

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 3.

JULY, MDCCCLXXI.

ARTICLE I.

TESTIMONY AND FAITH.

In most of the discourses upon faith, the credence yielded to ordinary testimony, founded upon the competence and credibility of the witness, is presented as a complete analogy to the heavenly grace. So that the faith of the believer is reduced to the acceptance of the balance of probabilities. This form of statement is the more taking, because the testimony upon which the Christian relies is the testimony of God, who is infinite in knowledge and in truth. As God knows all things, he cannot be mistaken concerning the facts revealed. As it is impossible for God to lie, the revelation stands upon an impregnable foundation. Therefore, the popular definition of faith is, the act of "taking God at his word."

Testimony presented by God himself concerning things relating primarily to God, and things that belong to his kingdom, is necessarily the highest form of witness-bearing of which the human mind can conceive. But the inevitable objection of unbelievers demands the proof that God has spoken at all, and then an accurate statement of his utterances upon each separate doctrine of the saints. Nor does this demand appear unreasonable; for each believer has his doubts upon these two points

VOL. XXII., NO. 3.—1.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PRESBYTERIAN REUNION, NORTH.

Presbyterian Reunion: A Memorial Volume. 1837-1871.
 Ὅτι εἰς ἄρτος, ἐν σώμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἴσμεν· οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου
 μετέχομεν.—1 Cor. x. 17. New York: De Witt C. Lent & Com-
 pany, 451 Broome Street. 1870. pp. 564. 8vo.

It is reasonable to suppose that the volume which furnishes a title to this article must needs contain the fullest and most flattering history of the Presbyterian Reunion consummated in Philadelphia last year. The book consists of eight chapters and an appendix. No less than twelve distinguished authors, eleven of whom are Doctors of Divinity, have contributed to its pages. The first and second chapters are devoted to an historical review of the two branches, from 1837 to the date of Reunion, the one by an Old School and the other by a New School writer, and two more to biographical sketches of ministers in both branches who have departed this life since the separation thirty-four years ago. The rest of the volume, excepting the final chapter, professes to review the entire history of the Reunion, and is of course the most important part of the work, unless the closing chapter which treats of the Future of the Unified Church, may claim preëminence. The style in which the work is put forth is, in most respects, worthy of high commendation. Good paper, plain type, broad margins, and well-executed illustrations, are among the externals; and the orderly arrangement of topics, as well as the general *animus* manifested in their treatment, are certainly praiseworthy.

The exceptions taken relate to certain exhibitions of the *sensational* which appear in various portions of the volume. The book smacks not a little of the *spread-eagle* spirit. Some indefinite, yet not extremely faint, indications would suggest to any British or any Southern reader that the work emanates from the same section which produces *Harper's Weekly*. Our fathers of the old Synod could not possibly have got up a production with

such *tone and air*. The Presbyterian Church before 1837 was not up to such sort of finish as this memorial wears. It is a clear and strong sign of the kind and degree of the progress made since that now-to-be-forgotten period. Of course, however, this is all as it must be, and must be expected to be. Our period is that of American Presbyterianism as it stands distinguished from the Scotch or Scotch-Irish, or it might be better said, from that of Gillespie and Rutherford. The volume is altogether characteristic of the reunited Church. It suits that body every way. Admitting the reunion itself to be a good thing, it might safely be said that this memorial volume was a good work well done. On the other hand, if the repudiation of the testimony of 1837, which was the precise thing effected by the Reunion, was an act of questionable propriety—then it may be said that the work now under examination contains about all that can be said in its defence.

Proceeding upon this last-mentioned ground, it is proper to observe that our attitude regarding the question is peculiar. We do not occupy precisely the position of any other outsiders. As an ecclesiastical organisation we have two experiences which belong to no other body of Christians. In the first place, we were compelled to go out from the pale of the big church, when it was smaller; and secondly, we were invited back since it attained its growth, and we declined the invitation. As we were once members of the family, but lost the relationship, and then refused to be endowed with it again, there must be some reasons why we stand just where and just as we are; but whatever these may be, the fact abides that we now form a different household.

Nevertheless, we may not deny the kinship subsisting betwixt us. It is not possible for the Northern Presbyterian Church to prosper without gladdening the hearts of all Christians in our separated body. It is not possible for that Church to go astray in any essential particular without inflicting a wound upon us. It were a great mistake on our side to harbor resentful feelings against them. It were a greater error on theirs to suspect us of such folly. While, therefore, we may use great plainness of speech in the review of their later history, we may not forget

the courtesy due to them and becoming in ourselves, nor the family relationship as betwixt Presbyterians, nor the brotherhood of the gospel.

I. The first point claiming attention has already been indicated, to wit, That the Reunion of the separated Churches is a precise denial of the testimony of 1837.

As this statement is in the very teeth of the initial chapter of the Reunion volume written by Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., it will be necessary to refer for proofs to the official history of the event as recorded in chapters V., VI., and VII. The discrepancy between these affirming testimonies and the earnest denial of Dr. Miller, can be accounted for upon several grounds, of which it will be sufficient to refer to a single one, and that is the innate repugnance which every sound Old School theologian must feel at the *appearance* of retreat from the vantage ground held by this branch since 1837.

Let it be observed now that Dr. Miller says: "Some have supposed a relaxation of doctrinal strictness in the Old School body, of which, however, there has not been the slightest evidence. . . . The very reverse is too apparent to be questioned." Pp. 47, 48.

A beginning may be made of proof from this memorial volume of the painful fact which Dr. Miller would be glad to hide from his own eyes, by pointing to pp. 249-252, where are recorded the first references, so far as appears by the Old School body, to "the two General Assemblies," and "the two Branches." In 1837 these Synods and Presbyteries are *disowned*, but in 1866 they have come to be "the other Branch," and the Old School then formally expresses its "earnest desire for Reunion," and denounces "controversies and division and strife." Now, what controversy is signalized here except precisely that betwixt the Old and the New School? And what force has the whole deliverance of the Old School Assembly at St. Louis in 1866 except to cast a slur upon the testimony for sound doctrine and Presbyterian order made in 1837?

Proof the second will be found recorded on pp. 257-269, where appear the terms of Reunion as proposed by the Joint

Committee, and substantially adopted by the Old School as well as the New. In these terms the Old School are made to acknowledge that the New *had ever held* the system of doctrine and the Presbyterian order of the standards. Moreover, the ministers of the two Branches are acknowledged as all of the same standing, and the two are made to be historically one Church. What can be conceived of more precisely in denial of the testimony of 1837?

Upon this occasion a minority of 64 ask for more definite statements of the doctrinal basis for the Reunion, but a majority of 152 vote it down, and the terms are sent forth for the popular consideration and acceptance.

The history of the Smith and Gurley amendments are well told by Dr. Adams (pp. 265-269); the one intended (he says) as "a kind and suitable balance" to the other; the former from a New School man to satisfy the orthodox demands of the Old School; the latter from an Old School man, designed to secure the liberty contended for by the New School. As for the latter, that very liberty it gave was a dishonor to the glorious testimony of 1837. As for the former, Dr. Adams makes quite too much of it considered as an evidence of New School orthodoxy. Manifestly, as he says himself, the Convention was "taken by surprise" when Prof. Smith offered it, (p. 265,) and some wished him to withdraw it, yet when he refused, only two men voted against what a leader so much trusted had proposed and desired. And afterwards all were content to let it stand as arranged.

And yet these famous amendments, so nicely balancing each other, failed to satisfy the Old School. Dr. Jacobus describes, on pp. 325, 326, the effort "to break the force of this basis after it was passed upon." A declaration was, in fact, unanimously adopted "that the doctrinal article of the basis . . . is not to be interpreted as giving license to the propagation of doctrines which have been condemned by either Assembly, nor to permit any Presbytery in the United Church to license or ordain to the work of the ministry any candidate who maintains any form of doctrine condemned by either Assembly." And this declaration was telegraphed to the other Branch at Harris-

burg, and a special delegation sent on to request that both the Smith and Gurley amendments might be stricken out of the basis. It reached Harrisburg, however, too late. But it cannot be denied that at that stage of the affair the Old School held the Smith guaranty of New School orthodoxy as dearly bought with the Gurley license to New School heterodoxy. Not yet had the tide of popular feeling carried the old ship clean over all the break-waters set up in 1837.

Proof the third is written down on pp. 285-287. There was a protest in the Old School Assembly of 1868 against the plan of union, the protesters averring that the New School held certain Pelagian and Arminian tenets to be consistent with the Calvinism of the Confession of Faith—in other words, that the New School acknowledged the Westminster symbols, but yet held that these tenets did not contradict those symbols.

Now, the proof we seek is to be found in various parts of the answer to this protest. The first ground taken in the answer is, not as one would expect, a *denial* of the fact alleged, but the statement that such an allegation *could not be* correct, as it would be self-stultifying to the New School. There never was a case, the answer says, in which a Church adopted a symbol of faith, and at the same time claimed exactly the contrary type of doctrine to be compatible with that symbol. We read Church history with different spectacles from those here made use of by Prof. Shedd, the author of this statement. But the answer proceeds, in the second place, to give the denial of the fact. And let our readers observe the form of this denial. "These very errors . . . have already been distinctly repudiated by them." This is coming to the point. But when was the repudiation made? In the year 1837 at the Auburn Convention!! Here, then, is the proof of our position that the Reunion of 1869 is against the testimony of 1837. The Old School of 1837 did not accept the Convention at Auburn as justly representing the New School body, or their declaration as satisfactory evidence that New School theology repudiates all Arminian and Pelagian errors and interpretations. But the men who bring about the Reunion in 1869 are glad to accept

this Auburn declaration of 1837, because they could get no other; and so they plead that old document to show that New School theology does not allow Arminian or Pelagian interpretations of the standards! And now, why was there not some more recent manifesto of the New School body to appeal to? Because that body chose to stand upon its dignity, having no declaration to make, whilst the other body *dared not ask* for any manifesto lest it should give offence. Is any other proof requisite to show how different was the spirit of the Old School of 1869 from that of their fathers in 1837?

Let the readers of this volume turn to page 100 and see what Dr. Stearns, who writes the Historical Review for the New School, has to say of their theology. He claims, first, that they have always been orthodox and held the standards pure and simple. He adds: "If any ask for a more explicit exposition of the particular *phase* of Calvinistic doctrine which should be distinguished as 'NEW SCHOOL THEOLOGY,' they will find none so *likely* to be accepted as such by the *larger number*, as that" of the Auburn Convention. The italics and capitals are his, and he proceeds to say, "But, in truth, there is no such phase of theology," and to insist that they take the standards "just as they are." "Further than that," he adds, "they give and claim from others *no pledges*; they give and take reasonable *liberty*." Now, this was all the Old School of 1870 could get—this acceptance of the standards, *without a sense*, by their New School allies; and truly they appear to be "thankful," in the circumstances, "for small favors."

It is worthy to be noticed how this same answer to the protest disposes of the allegation therein made that the United Church would be responsible for the unsound and heretical publications of the New School Committee. The reply is that the United Church will only be responsible for the new catalogue of publications which itself shall issue! No matter, it would seem, what false doctrines have been published since 1837 by the New School, (and they are not a little or a few,) the Old School may ally herself with them for the future in all safety, seeing that the new Board of Publication would hereafter see to publishing

only sound doctrine! This from Old School Presbyterians of 1869 is certainly quite different language from what our fathers held in 1837. But, looking at the names of the Committee, we discover a sufficient explanation of the difference, in that three of the five names are of New England men who have come into the Old School Church, but surely were not of her.

Proof the fourth shall be taken from the plan of Reunion as it was actually adopted, (see pp. 310-313,) where "Each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body," was the final form rejoiced in, and glorified so much by both churches, in which, at last, the full and complete denial of the testimony of 1837 was made by the Old School of 1869. If any inquire on what new ground they acknowledge the other body as sound and orthodox, no answer whatever can be given. The New School body did nothing to authorise this change of attitude by the Old Church. Individual men of the New School said, "Our Church is sound;" but the Church herself was silent. Dr. Stearns officially set forth the position thus: "*We give no pledges, and we claim liberty.*" Thus, the Old School, in the end, got no pledges of any particular sense of the Confession; but the New School will of course have their darling liberty. Dr. Crosby, for example, who is one of them, exercises this liberty by vacating the Atonement and making the Divine Nature dormant in our Saviour. Who of his brethren in the United Church has lifted one earnest voice of remonstrance or of protest? Dr. Skinner's article in the *Princeton Repertory* cannot be said to be either a remonstrance or a protest, and, if either, was far from being *earnest*.

Proof the fifth is from Dr. Jacobus's official history of the Assemblies of 1869, p. 320, where he says: "According as acknowledged differences are maximized or minimized must be the judgment in the case before us." He insinuates that his Old School fathers in 1837 *maximized* the differences, but he does not and cannot deny that he and his brethren in 1869, on the contrary, have *minimized* them. The terms are happily chosen, and we accept them cordially—those differences between new and old theology, which 1837 held to be *very great*, 1869 has,

in its wisdom, construed as *exceedingly small*, and so our point is proved out of the mouth of Dr. Jacobus, Moderator of the Old School Assembly, himself.

A sixth proof may be brought from Dr. Jacobus's response to the New School delegates, recorded on page 345, where he officially calls those *branches of the same vine* whom the Old School in 1837 cut off as not such; and where, again, he officially calls those *twin brothers* whom the Old School then declared otherwise. Moreover, he speaks of that separation as based upon mere "alienation of feeling;" whereas the Old School testimony then based it, and truly based it, on differences of doctrine. Still further, he describes the New School claim to the birth-right as fully equal to that of the Old School, and says, with great significance, that he is unable to determine "which is Jacob and which is Esau." Again, on page 381, he describes the Old School during their separation from the New, and by reason of it, as resembling the man with the withered arm; and on page 386 he compares the influences which were separating Old and New School as symbolised in the Monongahela River, which means the *river of crumbling banks*. It was "the crumbling banks of prejudice and alienation and suspicion and strife *on both sides* which muddied the current," but this muddy river and the Alleghany, or *river of clear morning waters*, should soon join and flow together. Now, the men of 1837, and their testimony, are grievously dishonored by this language.

The seventh proof is in Dr. Musgrave's address at the consummation of the Reunion, recorded on page 388. He contrasted distinctly 1869 with 1837, ascribing the separation of the one to God's "permissive will," but the Reunion of the other to his "gracious and efficacious will!" The implication is evidently that the separation was evil and wicked and God had no direct hand in it. Thus is the point in hand directly established by this witness.

And then we find an eighth proof on pp. 397-400, in what fell from the lips of the Honorables William Strong and Charles D. Drake and William E. Dodge, (two of them eminent ruling elders of the New School,) whose names and deeds are well known in the

South, but not alike unfavorably. The first said: "No man can any more say of himself 'I am an Old School Presbyterian,'" which means, of course, that the testimony of 1837 is dead and buried. And no doubt what Judge Strong said is literally true so far as this reunion can make it so. The second said, somewhat in the spread-eagle vein: "In a little time this Reunited Church . . . will be the grand time-piece of the Christian religion in the whole world," with more of the same sort which suits the Reunited Church, but would never have been accepted by the Old School Church of 1837. And then good Mr. Dodge, for whom we have a sincere respect, said: "We must forget Old School and New School." With this quotation we close our proofs that the Reunion of 1869 is in precise denial of the testimony of 1837. That which our fathers held up as a testimony for the truth of God worthy to be held in everlasting remembrance, that the Reunited Church of 1869 treads under foot as fit only to be forgotten.

Recurring again to Dr. Miller's denial of what it has now been attempted to prove, it is worthy of notice how feebly he maintains his ground. He bears a very honored name, and we feel sure that he inherits from both parents a fair and candid mind. The moderation of his representations in proof of his denial makes this manifest. All he pretends to make good is, that no Assembly and no considerable number of the Presbyteries formally *proposed* or *designed* a relaxation of doctrinal strictness! Then, as to the supposed return of the New School back to the old paths, mark the faintness of Dr. Miller's assertions: "From every quarter had come to the Old School multiplied assurances, in most influential forms, that the New School, not as to every individual, but as a Church, had become, and were becoming, *more orthodox than formerly*; nay, were now as strictly conformed to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms as the Old School themselves. Such assurances were given *in the Joint Committee* to the Old School members." The italics are ours. He gives as a specimen of all the assurances what Dr. Henry B. Smith, of the New York Seminary, rather indefinitely says of their once erroneous doctrines: "Certain objectionable forms

of doctrine and practice are no more taught in its pulpits and seminaries." This is the kind of declarations which, as Dr. Miller tells us, "the Old School, after long doubt, indeed, yet at length confidently received and believed." "May its confidence (he devoutly adds) never be shaken."

II. The second point which claims attention is, that the Reunion came not from principle but feeling. It was not the result of calm, careful, sober, and grave examination of the case by ministers and elders, a deliberate act of church rulers; but it was the offspring of feeling. The solemn, the weighty, the glorious testimony by which, under God, the General Assembly saved a Church from direful peril thirty years ago has been set aside in an outburst of *feeling*, and that mere *popular* feeling.

This popular impulse was twofold. In the first place, it was political. Reunion grew out of political sympathies betwixt the Old and the New School, engendered by the war. Such is the direct testimony of Dr. Adams, on pp. 247-249.

"Then came the memorable struggle for national integrity and life. Before the mighty enthusiasm and inflexible purpose of the nation to save itself from dismemberment and to preserve its Constitution, all subordinate distinctions in Church and State instantly disappeared. In large cities, in towns, villages and scattered settlements, there was one and the same high-wrought patriotism, drawing men together in the closest and firmest unity. Both Assemblies, though with different degrees of unanimity, took the same position in relation to the duty of the Church in the fiery trial to which our national life was subjected. As the conflict proceeded, it became apparent that the continued existence of slavery was involved in its issue. As this was the cause of the war, so had it much to do with the separation of the Presbyterian Church. It was not generally recognised as such in public debate. But large ships are turned about by that plank which is out of sight and under water. The New School Assembly, at the time of the disruption, had but few churches and ministers who endorsed slavery by theory and practice. All these withdrew and founded a separate organisation of their own in the South before the war, and before negotiations between Old School and New School were opened for reunion. The General Assembly, Old School, had a large slaveholding constituency, for which it always manifested in debate and legisla-

tion the utmost tenderness and caution. The time came when it was evident that slavery was to go down forever before the well-nigh unanimous purpose to maintain the national existence. This cause removed, there went with it what had long tended, in church judicatories, to produce irritation, repulsion, and strife. Much has not been said or written in the discussions of the last few years upon this subject; but all who are personally acquainted with the affairs of the Presbyterian Church in this country, for the last thirty-five years, will, in all candor, be prompt to admit that the existence of slavery had more to do with the division of the Church than has generally been supposed, and that its entire extinction has been among the many causes which have made the reunion of the two Northern Assemblies more easy and more certain.

“In view of all these circumstances, it was inevitable that the subject of Reunion should become a matter of discussion.”

Now, there is a portion of this testimony not to be accepted as well founded. Dr. Adams writes like a New School man, when he says that slavery was the plank under the water and out of sight which turned the Church about in 1837. Dr. Miller is undoubtedly better informed respecting the motives of the Old School. He ought to be, as born in that Church, (which Dr. Adams was not,) and as doubtless having often heard his own father, a leading man in it, speak of the real causes of the excision of 1837. And he says, (page 23):

“Sometimes it has been intimated that pro-slavery tendencies on the part of the Old School were among the most influential causes of the division of 1838. No allegation could be more entirely opposed to historical truth. A careful reading of all the official documents of that time, when, too, crimination and recrimination were loosely prevalent, will not disclose the slightest hint of such a charge from any quarter. Nay, the Assembly of 1835, in which there was a decided Old School majority, appointed a committee to report upon slavery; but the Assembly of 1836, in which the New School had altogether their own way, postponed the whole subject indefinitely by a vote of one hundred and fifty-four to eighty-seven!”

This testimony of Dr. Miller is precisely contrary to Dr. Adams's statements. We see not how any honest Old School man can patiently submit to such allegations by Dr. Adams

against his Church. She always averred that unsound theology and unpresbyterian church government led her to excise the New School. But, according to Dr. Adams, the real cause was something else which the Old School kept all the time hidden in the deep water. He charges that they always were very tender towards slavery, that sum of all villainies—in other words, they always were a *pro-slavery* Church. And he declares that when slavery went down, which the Old School had thus been secretly nurturing in their bosom so long, then, for the first time, was it possible for an end to come to the strife betwixt Old and New School. Thus all the glory Dr. Adams takes for the New and all the *shame* he gives to the Old School. But it never seems to enter the good man's mind to inquire how the New School, in their purity, could consent to join themselves to this impure pro-slavery Old School body. This Old School Church did not repent of their sin and put away slavery, but the war extinguished it. She held on to the Southern members year after year, though living in this dreadful iniquity, and never said aught about their being sinners until after the separation betwixt North and South. Yet the New School join themselves to them! And they would now, if possible, join us to them also, all reeking as our Church is with the guilt of slave-holding unrepented of! Where are the *principles* of these New School Presbyterians? Good Dr. Adams perhaps would answer, "Out of sight and under water."

But the other portion of Dr. Adams's testimony is not contradicted, but confirmed, by Dr. Miller. He says, (page 46,) concerning the warlike source whence issued the new-born love of Old and New School Presbyterians:

"The common, agitating excitements, alarms, perils and sufferings of a struggle for the nation's life, drew Old and New School men into closer and more frequent communion."

There is nothing strange, unnatural, or incredible in this. It may not be added there is nothing reprehensible. Because the truth of God is infinitely more precious than any earthly interests whatsoever. Old School men ought to have refused to begin

to ally themselves, as such, with a body excinded for New School heresy, no matter what worldly questions brought them upon a common worldly platform. What would be thought of Protestants making religious alliances with Papists, or of Trinitarians doing the same with Unitarians, because of common sympathies on any worldly question ?

1. But there is a confession here from both "branches," that what first began, to bring them together was the late war with the South. Not a word shall now be said by Southern Presbyterians to the New School of the North. Their Southern brethren had no peculiar claims whatever upon them. And very few words upon this point shall be said here to the Old School of the North. Let bygones be bygones. Only let history make record of it that the spring-head of this reunion was confessedly from no religious, but a political source. Whether the war waged by the North against the South—a war of invasion, a war to subjugate freemen to a government they rightfully wished to repudiate and to change, a war to take away from us what confessedly belonged to us, and to deny us not *their* rights, possessions, or privileges, (seeing we asked for none of these,) but *our own* rights, possessions, and privileges—whether this war, as waged by the North, was or was not a just and righteous war, still, this much is clear and confessed by both Old and New School Presbyterians of the North that *it was this war which first began to draw them into reunion!* It was, to say nothing about the character of the war, it was political impulses which brought forth this religious movement so much glorified in the volume before us. The people, not the rulers of the Church, and the people excited profoundly by political affairs, brought the Old and New School bodies into one.

In the second place, the popular impulse which led to this reunion was a social one. Consult Dr. Jacobus's account of the matter. Speaking (page 330) of the two Assemblies having met in 1856 in New York, he says: "No high public interest was then excited. There was then no drawing together of the parts, but a manifest distance. . . . The hour had not yet come. But now (1869) the city was moved. Entertainers

and outsiders were astir. The wires were at work to convey despatches to all quarters of the world. The leading daily journals, as the *Herald*, and the *Tribune*, and *Times*, and *Post*, were largely given up to the proceedings." Then he gives (pp. 332-333) an account of the joint prayer-meeting thus:

"It had been advised, as a prudential measure, that the exciting topic of reunion, in its delicate bearings at the moment, should not be introduced. But it was all in vain to set up barriers against the overflowing thought and emotion. You could as well shut out the morning from the day, or the spring-tide from the fields and gardens. The first prayer referred to it, and the first speaker plainly broached it, as the topic of the hour. Irresistibly, every exercise savored of this reunion sentiment, and it was seen to be the one great thought and feeling of the praying Assembly. . . . It was a first coming together of the brethren long time distant, and now met at the mercy seat. The ointment bewrayed itself. The atmosphere was redolent of it. Families of the city who had sought the spot as one of promised privilege, shared in the high enthusiasm."

Dr. Jacobus's history continues, (pp. 340-342, 370-372):

"On Monday evening a grand social reunion took place at the 'Apollo Rooms,' Broadway. It was a happy conception, admirably planned and carried out by the Rev. Drs. S. J. and E. D. G. Prime, of the *New York Observer*. The arrangements were magnificent and munificent, altogether worthy of the jubilant occasion, and of the great metropolis. Not only were the members of the two Assemblies thus brought into social contact, but the congregations of both branches were largely represented—the wives and sons and daughters added to the charm of the *soiree*. Ministers and laymen of other denominations evinced their interest by their cheering presence. Prominent civilians, from the city and from abroad; men of professional rank, and of military and political renown, gave zest to the occasion. Music was richly discoursed. Dr. Adams called the meeting to order, and announced the appropriate introductory of praise, "Blest be the tie that binds." This was sung with a will by the immense assemblage, variously estimated at 1,500 and 2,000. After an opening, in his own graceful style, upon the word 'RECEPTION,' which headed the cards of admission, saying that it was each receiving the other, he alluded to the *nuptials* in

prospect, and then, approaching the Moderator of the Old School Assembly, and seizing him by both hands, he led him to the front of the platform for an impromptu address. Dr. Jacobus responded to the graceful commitment, and followed up Dr. Adams's introductory by an allusion to Oriental nuptials, in which the bride is bargained for by father or brother, and when the groom is introduced to her by 'the friend of the bridegroom,' on the nuptial occasion, and the bride is then, perhaps, for the first time unveiled to his view, he is expected to make loud demonstration of joy; and the 'friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice.' Here it was the Elder Brother who had bespoken the Bride, and had made the contract, and we could all rejoice.

"This was followed by Dr. Howard Crosby, and by the Moderator, (New School,) Dr. Fowler, in words of brief acknowledgment; also, by Dr. Ormiston, of Canada, and by the venerable Dr. Samuel Hanson Cox.

"The buzz of a score of hundreds of voices overwhelmed the loudest efforts of the platform beyond the circuit of a few feet, till the speeches and music gave way for the banquet room. Here was, indeed, a rich display of the elegant hospitality of New York Christians. The highest credit is due to the generous entertainers, and to those who, by dint of indefatigable industry, wrought out such a splendid success. It was, in effect, social reunion pleading for the ecclesiastical reunion of Presbyterians. So many old friends came pleasantly together, ministers and members, Old and New, that the occasion formed, altogether, a most significant index and appropriate prelude to the higher reunion of the week."

"The hospitalities of New York Christians had been displayed in the spirit of a large-hearted Christianity. And no pen can adequately detail the thousand pleasing incidents occurring daily at the tables of the generous entertainers. Besides, it was quite a specialty of the occasion that *soirees* were given at private houses, in which groups of a score or two from the two Assemblies were gathered round the table, with Christian cheer, followed by genial rounds of address and personal reminiscences of reunion movements. Who that had the happiness of being present at the *dejeuner* of Dr. Adams, or of Mr. Henry Day, will ever forget the graceful challenge and genial repartee, and the impromptu address and response all round the circle, that brought smiles and tears in quick succession—such brimming emotions, as at length broke the alabaster box and filled the room with the odor of the ointment? And, not to mention other names, it may be

allowed to refer to like Christian refreshings at Dr. E. P. Rogers', of the Reformed Church, and Henry M. Alexander and James Brown, Esqrs., where elegant hospitalities were lavished upon the guests of both branches.

"Members lingered as if reluctant to leave the spot consecrated by such thrice happy meetings. And they looked with confident forecast over the six months interval to the reassembling at Pittsburg, to receive from the Presbyteries the word of ratification. Already the marriage covenant was signed by the high contracting parties. It seemed only a signature of the witnesses and a marriage certificate that was further requisite. And Pittsburg was already looked to as the city which should be honored with celebrating the rare nuptials.

"The press, both secular and religious, was most active and decisive for the reunion. And this was by no means confined to the press of the denomination, but was most remarkably the voice of the leading journals in the land. Such an *Eirenicon* was hailed, on all hands, as a precious national boon."

Now, Dr. Jacobus had spoken (p. 329) of the "change which had come over the Church bringing about more mutual confidences." And what has been quoted seems to make it plain that this change was in the popular mind, and not amongst the rulers of the Church; that it was the result of social influences and feelings among the people, and not of grave deliberation by the rulers of the Church. It was the "*grand social reunion* at the Apollo Rooms," so admirably planned and executed by the Doctors Prime, (*par nobile fratrum,*) with the magnificence and the munificence of the jubilant occasion, where wives, sons, and daughters, added to the charms of the *soiree*, and where prominent civilians and men of military and political renown gave zest to the occasion; where music was richly discoursed, and where Drs. Adams and Jacobus, in their own graceful style, touched off the nuptials in prospect, followed by Dr. Howard Crosby, author of a recent heretical work, and by Dr. S. H. Cox, author of some old and forgotten heretical speeches and writings; where, however, the *buzz* of twenty hundred voices made graceful and heretical speeches alike unheard, except by a few, until supper time came, and then, amidst the elegant hospitality of New York Christians, social reunion got fair swing in pleading

effectually for the ecclesiastical; this "grand social reunion" it was which did the business, and brought the separated Churches together, being assisted and seconded in the gracious and glorious operation by various other minor *soirees* and *dejeuners* at private houses, where groups of a score or two from the two Assemblies were gathered round the table, with Christian cheer and genial rounds of address, until they broke the alabaster box with their brimming emotion, and filled the room with odors; being aided and seconded also by the press, both secular and religious, in fact all the leading journals of the land, *Herald* and *Tribune* included. How was it possible, under such a grand and powerful combination of influences, social, political, military, musical, oratorical, and editorial, the pious editors of the *New York Observer* in the van, and the pious editors of the *Herald* and *Tribune* bringing up the rear—how was it possible to keep the two Churches any longer apart?

Now, it is pertinent to remark that Church action from popular impulse suits very well the genius of Congregationalism, but does not comport with the Presbyterian system. Under it the Church is governed always by representative Assemblies, taking counsel of *principle, of right, and of truth*, and not of the *feelings of the people*. It follows that neither of the two Assemblies, and particularly not the Old School, acted like Presbyterians in all this matter, but like Congregationalists. Presbyterians hold with Calvin that *Incertum scindi studia in contraria vulgus*, and that such an *afflatus* as the popular breath, such an inspiration as public sentiment, is an exceedingly unsafe guide. Conceive of Dort, or of Westminster, swayed by popular excitement, and that at a tea party! What had been the weight of the testimony of 1837, if it could have been shown to be the result of mere clamor by a mob? Dr. Adams solemnly records (pp. 313, 314,) his "conviction that the whole movement has been under the guidance of the great Head of the Church." He pronounces this work of healing to be "divine." But he gives no proofs from Scripture or elsewhere for the opinion. Now, Scripture condemns some healings of hurts as not divine; some confederacies as not approved of God. And what Dr.

Adams takes for granted, or has impressed in a pious rhapsody upon his earnest heart, is just the question which must lie open for consideration and for decision hereafter. Was this, or was it not, a Divine movement? Was the *vox populi* in this case, or was it not, *vox Dei*?

III. Much as this sensational volume contains to offend good taste and good sense, there are many things in it which it were well for the Presbyterian Church of the South to observe and to consider.

One thing which it must serve to bring to our recollection, is the union betwixt our General Assembly and the United Synod, which is so often quoted in this volume as justifying the late reunion. But, in truth, the reference to Southern example is not warranted by the circumstances of the two cases. We happen to be of those who were not in any degree responsible for that union, and therefore the opinion about to be expressed is given with the greater freedom. It is, that in more than one essential particular the two cases are entirely different. But without entering on that question just now, it is enough to remark that the Assembly and the Synod never said that the war was what brought them together; nor does it appear that tea parties, social reunions, *soiree* or *dejeuners*, music, lemonade, cakes, good wine, elegant hospitality, Christian cheer, or genial rounds of address, had anything whatever to do in bringing that union to pass.

But a more important comparison which this volume must suggest to Southern Presbyterians, is that betwixt the New School separation from the Old School in 1837-1838, and our separation from the Northern Presbyterian Church, Old School, in 1861. We might well study the old division and see how it worked on both sides; albeit, our division from the North was so different in the nature and grounds of it. We, who are the weaker party so far as numbers and worldly wealth are concerned, might well also study the history and progress of the weaker body in that case, although in some respects our very opposites. One fact worthy of note here is, how, after the sep-

aration in 1837-1838, it was the New School who seemed for a while to feel less assured of their position and the more anxious for immediate reunion, (pp. 54, 55,) although in the end the Old School seemed to lose their moral force, and, as the superior *loyalty* of the New School body gave it brighter popular *eclat* during and after the war, lo! it is the Old School who manifest, in 1869, the most eagerness for reunion. Comparing the behavior of the parties to the separation of 1861, respectively, we see the Northern Church furious, for successive years, in its declarations against liberty of return for the "impenitent rebels," and then suddenly veering like the wind round to the opposite point of the compass and blowing as hot as it blew cold before! The Southern Church, on the contrary, has spent no breath in denouncing her Northern sister, but seems in no haste to patch up a fresh union with her. This calmness of the Southern demeanor is very significant.

But a still more interesting question for our study would be, What light is cast by this volume upon the prospect of a future reunion betwixt our Church and the Northern Presbyterians? Dr. Adams tells (p. 246) what the causes were which brought about the reunion, viz.: 1. The death of the old leaders on either side. 2. A new generation, having little information and less interest in the separation itself. 3. Social and ecclesiastical intercourse, obliterating former lines. 4. Exchanging of pulpits. 5. Dismission and reception of members mutually. 6. Coöperation in good causes in cities and towns. But of course the chief cause was the seventh in Dr. Adams's list, and the last, namely, The sympathy awakened during and by the "memorable struggle for national life."

Now, in our future, the two first named may of course be just as operative as they were in the case narrated in this volume; but the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth, may be expected naturally to be much less operative. The seventh and chief can have no place, of course, in this estimate. But it is to be observed that Dr. Adams makes no reference to doctrinal differences as operating to produce the old separation, or the removal of such doctrinal differences as tending to unite the parties. With Dr.

Adams it was the *large slaveholding constituency of the Old School Assembly*, for which it had "always manifested in debate and legislation the utmost tenderness and caution;" not the *heresy of the New School*, which had brought about the separation. Slavery removed, "there went with it what had long tended in Church judicatories to produce irritation, repulsion, and strife." This, according to Dr. Adams, was all the trouble between the two parties in 1837. "The New School, at the time of the disruption, had but few churches and ministers who endorsed slavery by theory and practice," (p. 248.) In other words, the New School were abolitionists. But the Old School were to a great extent at that time what was called *pro-slavery*. But slavery abolished, all ground of separation, he considers, was removed. And so, of course, it became easy for churches, the one of which was just as much Old School as the other, and the other just as much New School as the one, to come together in the fondest love so soon as they had gotten rid of the South with her odious system. Now, to dwell no longer upon this representation of the case made by one so much honored in the Reunited Church, there are evidently three principles for which the Southern Church is testifying in her separate life and action. They are very important principles, and we propose to state them distinctly, but not to dwell upon them at length.

The first relates to slavery. The position of our Church touching slavery or slaveholding is perfectly clear and definite. She stands on the ground of the Scriptures. Slavery is a form of government which the Bible does not condemn. The Southern Church did therefore not condemn it. She does not condemn it now. Her members who were slaveholders she would not discipline, for that was no sin according to the Word. Any man or any church who says it is sin takes some other rule of faith, and is so far infidel. The Old School Church was not willing to say anything like this before the war. But the war separated her from the South, and also fired her heart with hatred against the South, and she was led during the war and subsequently to declare slaveholding to be sinful in itself. She deliberately assumed the infidel ground. But not only did the war

fire her heart with hatred for the South, but, on the other hand, as this volume declares, it fired her heart with love for the New School, and blinded her eyes to those differences which Dr. Adams and his New School brethren will not admit to have existed, but which the Old School has always been so loud in declaring. Meantime, the Southern Church stands as the Old School Church stood before the war, upon the Bible ground regarding slaveholding. She has not changed her attitude in the least upon this point. Is it to be expected that she will change it in the future? A deliberate, cold-blooded change is plainly not supposable. A terrible civil war, making us hate somebody, and in the same proportion love this Reunited Old and New School Church, and then the requisite amount of social reunions and Christian cheer, might affect us as it affected our brethren at the North. Such influences, however, are not to be looked for. And then, while we plead guilty to the same human nature with our brethren, there is one little difference betwixt us and them which perhaps might save us even should this mighty influence of war and tea parties combined ever be brought to operate upon our Church. It is that the South has always been more disposed to stickle for principle than the North; while at the same time she never has been so impressible by social or public demonstrations, by shows and by shams. On the whole, no man can pretend to say what our Church may not be left to do or to accept. Human nature is very weak and wayward, and even the Church may err. But it certainly would be a dreadful fall should we ever give up the Word as the only and sufficient rule of our faith and practice, and accept the new moral dogma of the Northern Church.

The second principle is that Christ's Church owes loyalty to no government on earth. The volume under review is a semi-official record of the zeal of both the reuniting churches in proclaiming their devotion to the American Cæsar. The New School historian, Dr. Stearns, (chap. 2,) coolly, and no doubt justly, claims for his Church the preëminence in this regard. But Dr. Miller (chap. 1) does his best to make out a clear case of loyalty for the Old School likewise. And various parts of

the volume make it plain that the virtue of loyalty to the government, having come to be now decidedly *above par*, whilst orthodoxy of doctrine had got to be a little *below par*, the Old School body were conscious of being somewhat behind "the other branch" in this now chief excellence, and were influenced in desiring the reunion somewhat by the expectation of its improving their public reputation. Accordingly Dr. Miller is not ashamed to write down that "little incident of the year 1863," which we hope he may live to see in its true light, when the flag of the government was unfurled over the Kingdom of our Lord and Head, as represented in their General Assembly, which flag was subsequently voted by that Assembly to be "*their flag!*"

Now, as to the question whether the Presbyterian Church of the South is likely ever to abandon her high ground on this subject by consenting to a union with the Northern Presbyterians, who call Cæsar king as well as Christ, it seems reasonable to observe that that question is capable of being inverted, so that it shall be asked whether the Reunited Church is likely ever to abandon officially its declared position about loyalty. It does not appear reasonable to expect that the Northern Church ever will officially abandon this position. It is no more reasonable to expect that the Presbyterians of the South ever will abandon theirs. The question is of course a vital one, and never can be shelved as unimportant; and the attitude of the two bodies is singularly definite regarding it. And being, as it is, a matter so eminently concrete and practical, and so little abstract or speculative, it would seem that it must continue indefinitely to be what is called a *live* question, and so a barrier to union. It is not a question that will ever go to sleep, or that ever can go to sleep in this country.

The *third* principle for which the Southern Church, in her separate life and action, appears to be set apart in divine providence to contend, is the *permanent, abiding, and incalculable value of the testimony of our fathers in 1837.*

It has been intimated already that the charge of the Southern Church's having herself united with a New School body cannot be allowed. That action differed from the course of the Old

School Church in the late reunion in at least two essential particulars:

1. It never was believed by the Southern Church that the generality of the United Synod were unsound men. On the contrary, it was ever believed by the Old School at the North that the generality of the New School were unsound. It may be safely affirmed that not more than half a dozen ministers of the United Synod were judged to be other than thoroughly Presbyterian and Calvinistic. Whether this was or was not a correct opinion, it was certainly the belief which prevailed, and upon which the Assembly at Charlotte acted.

2. There was a precise statement of the interpretation put upon the standards, which was made to constitute the basis of the union at Charlotte. This statement was satisfactory to the Assembly, and has seemed to prove satisfactory to the Church.

Now, suppose that in the case of the Reunion it had been true that the thorough orthodoxy of nearly every minister of the whole New School had been believed by the Old School, and also that, by way of bringing together the two bodies, there had been accepted cordially by the New School a precise statement respecting the disputed doctrines which was entirely satisfactory to the Old School, who could ever say a word against their reunion? In fact, such circumstances as these being supposed, how could there ever have happened the disruption of 1837?

And let it be observed that the United Synod did not separate as an organised body from the Old School in 1837. Those who afterwards composed that body were certain Southern men, chiefly in Virginia, who were carried away from the Old School, not by doctrinal unsoundness, but by a certain sympathy with the New School, as having been dealt with severely by their brethren. The worst that could justly be said of them as a body, was, that their feelings misled their judgment. Subsequent developments of the radical spirit of the New School had brought them to a separation from that body. Here then was a certain sound and orthodox but separated portion of the New School finding itself surrounded by a Church with which it was in full sympathy. They were not the men whom the Old School

had excinded in 1837, but disapproving the excision of the four Northwestern Synods, they had cast in their lot with the excinded for a time. And they afterwards quit the New School, and then subsequently they come back and rejoin their Old School brethren of the South on the basis of a distinct statement of the sense in which the standards were mutually accepted and affirmed.

All this, therefore, does not constitute a very flagrant denial of the testimony of 1837, although by some objected to earnestly at the time upon this ground. But it cannot be said that the Southern Church would have accepted the action of their Assembly at Charlotte, had she viewed it as in any sense or degree a denial of that glorious testimony. Her idea was that she was not dealing with the New School body, but with a sound and orthodox fragment of it, separated from it for truth's sake. It was not the Southern Church that ever called the New School "the other branch," and denounced controversy with the New School as "strife." It was not she who ever acknowledged formally that the New School body had all along maintained the standards, and that Old and New School were to be viewed historically as one Church. It was not she who ever said formally and distinctly that the New School had repudiated, even in 1837 itself, all New School errors! It was not she who actually and formally and solemnly recognised the New School as a sound and orthodox body. It was not she, nor yet her acknowledged leaders, who ever said that New School errors need only be *minimized* a little and they would become Old School truths; or that the separation of 1837 sprang from mere alienated feeling; or that the Old and New School were the twins, Esau and Jacob, but that none could tell *which was which*; or that the Old School while separated from the New was like the man who had the withered arm; or that the waters of the separation were the muddy waters of suspicion and strife, but those of the reunion clear running waters; or that God permitted the separation as being wicked, but ordained the reunion as being holy. Never, either by word or deed has the Southern Church, as such, or any of those whom she trusts, cast a slur, in any form, upon the

testimony of our fathers of 1837. Now, is it to be expected that she may hereafter do this thing by a union with that reunited body whose most peculiar and characteristic feature is precisely this: that she has trampled and is trampling on that testimony?

This is a question to which, of course, there being now no prophets of the future amongst us, no answer can be given. Without hesitation, however, this may be said, that if a beacon of large and tall proportions, and in a commanding position, warning the Southern Church away from such a fatal course, can avail to save her, she has been granted such a safeguard in that which has been allowed to happen to her Northern Old School sister; and that if a story ever was suitable in style and manner and spirit to the events and transactions it records, the Southern Church may here read, in fit and becoming language, an account of the whole of this sad affair in this Reunion Memorial volume.

There are numerous references all through this volume to the Southern Church. They are generally rather unkind, and sometimes very much so. But this is not surprising in the circumstances. Very refreshing indeed it is, in the very midst of so much that seems unreal and affected, to read the simple, manly, honest reply of our Louisville Assembly to the overture for reunion from the Northern Assemblies. The reader may need a little of this refreshing influence after all that he has been conducted through in this paper; and for the purpose of so refreshing him, and also because the document deserves to be rendered as accessible and familiar to us all as possible, it is now here appended as copied from pp. 448-450:

REPLY FROM THE SOUTH TO OVERTURE FOR REUNION.

“LOUISVILLE, KY., May 28th, 1870.

Rev. E. F. Hatfield, D. D., Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America:

“DEAR BROTHER: The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, in session at Louisville, has directed me to forward to you the following official document. It is a true extract from the minutes of Friday, May 27th.

“The Committee on Foreign Correspondence, to whom was referred the overture for reunion from the Old School General Assembly, North, of 1869, at its sessions in the city of New York; and also the proposition from the United Assembly of the Northern Presbyterian Church, now sitting in Philadelphia, conveyed to us by a special delegation, respectfully report: That the former of these documents is virtually superseded by the latter; because the body by whom it was adopted has since been merged into the United Assembly, from which emanates a new and fresh proposal reflecting the views of the larger constituency. To this proposition, then, ‘that a Committee of five ministers and four elders be appointed by this Assembly, to confer with a similar Committee of their Assembly in respect to opening a friendly correspondence between the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Church,’ your Committee recommend the following answer to be returned:

“Whatever obstructions may exist in the way of cordial intercourse between the two bodies above named are entirely of a public nature, and involve grave and fundamental principles. The Southern Presbyterian Church can confidently appeal to all the acts and declarations of all its Assemblies that no attitude of aggression or hostility has been, or is now, assumed by it towards the Northern Church. And this General Assembly distinctly avows (as it has always believed and declared) that no grievances experienced by us, however real, would justify us in acts of aggression, or a spirit of malice or retaliation against any branch of Christ’s visible kingdom. We are prepared, therefore, in advance of all discussion, to exercise towards the General Assembly, North, and the churches represented therein, such amity as fidelity to our principles could, under any possible circumstances, permit. Under this view, the appointment of a Committee of Conference might seem wholly unnecessary; but, in order to exhibit before the Christian world the spirit of reconciliation and kindness to the last degree, this Assembly agrees to appoint a Committee of Conference to meet a similar Committee already appointed by the Northern Assembly, with instructions to the same, that the difficulties which lie in the way of cordial correspondence between the two bodies must be distinctly met and removed, and which may be comprehensively stated in the following particulars:

“1. Both the wings of the now united Assembly, during their separate existence before the fusion, did fatally complicate themselves with the State in political utterances, deliberately uttered year after year; and which, in our judgment, were a

sad betrayal of the cause and kingdom of our common Lord and Head. We believe it to be solemnly incumbent upon the Northern Presbyterian Church, not with reference to us, but before the Christian world, and before our Divine Master and King, to purge itself of this error, and by public proclamation of the truth to place the crown once more upon the head of Jesus Christ, as the alone King of Zion. In default of which, the Southern Presbyterian Church, which has already suffered much in maintaining the independence and spirituality of the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth, feels constrained to bear public testimony against this defection of our late associates from the truth. Nor can we, by official correspondence even, consent to blunt the edge of this our testimony concerning the very nature and mission of the Church as a purely spiritual body among men.

"2. The union now consummated between the Old and New School Assemblies, North, was accomplished by methods which, in our judgment, involved a total surrender of all the great testimonies of the Church for the fundamental doctrines of grace, at a time when the victory of truth over error hung long in the balance. The United Assembly stands, of necessity, upon an allowed latitude of interpretation of the standards, and must come at length to embrace nearly all shades of doctrinal belief. Of these falling testimonies we are the sole surviving heirs, which we must lift from the dust, and bear to the generations after us. It would be a serious compromise of this sacred trust to enter into public and official friendship with those repudiating these testimonies; and to do this expressly upon the ground, as stated in the preamble to the overture before us, 'that the terms of reunion between the two branches of the Presbyterian Church at the North, now happily consummated, present an auspicious opportunity for the adjustment of such relations'—to found a correspondence professedly upon this idea, would be to endorse that which we thoroughly disapprove.

"3. Some of the members of our own body were, but a short time since, violently and unconstitutionally expelled from the communion of one branch of the now United Northern Assembly, under ecclesiastical charges which, if true, render them utterly infamous before the Church and the world. It is to the last degree unsatisfactory to construe this offensive legislation obsolete by the mere fusion of that body with another, or through the operation of a faint declaration which was not intended originally to cover this case. This is no mere 'rule' or 'precedent,' but a solemn sentence of outlawry against what is now

an important and constituent part of our own body. Every principle of honor and of good faith compels us to say that an unequivocal repudiation of that interpretation of the law under which these men were condemned, must be a condition precedent to any official correspondence on our part.

"4. It is well known that similar injurious accusations were preferred against the whole Southern Presbyterian Church, with which the ear of the whole world has been filled. Extending, as these charges do, to heresy and blasphemy, they cannot be quietly ignored by an indirection of any sort. If true, we are not worthy of the 'confidence, respect, Christian honor and love' which are extended to us in this overture; if untrue, Christian manliness and truth require them to be openly and squarely withdrawn. So long as they remain on record they are an impassable barrier to official intercourse."

"Yours fraternally,

"JOSEPH R. WILSON,

"Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States."

ARTICLE V.

WHAT IS TRUTH?

While Jesus stood in the judgment hall, the Roman Governor put the question, "What is Truth?" Jesus did not refuse to answer, but "when Pilate said this he went out unto the Jews." Had he asked, and humbly waited, the Master, no doubt, would have responded. For to others, in unmistakable language, he had already unfolded the nature and uses of truth.

The Saviour, in his intercessory prayer for the disciples, said, "Sanctify them through the truth—thy word is truth." Again, "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light." "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," "Ye seek to kill me, a man that told you the truth." "The Spirit of truth will guide you into all truth." "I AM THE WAY, AND THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE."

Many things are true which, nevertheless, cannot be called the truth. Man lives, thinks, labors, suffers, and dies; this is