the "discontinuance of which would be to him a great relief." Notwithstanding many misconceptions and misrepresentations of us, his article nevertheless contains, as does also his July number, many kind expressions towards the South. Dr. Hodge still differs with us strongly, and deals out unstintedly his condemnation of our course, and yet the general impression which these articles make upon our mind is, that his heart still pulsates with a brother's

---

It can hear no voice but his; obey no commands but his; pursue no ends but his. Its officers are his servants, bound to execute only his will. Its doctrines are his teachings, which he, as a prophet, has given from God; its discipline his law, which he, as king, has ordained. The power of the Church, accordingly, is only ministerial, and declarative. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is her rule of faith and practice. She can announce what it teaches; enjoin what it commands; prohibit what it condemns, and enforce her testimonies by spiritual sanctions. Beyond the Bible she can never go, and apart from the Bible she can never speak. To the law and to the testimony, and to them alone, she must always appeal; and when they are silent, it is her duty to put her hand upon her lips."

We add to the above, another statement of this "new theory," taken from a report presented to his Synod in 1861, ten years after the foregoing.

"This Synod is clear that the provinces of Church and State are entirely distinct, and that the Church as much transcends its sphere in pronouncing upon questions political, as the State transcends its sphere in dealing with matters ecclesiastical. The Church, it is true, is to declare and enforce revealed truth, and, among other duties, she is to enjoin obedience to the powers that be. But when the question arises, who and what those powers are, and how far obedience must be carried, the Church must remit the answer to the civil tribunals of the land, and to the dictates of the individual conscience. She has no commission from her Lord to declare what form of government any people shall adopt, how long they shall continue to maintain it, or under what circumstances they shall change it. Her members, as citizens, may and should take an active part in all discussions of the kind; but her courts, as authoritative tribunals of Christ, must be as silent as their Master. General principles she may, and must announce, the eternal principles of the moral law; but their concrete application to political constitutions and political changes, does not fall within the limits of her power."

love. We can truly say that we reciprocate his kind feelings, whilst we cannot shut our eyes to many things in these articles which we consider inconsistent and erroneous.

In drawing to a close, we shall be pardoned for making two short digressions from our main topic. Dr. Hodge tells us, p. 639, that as long ago as 1836, and in the years subsequent, he expressed the opinion that sudden and general emancipation would be disastrous to the blacks as well as to the whites. On p. 657, he tells us that as slavery was the cause of "the rebellion," and the South constantly refused reasonable terms, the President was right in emancipating all slaves within military lines, and the government right in demanding the entire and final abolition of slavery. This seems to us to signify that he accepts a fatal disaster for the blacks, in order to secure the punishment of the "rebellious" whites. And yet, if we mistake not, the chief ground of the eulogy of President Lincoln, published by Dr. Hodge, in his Review for July, (after having been delivered, as we understand, from several Presbyterian pulpits by him,) was the unspeakable boon to humanity of which he was the author in this very deed. As for ourselves, we retain all our former opinions respecting slavery. It was a kindly relation on both sides. It was a good institution, although some abuses were connected with it which demanded reformation, and would have been reformed had the South been let alone of her persecutors. But, whatever be our judgment of slavery, and whatever we may think of emancipation, we accept the latter as a fact accomplished. Slavery was an anxious trust to Southern Christians. Most conscientiously we studied its duties, and most earnestly we sought to solve the problem of its future. It occupied ourselves personally as no other question did for thirty years and more. Our Northern brethren claim a commission from the Almighty to solve the great problem, and they accordingly have abolished the institution. We cannot dispute their claim, nor are we so disposed. They have taken upon them a responsibility which, in some important respects, rids us of ours. The freedman is robbed of his old confidences and affections. His "best friends" now are strangers from a distance, who seek, at

least many of them, to set him against those he once confided in. Alas for him, neither for this world, nor for that which is to come, can his former master be, for the present, of much service to the freedman. It is a great work the North has assumed to do. Let them gird themselves for the mighty task, for to God must they answer it, if they fail in its accomplishment. In all sincerity we can and do pray that, in all they undertake for him which is for his real good, they may succeed and not fail. We believe this to be the sentiment of the Christian South. We still love the negro. He had powerful claims upon us before the war; his conduct all through that struggle, and even up to the present time, notwithstanding the many temptations to which he has been, and still is exposed, has added greatly to their force.

In like manner, we accept the failure of secession, as manifestly providential. The overthrow of that just cause made evident not so much the prowess of its foes, nor even their prodigiously superior resources, as it did the direct hand of the Almighty. Yes! the hand of God, gracious though heavy, is upon the South for her discipline. Dr. Hodge says, in his article on President Lincoln, p. 455, that the South is "humbled in her own eyes." Well, if the South were but humbled under God's mighty hand, in the true sense of the expression, we might well thank the Lord for his grace so given. And well may the North tremble, if all that has occurred has taught her only pride and self-confidence, censoriousness and severity towards brethren. But whatever may be true on this subject, it is not true that the South is ashamed of the war, or penitent for her noble, though unavailing, defence of constitutional liberty.

We close this article by reiterating our cordial acceptance of what Dr. Hodge says respecting the reunion of the Churches upon the pages indicated above. Schism being a sinful thing, we are bound to desire ecclesiastical reconstruction, if it can be consistently and properly acquired. We re-echo, with deep solemnity of feeling, Dr. Hodge's words, "If reunion be prevented merely by alienation of feeling, it will be a poor excuse in the day of judgment to have refused fellowship with Chris-

tian brethren, because of hatred towards them." In all sincerity we aver that this is not our case. We were forced to part from our brethren by their forsaking the old and right way of keeping the Church separate from the State, and we are obliged to continue apart, because more and more this grievous error has been developed amongst them. But we do not hate them. Their errors are hateful to us, but not their persons. Besides this difficulty in the way of reunion, there are some others. One is their attitude on the subject of slavery—a rationalistic and practically infidel attitude,—for they have set up a morality better than the Bible's, and are impugning the perfectness of Christ's conduct and doctrine. They claim to be more righteous than God, and wiser than his word. Still another is the relation they persist in maintaining between the Church and other organisations appointed to act in her stead. They seem wedded to a denial of the Church's right and duty to do, herself, her own Master's work. God's good providence has delivered our Church from this thralldom. We should sin, were we not to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. Upon all these three important matters we seem to be called, as a Church, to give a testimony. We must stand in our lot, and bear witness to the truth, as it has been committed to us.