

# THE Union Seminary Magazine.

---

Vol. XL

FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1900.

No. 3.

---

## I. Literary.

---

### THE CHARACTERISTIC AND DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA.

BY REV. DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D. D.

THE *Reformed Church in America* has no noteworthy "characteristic features" to distinguish it from the larger branches of the "Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System." It is, to all intents and purposes, identical in doctrine and polity with the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches.

Nevertheless it holds a separate existence, because of a belief, more or less prevalent among its adherents, that it has a real *raison d'etre*. There are those who aver that its power for good—which is not inconsiderable—would be greatly increased by an alliance with one of the larger Presbyterian bodies. Overtures looking to such a union have been made more than once, but for various reasons have come to naught.

I. The Reformed Church has an honorable history. It is the oldest evangelical organization in America. The first Dutch immigrants came over in the *Half-Moon*, Hendrik Hudson, skipper, in 1609. This was the year of Holland's armistice with Spain after a century of bloody conflict for religious liberty. The *Half-Moon* returned to Holland the following year, reporting an exploration of the Hudson River in vain search for the fabulous open passage to the Orient. An allusion to "fertile lands and fur-bearing animals" tempted the thrifty spirit of the Dutch

## VI. Criticisms and Reviews.

---

STONEWALL JACKSON AND THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR. *By Lieut-Col. G. F. R. Henderson, Major the York and Lancaster Regiment; Professor of Military Art and History, the Staff College; author of "The Battle of Spichern," "A Tactical Study," and "The Campaign of Fredericksburg."* In two volumes, 8vo. Vol. I., pp. xiv. and 550; Vol. II., pp. 561. Longman, Green & Co., 39 Paternoster Row, London, New York and Bombay, 1898.

LIFE AND CAMPAIGNS OF LIEUT-GEN. THOMAS J. JACKSON (STONEWALL JACKSON.) *By Prof. R. L. Dabney, D. D., of the Union Theological Seminary, Virginia.* New York: Blelock & Co., 19 Beekman street. Richmond, Va., and Philadelphia, Pa.: National Publishing Company. 1866.

Colonel Henderson's *Stonewall Jackson* is a great work—great as a biography, great as a history, and great as an essay on military strategy. A story has been going the rounds which characterizes it well. It runs, in substance, on this wise: A gentleman, in calling on a friend, found him poring over this life of Jackson. He remarked, "Col. Henderson has given us two books within one there, a noble biography of a man of extraordinary genius, and a magnificent history of a splendid campaign." "You are mistaken," replied the reader; "he has, indeed, as you say, given us a noble biography of a man of extraordinary genius, and a magnificent history of a splendid campaign, but he has done more, he has given us a third book here, one of the most masterful essays on military strategy to be found in all literature." The last speaker was more nearly adequate in his characterization. We suppose that the body of this work was primarily designed for the very purpose of inculcating the importance and illustrating the nature of the highest order of military strategy and tactics to the cadets whom it was the author's function to teach military art and history. Jackson sharpened his great genius for war by the study of the campaigns of Washington and Napoleon. Col. Henderson has proposed to teach English cadets by presenting the campaigns of one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, of the free disciples of Napoleon in the art of war.

We are glad that the world has been given this work. The author cannot be accused of bias; he gives the most unmistakable evidences of the full mastery of the historical materials, of fine judgment of the man and the soldier, of a judicial tone along with and in spite of a glowing enthusiasm for his subject. He writes well. He will be widely read. His work will be an enduring monument to the genius and the Christian manhood of Jackson and the old South.

The representations of Jackson, given and justified in these noble volumes, put him as a soldier of intellect and executive power with the noblest company, with Alexander, Hannibal, Cæsar, Marlborough, Washington, Frederick, Napoleon, Wellington, and Nelson. They show that, tested by Napoleon's maxim, "The greatest general is he who makes the fewest mistakes," *i. e.*, he who neither negelects an opportunity nor offers one. Jackson has had few superiors in military history. For, "During the whole of the two years he held command he never committed a single error. At Mechanicsville, and again at Frayser's Farm, the failure to establish some method of intercommunication left his column isolated. This, however, was a failure in staff duties, for which the Confederate headquarters was more to blame than himself. And further, how sure and swift was the retribution which followed a mistake committed within his sphere of action? What opportunity did Jackson miss? His penetration was unerring; and when, after he had marked his prey, did he ever hesitate to swoop? . . . . On the field of battle his manœuvres were always sound and often brilliant. He never failed to detect the key-point of a position, or to make the best use of the ground. On the defensive, his flanks were always strong, and his troops concealed both from view and fire; on the offensive, he invariably attacked where he was least expected. . . . .

"Until Jackson fell the Army of Northern Virginia, except when his advice was overruled, had never missed an opening. Afterwards it missed many. Gettysburg, which should have been decisive of the war, was preëminently a battle of lost opportunities; and there were others which fall into the same category. It is a perfectly fair assumption, then, that Jackson, so unerring was his insight, would not only have proved an efficient substitute for Lee, but that he would have won such fame as would have placed him, as it placed his great commander, among the most illustrious soldiers of all ages. With any of his contemporaries, not even excepting Lee, he compares more than favorably. Most obedient of subordinates as he was, his strategical views were not always in accordance with those of his Commander-in-Chief. If Jackson had been in charge of the operations, the disastrous battle of Malvern Hill would never have been fought; Pope would have been cut off from the Rappahannock; McClellan would have found the whole Confederate army arrayed against him at South Mountain, or would have been attacked near Frederick; and Burnside would have been encountered on the North Anna, where defeat would probably have proved his ruin. . . . . It would seem that Jackson, in one respect, was Lee's superior. His courage, physical and moral, was not more brilliant or more steadfast; his tactical skill no greater; but he was made of sterner stuff. His self-confidence was supreme. He never doubted his ability, with God's help, to carry out any task his judgment approved. Lee, on the other hand, was oppressed by a consciousness of his own shortcomings. Jackson never held but one council of war. Lee seldom made an important movement without consulting his corps commanders. Jackson kept his subordinates in their places, exacting from his generals

the same implicit obedience he exacted from his corporals. Lee lost the battle of Gettysburg because he allowed his second in command to argue instead of marching. Nor was that political courage which Nelson declared was as necessary for a commander as military courage, a component part of Lee's character. On assuming command of the Army of Northern Virginia, in spite of Mr. Davis' protestations, he resigned the control of the whole forces of the Confederacy, and he submitted without complaint to interference. Jackson's action when Loring's regiments were ordered back by the Secretary of War is sufficient proof that he would have brooked no meddling with his designs when once they had received the sanction of the Cabinet." (Vol. II., pp. 598, ff.)

Naturally, our author puts Jackson high above Grant on the list of illustrious captains. He finds him possessed of many of the military characteristics of Wellington. And he finds among the campaigns of the Corsican war genius nothing more brilliant than Jackson's valley campaign.

Col. Henderson's portrayal of Jackson's moral and religious character is also very fine. He says, "His creed may not be ours; but in whom shall we find a firmer faith, a mind more humble, a sincerity more absolute? He had his temptations like the rest of us. His passions were strong; his temper was hot; forgiveness never came easily to him, and he loved power. He dreaded strong liquor because he liked it; and if in his nature there were great capacities for good, there were none the less, had it been once perverted, great capacities for evil. Fearless and strong, self-dependent and ambitious, he had within him the making of a Napoleon, and yet his name is without spot or blemish. From his boyhood onward, until he died on the Rappahannock, he was the very model of a Christian gentleman:

'E'en as he trod that day to God, so walked he from his birth,  
In simpleness, and gentleness, and honor, and clean mirth.'"

(Vol. II., p. 610.)

But fine as these words are, and fine as the current portrayal of Jackson's Christian character throughout the book is, we think there is relative failure here. The writer needs to have the very creed of Jackson to set him forth adequately here. Jackson understood the principles and the art of war as thoroughly as Frederick, or Napoleon, or Wellington. He was as great a patriot as Hampden. We have awakened by degrees to the belief that he was one of the holiest men of the Christian Church, as well as one of the greatest simplicity and directness of character.

We can only say, in passing, that we have a high, though we believe insufficiently high, representation in these pages of the character of the rank and file of the men who fought under Jackson. Southern young men ought to buy and read these volumes to see how noble our fathers were, even as Col. Henderson saw them. We must bestir ourselves, else the floods of literature bearing on the great struggle between the sections emanating from the Northern presses will cover up the truth and

make us despise those worthy of the greatest reverence. The circulation of this work widely would subserve the interests of truth and justice.

The greatest fault which the work has, in our judgement, is the chapter on Secession. It is not clear and distinct. It tries to justify both North and South in regard to that matter. But this can no more be done than proving true two contradictions. We shall not attempt to explain the author's amiable superficialities on this subject. It may be that he is no philosophic statesman. It may be that he makes right while talking on this subject a relative thing, as so many others do, though elsewhere he seems to have correct notions of right.

The writer of these volumes, as was said at the outset, has mastered the materials of the subject. He has deeply drunk from the teaching of Prof. Robert L. Dabney in his *Life of Stonewall Jackson*. In the explanation of the campaigns he has, we believe, surpassed Dr. Dabney, though often his text is hardly more than a noble commentary on the more concise descriptions of Dabney. His volumes, too, are better published, the maps more excellent and more convenient for the reader's use.

Dabney's *Life of (Stonewall) Jackson* must continue to be regarded as a great work. How rare a thing for a man to have two such biographers as Dabney and Henderson. They hold in common the same generic view of Jackson as a military commander of the first water. Dr. Dabney used to mystify his friends by keeping on one nail in his study a medallion of Napoleon Bonaparte, and over it a similar one of Jackson, with a shade's difference in size. Visitors in Dr. Dabney's study could see Jackson's medallion plainly, and just back of it, but slightly under it, the rim of another. Examination disclosed the face of Napoleon; and once, at least, an inquisitive observer elicited from the Doctor the explanation, that thus he indicated his estimate of the relative geniuses of those two great soldiers.

We had read this book in our boyhood, but after reading the great work of Henderson we reread Dabney, that we might be better able to judge of each work, and might see Jackson as nearly as he was as possible. We have been reimpressed with the ability of Dr. Dabney's *Life of Jackson*. In the discussion of Jackson's strategy and tactics, while he is less informing than Henderson, the fact seems to be largely duty to his relatively greater brevity. In treating the civil questions between the two sections, Dabney speaks as a man who had mastered the subject. He does, indeed, forget to be *suaviter in modo*, while he thunders *fortiter in re*. But he knew the truth, and states it clearly; his treatment has all the adequacy of the sketch of the master. There are no hesitating, wavering, timorous, or false strokes.

Dr. Dabney, naturally perhaps, brings out in a vastly abler way Jackson's Christian and evangelical character. It was with this purpose, indeed, in the forefront that Dr. Dabney wrote the work. He says, "My prime object has been to portray and vindicate his Christian character, that his countryman may possess it as a precious example, and may honor that God in it whom he so delighted to honor. It is for this purpose that the attempt was made so carefully to explain and

defend his action, as citizen and soldier, in recent events. Next, it was desired to unfold his military genius as displayed in his campaigns."

What a "precious example" we have in this hero of the South as portrayed in Dabney's pages! As a man of *conscience*, as a *believer in Divine providence*, as a *man of prayer*, as an *evangelist* in his life and influence.

Would that the young men of our land would have his conscientiousness. "He argued that, as every man is bound to do whatever is practicable and lawful for him to do to prevent the commission of sin, he who posted or received letters on the Sabbath day, or even sent a letter which would occupy that day in travelling, was responsible for a part of the guilt. It was of no avail to reply to him that this self-denial on the part of one Christian would not close a single post-office, nor arrest a single mail-coach in the whole country. His answer was that unless some Christians would begin singly to practice their exact duty, and thus set the proper example, the reform would never be begun; that his responsibility was to see to it that he, at least, was not *particeps criminis*; and that whether others would coöperate was their concern, not his"; that his duty was determined by *the revealed will of God*, not by his sense of expediency. And this conscientiousness pervaded his whole life.

Few Christians have been so nearly able to keep the command to 'pray always.' How few can say, "When I take a draught of water, I always pause as my palate receives the refreshment to lift up my heart to God in thanks and prayer for the water of life. Whenever I drop a letter into the box at the post-office, I send a petition along with it for God's blessing upon its mission, and upon the person to whom it is sent. When I break the seal of the letter just received, I stop to pray to God that he may prepare me for its contents, and make it a messenger of good. When I go to my class-room, and await the arrangement of the cadets in their places, that is my time to intercede with God for them. And so for every other familiar act of the day." His dependence on God was a part of his character; it was a confirmed habit.

It was based in part upon his conviction of an all-ruling providence. No man had more frequently on his lips, "For we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, even to them that are the called, according to his purpose." He was sometimes accused of fatalism. No man was further from fatalism, but few have held more consistently the doctrine of God's sovereignty. "His faith produced a combination of courageous serenity, with cheerful diligence in the use of means. Jackson was as laborious as he was trustful, and laborious precisely because he was trustful."

His efforts in behalf of evangelistic work in the army in February, March and April, 1863, betray a fervid love for God and man hard to parallel in one of such high military rank. He was really the heart of the movement under God.

We understand that some copies of this work are in the hands of Dr. Charles Dabney, of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.

We know of few books better worth buying. It ennobles the reader. It ought to be brought out in a new edition.

THOMAS C. JOHNSON.

15 Jan., 1900, *Union Seminary, Richmond, Va.*

MOSES DRURY HOGE: LIFE AND LETTERS. *By his nephew, Peyton Harrison Hoge.* Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication.

This noble volume has already received sincere, earnest, and high commendation at the hands of many of our religious newspapers and periodicals. It reached us just too late for notice in our last issue. We avail ourselves of this our earliest opportunity to join in the general chorus in its praise, being assured, after a somewhat careful reading from the title page to the end, that it is worthy of all the praise it has received.

A glance at the physical features of this book makes one devoutly grateful that we have in our Southern Zion printers of such skill and excellence as Messrs. Whittet & Shepperson, and that the whole book-making art has been carried to such perfection in our midst. It is a very handsomely made volume. But of this printing, binding, and so forth, we had no thought in our introductory remarks. We had there in mind the work of Dr. Peyton H. Hoge.

Dr. Hoge has very unusual fitness for this sort of work. He has fine insight into most things upon which he turns his mind, first-class analytical powers, and just as good synthetical ability. He is gifted with an incisive and vigorous, yet delicate and mellow power of expression. He is one of the most cultured of American ministers of his equals in age; and his culture irradiates the simplest and most straightforward narrative.

He had a very fine subject—a subject worthy of all the powers he could bring to bear in his work. Indeed, it would hardly have been possible for any man to have written an absolutely tame, insipid and unattractive life of Moses Drury Hoge. He was, as a boy, as a youth, as a mature man, and as a man of advanced years, full of life and energy, of heart and head, of vitality and will-power that overcame obstacles insurmountable by men of less heroic mold; and that enabled him to accomplish his huge achievements with, not weariness and fatigue, but zest and delight. Few men have found so much of delight and joy in life, a kind of high *gradium certaminis*. Dr. Moses Drury Hoge was as lovable a subject as he was a living one, too. Those who saw him at a distance only might doubt this, but we know of no one who saw him intimately who has ever doubted it. Indeed, to be brought into close acquaintance with him was to come to have very unusual regard for him.

His biographer has done wisely to let him do so much talking in this book for himself. No one could have done it better. Dr. Hoge was a delightful correspondent. What courtesy in these letters! What tenderness in many of them! What beauty of thought and style in all!