

THE
PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 2.—OCTOBER, 1887.

I. SPURIOUS RELIGIOUS EXCITEMENTS.

It is believed all thoughtful Christians are alive to the fact that religious excitements, which consist of temporary movements of the emotions devoid of any saving operation of the Truth on the reason and conscience, are equally frequent and mischievous in America. This judgment not seldom expresses itself in very queer and inaccurate forms. Thus: good brethren write to the religious journals grateful accounts of a work of grace in their charges, and tell the Editor that "they are happy to say, the work has been purely rational and quiet, and attended by not the slightest excitement." They forget that the efficacious (not possibly, tempestuous) movement of the feelings is just as essential a part of a true religious experience, as the illumination of the intellect by divine truth; for indeed, there is no such thing as the implantation of practical principle, or the right decisions of the will, without feeling. In estimating a work of divine grace as genuine, we should rather ask ourselves whether the right feelings are excited; and excited by divine cause. If so, we need not fear the most intense excitement. This misconception is parallel to the one uttered by public speakers, when they assure hearers that, designing to show them the respect due to rational beings, and to use the honesty suitable to true patriots, "they shall make no appeal to their feelings, but address themselves only to their understandings." This is virtually impossi-

Spirit resting upon us, we shall be able to retrieve the character of the evangelism of our day, to free it from the opprobrium under which, to a considerable extent, it rests in the public mind, and make it indeed what, as we have seen, it is claimed to be, the "highest and most enduring glory" of the nineteenth century.

T. D. WITHERSPOON.

V. ORGANIC UNION.

To arrest the progress of the dangerous sentiment in favor of organic union with the Northern Church, and to prevent the division of our own, it is only necessary for our people to be made to comprehend the real issues involved in the case. Whatever advantage might be gained along the border line between the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, or in interior localities where they come face to face in the same community, by an organic fusion of the two bodies, this advantage must be foregone if there are reasons sufficient to justify and demand the continued independence of the Southern Church. Without such reasons, that Church can show no cause for its existence at all; but if it can justify its right to live as a branch of the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus, every reason for its existence is a reason for its existence independent of every other branch of the Kingdom. This is the real issue involved in this question of organic union. If we go into it, our autonomy is lost; we are merged absolutely in a body so overwhelmingly superior in number, that we shall be constitutionally subjected absolutely to their control. They will have the settlement of questions vital to our interests not only in the ecclesiastical, but in the social sphere altogether in their hands. Our relations to the negro race, the control of all our property, the right to determine all questions of ecclesiastical usage and policy, the propriety of a rotary eldership, the examination of ministers, the relations of women to the *public* work of the Church, the question of a mixed Church of whites and blacks—

all such questions will be determined for us by the overwhelming majorities of a Northern body. We have these questions now, so far as our own ecclesiastical life is concerned, in our own hands. Some of them are vital to our social existence. Some of them involve principles which we have long held with cordial unanimity as matters of conscience before God. Some of them are so vital to our covenanted creed that we shall be compelled to abandon it if we merge ourselves in a Church standing on the present basis of the Church of the North. What higher grounds of necessity, reason, conscience and the Word of God, any favorer of organic union could demand to assure him of the absolute necessity for the continued existence of the independence of the Southern Church, it would be hard to conjecture. To develop the reasons for this in their full extent, we feel assured, will break down this dangerous movement and preserve us from any serious division in any parts of our bounds.

But before we proceed to do this, we desire to set aside some of the purely gratuitous and unfounded assumptions which are made touching the decisive opposition which is felt towards this policy of fusion. It is alleged that political hostility to Northern men is at the bottom of this opposition to ecclesiastical union. This we pointedly repudiate and deny. If this were true, why are we not equally hostile in feeling towards other Churches of the North? Not one feeling of opposition exists in any Southern heart towards the Episcopal or Congregational or Methodist or Baptist Churches in the Northern States. Our feelings towards them are those of cordial good-will. We feel towards them just as we feel towards those same denominations in our own section. Why is this, if political feeling animates the resistance to organic union with Northern Presbyterians? The members of those Churches are presumably as much opposed to our view of political matters, past and present, as are the members of the Presbyterian Church of the North. Yet political differences do not qualify our kindly feeling towards them, while those differences are held to account for our opposition to organic union with Northern Presbyterians. Why is this difference made in our feelings towards the various Churches of the North?

It is simply due to the fact that all of them except the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are content to let us alone, to work out the hard problems thrown upon us by the universal uprooting of our social state, without their interference. On the contrary, that one member of the family of Presbyterian Churches at the North, no nearer to us than the rest, seems to feel commissioned to attempt the formation of such relations as will take from us and give to it the absolute control over our whole ecclesiastical existence, including questions so vital to our success as a Church and our very existence as a race, that it would be absolute lunacy to put them out of our own control, and to leave our protection to the determination of a Northern body. If the Presbyterian Church of the North would assume and keep the same position towards us that other Northern Churches maintain, it would be as cordially recognized as those other Churches are. If there were questions in which Northern Presbyterians had an interest a thousand-fold more important than our interest in them, and had in their own hands the power to protect themselves in them, they would regard as an absolute impertinence, a proposition from us to have that power transferred into our hands. It would be nothing but justice to credit us with a similar measure of common-sense without charging us with political prejudice, or self-righteousness, or the Pharisaic assumption of superiority to their fellowship, in refusing to yield our autonomy and with it all our security into their hands. In asserting our convictions of truth, we are only faithful to our convictions, and it is an outrage upon all reason and right to charge us on this account with assumptions of a consequence which makes us construe Northern Presbyterians as unfit for our fellowship. We hold all Christians worthy of our communion; we reverence all who serve our Lord in all fundamental articles of obedience. But we do not hold ourselves bound to an organic union with many branches of the Kingdom, just because we cannot make ourselves responsible for the errors which we do honestly think they have mingled with their testimony to the truth. In spite of all imputations of political prejudice, and unworthy assumptions of superior excellence, this is

the reason why we cannot unite with the Northern Presbyterian Church. That Church is positively alleged to be absolutely one with us. Such an assertion could only be made under incompetent conceptions of the actual truth. This we shall proceed to show in a manner which will define a necessity for the continued existence and independence of the Southern Presbyterian Church which no one can deny as to fact, and no true Presbyterian can gainsay as to importance to the integrity of the Presbyterian faith. These great reasons are four-fold in number, and exclusively religious and ecclesiastical in their nature. Not a shadow of political thought is to be found in any one of them. Organic union with the Northern Church is prohibited to us, and the existence and independence of the Southern Church is absolutely required,

First, by a radical difference in *creed principle*;

Second, by differences in doctrinal views of Christian truth;

Third, by a difference in view of a moral question on which there is an explicit decision by the Holy Spirit in Holy Scripture;

Fourth, by wide differences on a variety of important questions of ecclesiastical administration, policy and usage.

To the proof of these points we now ask the impartial and discriminating attention of every member of the Southern Church. We will introduce this proof by a brief history of the New and Old School parties from the division in 1837 up to their reunion in 1869. Let the fact be fully noted and weighed, that the Church we are now invited to enter is not the Church from which we separated in 1861. With that Church we were in full harmony in *creed principles*—in *doctrine*—in our *testimonies on great moral questions*—and, for the most part, in *our views of ecclesiastical policies and usages*. But after negotiations extending through several years, this Church, from which we had separated on the single issue of the Spiritual character of the Church, merged itself with another Church from which we had been separated on many grave and important doctrinal and moral questions. The result of this amalgamation was the emergence of another Church, perhaps differing from both of its constituents, and certainly presenting us with a question of inexpressible importance when we are invited to become part and parcel of it. Certainly if the Church from which we separated had remained

as it was before our departure, there would have been comparatively little difficulty in our reuniting with them. It is equally certain that if the New School Church had remained separate, no proposition for our uniting with them would have been entertained for a moment. But their fusion in 1869 raises the serious question, what is now the character of the body which emerged from the fusing process which has taken place between a Church with which our difference, formerly, was confined to a single point, and a Church with which our former differences were not only many in number, but radical in essence? The *tertium quid* may be different from both of its constituents. But, possibly, the effect may have been to carry the Church from which we differed the least, still farther away than the single issue of the Spiritual character of the Church. Possibly the effect may have been to qualify the errors of the New School to a certain extent, and yet to leave enough of its grave departures from the creed of our Church to admit of no room for our union with them. Possibly the effect may have been to give a new and treaty-guarded standing to all, or the most, of the errors driven from the Church in 1837. Who can answer this grave question? Yet it must be answered, or organic union will involve to us a fearful breach in our covenant as a Church. We are now under a solemn covenant with each other to teach the old Calvinistic doctrines, of the Federal Headship of Adam, Imputation, Original Sin, Total Depravity, the Election of Grace, Regeneration by the Spirit, and Vicarious Atonement. Each of these doctrines was repudiated in the bosom of the New School of Presbyterian theology in 1837—not by all New School men, but by many. The errors opposed to these doctrines had so full and extensive a standing among the New School party that they were the distinguishing features of the New School doctrine. This was the deliberate judgment of such men as Charles Hodge, Archibald Alexander, George Baxter, Ashbel Green, Robert Breckinridge, William Plumer, and of the whole of that grave body of able and godly men who met in Convention on the 11th of May, 1837, one week previous to the meeting of the celebrated Assembly of that year. Let any

one read the Memorial presented by that body, or prepared for presentment, to the Assembly, if he wishes to gain an idea of what New School theology really was in the beginning. *Has it changed?* If not, then organic union involves our absolute apostacy from our covenanted creed. We have solemnly pledged faith to each other in our Southern Presbyterian Church, to deny these errors and to maintain faithfully the truths which oppose them. Can we now consent to admit these errors under our covenant and bind ourselves to respect forever the chartered freedom and franchise of these dangerous travesties of the truth of Christ, now standing guarded by treaty in the Church of the Northern Presbyterians? We trow not; this Southern Church is, we trust, yet sound and faithful enough to turn with horror from the bare suggestion. But to the *history* of this scheme of error misnamed Presbyterian. We go no farther back than the period of the disruption of the Church in 1837. For several years the Church had been rent with controversy about the errors in doctrine, in Church order and in discipline, which had found their way into the Church chiefly through the agency of the Plan of Union with the Congregationalists of New England, adopted in 1804. That serious departures from the doctrines of the Presbyterian creed had become widespread in the Church, can admit of no reasonable doubt. Prolonged conflicts preceded the disruption. For years the ablest men on both sides had been engaged in open conflict. The mischief had increased to such an extent that the Church was nearly equally divided. In 1836, the errors of Mr. Barnes which had implicated his Presbytery in Philadelphia and the Synod of Pennsylvania in a severe struggle for many months, were actually sustained by the General Assembly on his appeal. From this period the friends of the old and genuine faith of Presbyterians saw that the time for decisive measures had come, if the creed of the Westminster Standards was to be maintained. The open design of revolutionizing the Presbyterian Church had been exultingly proclaimed by Lyman Beecher, when Barnes was sustained, and Wilson, of Cincinnati, withdrew his appeal to the Assembly of 1836. The next year the issue was brought to a settlement. A Convention,

composed of firm friends of the Presbyterian system, met in Philadelphia on the 11th of May, one week previous to the meeting of the Assembly. That body drew up a Memorial setting forth the causes of the trouble which was desolating the Church. The paper under the heads of "Errors in Doctrine," "Errors in Church Order," and "Errors in Discipline," disclosed a condition of things in the Church absolutely appalling. This paper was presented to the Assembly and designed to define and regulate its action. But the course of events in the Assembly was modified by the issues raised during its sessions; its powerful and effective remedies were applied without the guidance of the Memorial, and that paper was finally adopted after the measures of relief had been passed, and was given to the Church as an explanation of the grounds on which the course of the Assembly had been taken. That paper then has become historical, not only on the authority of the Convention which prepared it, but of the great Court of the Church which adopted it. Surely, allegations of fact touching errors in doctrine which come down to us certified and assured by such men as George A. Baxter, Robert Breckinridge, Charles Hodge, Archibald Alexander, and the whole O. S. party in the Assembly of '37, are fully entitled to our credit. They were men not to be deceived by the subtle investment of these errors in the form of orthodox phraseology, nor misled as to their gravity and importance. The following extract from the Memorial adopted by the Assembly will disclose to the Church the real nature of the *doctrines* of the so-called New School of Presbyterian theology. No one at all acquainted with the real doctrines of the Presbyterian Church can fail to see that these errors, in the language of the Convention of May 11th, 1837, "strike at the foundation of the system of the gospel of grace." They contain a strange mixture of Arminian and Pelagian errors, enveloped as we shall see in the established forms of orthodox expression. This will appear in the answer to the allegations of the Memorial, by the New School men.

"ERRORS IN DOCTRINE."*

1st. That God would have been glad to prevent the existence of

* See Foote's Sketches of Virginia. Second Series, pp. 514-515.

sin in our world but was not able, without destroying the moral agency of man, or from aught that appears in the Bible to the contrary, sin is incidental to any wise moral system.

2d. That election to eternal life is founded on a foresight of faith and obedience.

3d. That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam than with the sin of any other parent.

4th. That infants come into the world as free from moral defilement as was Adam when he was created.

5th. That infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God, as brute animals, and their sufferings and death are to be accounted for on the same principles as those of brutes, and not by any means to be considered as penal.

6th. That there is no other original sin than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though by nature innocent, or possessed of no moral character, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency; or that original sin does not include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering; and that there is no evidence in Scripture that infants, in order to salvation, do need redemption by the blood of Christ and regeneration of the Holy Ghost.

7th. That the doctrine of imputation, whether of Adam's sin or of Christ's righteousness, has no foundation in the word of God, and is both unjust and absurd.

8th. That the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental, and instructive only.

9th. That the impenitent sinner is by nature, and independently of renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy Spirit, in full possession of all the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God.

10th. That Christ never intercedes for any but those who are actually united to Him by faith; or that Christ does not intercede for the elect until after their regeneration.

11th. That saving faith is the mere belief of the word of God, and not a grace of the Holy Spirit.

12th. That regeneration is the act of the sinner himself, and that it consists in a change of his governing purpose, which he himself must produce, and which is the result, not of any direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart, but chiefly of a persuasive exhibition of the truth, analogous to the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another; or that regeneration is not an instantaneous act, but a progressive work.

13th. That God has done all he can for the salvation of all men, and that man himself must do the rest.

14th. That God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men, as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a certain manner without impairing their moral agency.

15th. That the righteousness of Christ is not the sole ground of the sinner's acceptance with God; and that in no sense does the righteousness of Christ become ours.

16th. That the reason why some differ from others in regard to their reception of the Gospel is, that they make themselves to differ.

To this allegation of error, the following reply was made :

We protest, finally, because in view of all the circumstances of the case, we feel that while we were prevented from uniting in the final vote with the majority in their testimony against error, for the reasons above stated, we owe it to ourselves, to our brethren, to the Church and to the world, to declare and protest that it is not because we do directly or indirectly hold or countenance the errors stated. We are willing to bear our testimony in full against them, and now do so, when, without misapprehension and liability to have our vote misconstrued, we avow our real sentiments, and contrast them with the errors condemned, styling them, as we believe, the true doctrine, in opposition to the erroneous doctrine condemned, as follows, viz :

First Error. "That God would have prevented the existence of sin in our world, but was not able without destroying the moral agency of man; or that, for aught that appears in the Bible to the contrary, sin is incidental to any wise moral system."

True Doctrine. God permitted the introduction of sin, not because he was unable to prevent it, consistently with the moral freedom of his creatures, but for wise and benevolent reasons, which he has not revealed.

Second Error. "That election to eternal life is founded on a foresight of faith and obedience."

True Doctrine. Election to eternal life is not founded on a foresight of faith and obedience, but is a sovereign act of God's mercy, whereby, according to the counsel of his own will he hath chosen some to salvation; "yet, so as thereby neither is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established;" nor does this gracious purpose ever take effect independently of faith and a holy life.

Third Error. "That we have no more to do with the first sin of Adam, than with the sins of any other parent."

True Doctrine. By a divine constitution, Adam was so the head and representative of the race that, as a consequence of his transgression, all mankind became morally corrupt and liable to death, temporal and eternal.

Fourth Error. "That infants come into the world as free from moral defilement as was Adam when he was created."

True Doctrine. Adam was created in the image of God, endowed with knowledge, righteousness and true holiness. Infants come into

the world, not only destitute of these, but with a nature inclined to evil and only evil.

Fifth Error. "That infants sustain the same relation to the moral government of God, in this world, as brute animals, and that their sufferings and death are to be accounted for on the same principles as those of brutes, and not by any means to be considered as penal."

True Doctrine. Brute animals sustain no such relation to the moral government of God as does the human family. Infants are a part of the human family; and their sufferings and death are to be accounted for on the ground of their being involved in the general moral ruin of the race induced by the apostacy.

Sixth Error. "That there is no other original sin than the fact that all the posterity of Adam, though by nature innocent, will always begin to sin when they begin to exercise moral agency; that original sin does not include a sinful bias of the human mind, and a just exposure to penal suffering; and that there is no evidence in Scripture that infants, in order to salvation, do need redemption by the blood of Christ and regeneration by the Holy Ghost."

True Doctrine. Original sin is a natural bias to evil, resulting from the first apostacy, leading invariably and certainly to actual transgression. And all infants, as well as adults, in order to be saved, need redemption by the blood of Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost.

Seventh Error. "That the doctrine of imputation, whether of the guilt of Adam's sin, or of the righteousness of Christ, has no foundation in the word of God, and is both unjust and absurd."

True Doctrine. The sin of Adam is not imputed to his posterity in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities, acts and demerit; but by reason of the sin of Adam, in his peculiar relation, the race are treated as if they had sinned. Nor is the righteousness of Christ imputed to his people in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities, acts and merit; but by reason of his righteousness in his peculiar relation, they are treated as if they were righteous.

Eighth error. "That the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental and instructive only."

True Doctrine. The sufferings and death of Christ were not symbolical, governmental, and instructive only, but were truly vicarious, *i. e.*, a substitute for the punishment due to transgressors. And while Christ did not suffer the literal penalty of the law, involving remorse of conscience, and the pains of hell, he did offer a sacrifice which infinite wisdom saw to be a full equivalent. And by virtue of this atonement, overtures of mercy are sincerely made to the race, and salvation secured to all who believe.

Ninth error. "That the impenitent sinner is by nature, and independently of the renewing influence or almighty energy of the Holy

Spirit, in full possession of all the ability necessary to a full compliance with all the commands of God."

True Doctrine. While sinners have all the faculties necessary to a perfect moral agency and a just accountability, such is their love of sin and opposition to God and his law, that independently of the renewing influence and almighty energy of the Holy Spirit they never will comply with the commands of God.

Tenth Error. "That Christ does not intercede for the elect until after their regeneration."

True Doctrine. The intercession of Christ for the elect is previous as well as subsequent to their regeneration, as appears from the following Scripture, viz: "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word."

Eleventh Error. "That saving faith is not an effect of the operations of the Holy Spirit, but a mere rational belief of the truth, or assent to the word of God."

True Doctrine. Saving faith is an intelligent and cordial assent to the testimony of God concerning his Son, implying reliance on Christ alone for pardon and eternal life, and in all cases it is an effect of the special operation of the Holy Spirit.

Twelfth Error. "That regeneration is the act of the sinner himself, and that it consists in a change of his governing purpose which he himself must produce, and which is the result not of any direct influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart, but chiefly of a persuasive exhibition of the truth, analogous to the influence which one man exerts over the mind of another, or that regeneration is not an instantaneous act, but a progressive work."

True Doctrine. Regeneration is a radical change of heart, produced by the special operations of the Holy Spirit, "determining the sinner to that which is good," and is in all cases instantaneous.

Thirteenth Error. "That God has done all that he can do for the salvation of all men, and that man himself must do the rest."

True Doctrine. While repentance for sin and faith in Christ are indispensable to salvation, all who are saved are indebted from first to last to the grace and Spirit of God. And the reason that God does not save all is not that he wants the *power* to do it, but that in his wisdom he does not see fit to exert that power further than he actually does.

Fourteenth Error. "That God cannot exert such influence on the minds of men as shall make it certain that they will choose and act in a particular manner without impairing their moral agency."

True Doctrine. While the liberty of the will is not impaired, nor the established connection between means and end broken by any action of God on the mind, he can influence it according to his pleasure, and does effectually determine it to good in all cases of true conversion.

Fifteenth Error. "That the righteousness of Christ is not the sole ground of the sinner's acceptance with God, and that in no sense does the righteousness of Christ become ours."

True Doctrine. All believers are justified, not on the ground of personal merit, but solely on the ground of the obedience and death, or in other words, the righteousness of Christ. And while that righteousness does not become theirs in the sense of a literal transfer of personal qualities and merit, yet from respect to it, God can and does treat them as if they were righteous.

Sixteenth Error. "That the reason why some differ from others in regard to their reception of the Gospel, is that they make themselves to differ."

True Doctrine. While all such as reject the Gospel of Christ do it not by coercion, but freely, and all who embrace it, do it not by coercion, but freely, the reason why some differ from others, is because God has made them to differ. (Moore's Digest, pp. 227-230).

In these two papers adopted and recorded in 1837, we have the whole case so far as the doctrinal issues were concerned, as between the Old and New School parties in the Church. From the very beginning there was an allegation of error on the one side and a denial on the other. The denial is couched, in forms of orthodox expression adroitly adapted to avoid the acknowledgement of the orthodox conception, and yet appear at the same time not to impeach or depart from it. Orthodox terms are used; orthodox logic is employed; and so effectually are these expedients employed, that the ordinary reader is left at a loss to know wherein the parties differ, and to ascribe the strong assertions of serious error to the artificial modes of thinking in the professional theologian, with which the common mind cannot sympathize, or perhaps, to the virulence of theological antipathies and prejudice. Such a class of minds is apt to fall into a snare. They are not aware that such is the universal mode under which serious errors spring up under an established and authoritative creed. Arius pursued this method when he introduced the Arian heresy. Arminius pursued it, when under a Calvinistic symbol, and in a Calvinistic Church, he introduced the Arminian theory. Both used and continued to the last to use orthodox expressions, the regular and established technicalities of the orthodox creed. An ordinary reader or hearer

would have been puzzled to understand where the difficulty lay. Yet under a form of sound words, Arius denied the divinity of Christ, and Arminius, the doctrines of grace. It is absolutely certain that the able and accomplished men who made open and uncompromising war on New School theology, the Baxters, Hodges, Alexanders, Greens and Breckinridges, and all the Old School party who followed their lead, asserted that the dangerous errors cited in the Memorial of the Convention of May 11th, 1837, were couched in the orthodox phrase employed by the New School. The only alternatives are these: either the Old School utterly misapprehended and misrepresented the views of the New School in 1837, or else these errors were hidden under orthodox form of expression, adroitly contrived to make the impression of adhesion to orthodox views, while carrying a sense really divergent from them. Take one or two examples. The Federal Headship of Adam was denied by Barnes, according to the Old School view of his teaching. In the New School vindication of him,* it is denied that Mr. Barnes "denies, much less sneers at," the doctrine; but it is asserted that, "though he employs not these terms, he does, in other language, teach the same truths which are taught by this phraseology." In the assertion of the "True Doctrine," as opposed to the "Third Error,"† it is stated in carefully guarded phrase that, "by a divine constitution, Adam was so the head and representative of the race, that as a consequence of his transgression, all mankind became corrupt and liable to death temporal and eternal." "Adam was *so* the head and representative of the race." But *how* was he so constituted? There are two theories touching the *method* of this constitution, and the difference in the view of *this method* constitutes the difference between the doctrine of Calvinistic theology and the doctrine of Arminianism and other divergent creeds. The Calvinistic view makes Adam the Federal Head and *legal* representative of his descendants, and in consequence of his sin, the consequences fell upon them *as a sentence of law*. The Arminian view denies the legal representative character, makes Adam merely the natural head of his posterity,

*Moore's Digest, p. 227. †Moore's Digest, p. 229.

their representative purely as the result of a social organization or natural relation, and the consequences of his fall come upon them merely as the effect of the law of heredity—as the mere natural consequence of an unalterable law of nature. Now, in view of these divergent theories, it is perfectly obvious that it is altogether futile to say that “Adam was so the head and representative of the race,” in order to vindicate a claim to Calvinistic orthodoxy. Calvinistic theology explains and asserts the method of Adam’s headship as *Federal* and *legal* representation. To refuse to use these terms as Barnes does, and as the explication of “True Doctrine” does, creates an irresistible conviction that *they do not* hold the Federal Headship of Adam in the Calvinistic sense. Why should they refuse the terms if they hold the idea? These terms have long been settled as technicalities fairly expressing the conception; why should they be repudiated if the conception is really held? It is altogether misleading to employ a phrase which may be used by an Arminian, or by any theorist denying the Calvinistic view, as in itself a reliable proof of adhesion to Calvinistic conceptions.

Take another sample, for it is impossible for us to go through the whole of the sixteen contrasted statements. To the allegation of the “Eighth Error,” “that the sufferings and death of Christ were not truly vicarious and penal, but symbolical, governmental and instructive only,” it is replied in the assertion of the “True Doctrine,” that “the sufferings and death of Christ were not symbolical, governmental and instructive only, but were truly vicarious, *i. e.*, a substitute for the punishment due to transgressors.” We do not copy the whole of this assertion of the “True Doctrine,” because it is enough for our purpose to quote the statement on the one only point on which we have space to comment. We are informed that the vicarious nature of our Lord’s intervention consists not in his becoming a substitute for sinners, but in the adoption of a “substitute for the punishment due to transgressors.” This is a clear variation from the Calvinistic theology, which teaches that God laid upon Christ the iniquity of us all, and that “by his obedience and death he did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to God’s justice in

behalf of them that are justified.”* This teaches a substitution for *persons*—not *penalties*. It is obvious also that if a substitute for the punishment due to sinners was found, then the actual claims of the law were set aside, and Christ did not redeem us from the real curse by being made a curse for us. The curse is set aside; a substitute is found for it. There is no satisfaction made to the broken law; for its claims are set aside, and a substitute found for them. Atonement is not a satisfaction of justice, but a compliance with a substitute for it. Is it possible to conceive a more dangerous travesty of Gospel grace? Is it possible to conceive of a phrase, apparently orthodox, carrying a sense so completely divergent from the Calvinistic creed—so utterly empty of all power to give peace to a soul really awake to the sense of sin and the awful, intrinsic and unalterable justice of the penal claims of the law?

We have no space to pursue the analysis of these subtle assertions of the “True Doctrine.” *Ex uno disce omnes.* Let the Southern Presbyterian Church understand *what she is invited to do*, by the project of organic union. She would not tolerate these errors now in her own bosom. She is not now responsible for their treaty-guarded standing in the Northern Church. She is under a solemn covenant to teach the doctrines of her creed, and to resist the errors opposed to them. Organic union will take her into a body where these errors have a standing, and apparently a treaty-bound and chartered freedom to propagate at will. We must come on the same terms on which the re-union took place in 1869. We must assume responsibility for these errors. We must pledge ourselves not to resist them. In other words, organic union means the *repudiation of our creed and principles of adhesion to our Standards*—the breach of our covenant, as a Church, to teach the doctrines of genuine Calvinism—the acceptance of responsibility for errors which we do not hold—the abandonment of our right and solemn duty to resist and repudiate these errors. Are any of us ready for this? We do not believe it of one in our whole connection.

But to anticipate here a cavil which will be made to the

* Larger Catechism, Question 71.

above impeachment of the soundness of the Northern Church—the New School for making these erroneous constructions of the Westminster Standards—the Old School for allowing them to be made under their responsibility: it will be said we impeach *the integrity* of both sections of the Northern Church. We distinctly repudiate all reflection upon their *integrity*; we only impeach the *correctness* of their interpretation of the Standards, and their view of what is required by a genuine Presbyterian theory of adhesion to the Standards. We do not impeach the integrity of the original New School innovators, much less of the present generation of New School theologians. We only impeach the correctness of their interpretation of the Standards, and *assert their divergence in doctrinal view from ourselves*. How symbols so clearly and definitely Calvinistic could be construed to yield results so completely divergent from Calvinistic principles, we do not pretend to explain. The vagaries of the human understanding are infinite and inexplicable. We impeach the integrity of no Christian man, and especially of no great branch of the Christian Church, while we are bound to recognize their errors. This is all we do in recognizing the errors of the Northern Presbyterian Church. Let no advocate of organic union try to make capital of our impeachment of these errors, as synonymous with an imputation upon their integrity. We disclaim it in advance. Nor do we impute these errors to all New School men, either of the era of 1837 or of the present day: we only assert that the statements of doctrine formulated in the protests and answers of the party in 1837 are not just expositions of Calvinistic doctrine. We only assert that many of their leading men, such as Barnes and Beman, were undeniably unsound. We do not deny that many New School men—then and now—notably the Southern New School party, were sound men. It may be that the authors of “the Auburn Declaration” may have been sound men: we do not assert that as fact, for we have never seen the Declaration, and do not know the men who adopted it. The New School party in 1837 was, emphatically, not a uniform or consolidated body, so far as doctrine was concerned. Knowing this, it seems altogether logically possible for

a whole convention of the sound men among them to have met and honestly protested against the imputation to them of the errors of their party. This could have been done by the Southern New School; it may have been done by some among the Northern New School. But *the fatal fact* remains that the errors charged by the Old School did have a currency *wide enough to constitute the characteristic features of the New School theology*, and were covertly contained in the public formulations of doctrine in the Protests and Answers of the party in the Church Courts, and in the writings of their leading men. They are, therefore, *as a party*, answerable for these errors, in spite of the presence of sound men, to a greater or less degree, in their ranks. We do no injustice, then, in dealing with these views as *distinctively New School Theology*.

Now what has been the history and what is *now the present status of these new views?* Two Churches distinct in form, and openly antagonistic, sprang out of the long and vehement conflicts resulting in the exciding acts of the Assembly of 1837. For twelve years they stood apart in uncompromising opposition. In 1849, the first move towards friendly relations was made in the New School Assembly. The Old School made no response and the matter was dropped. In 1850 the Old School Assembly made a general declaration of its desire for the union of all sound Presbyterians. To this the New School made no response. In 1862 the N. S. Assembly expressed its willingness to unite "with all persons who can stand on the Basis of the Standards, and who agree on the moral questions of the day, in the matter, especially, of *loyalty* to the Government and in the views of slavery set forth, prior to the division in 1818." In 1862 the O. S. Assembly initiated the project proposed by the New School in 1849 for exchange of delegates. In 1863 this was accepted by the N. S. Assembly and the system of intercourse by delegates adopted. In 1866 the proposal of reunion into one organic body was made by the O. S. Assembly and a Reunion Committee was appointed, consisting of nine ministers and six elders. In the same year a similar committee was appointed by the N. S. Assembly. These committees met in joint session in New

York in February, 1867, and continued sitting for five days. They adjourned to meet in May and continued in session seven days. They united in a paper proposing terms of reunion in a series of eleven propositions directly bearing on the issue, and three more on the incidental requisites to a general understanding of them. In 1867 the report of the Joint Committee was favorably received by the O. S. Assembly, and recommitted to the Joint Committee for further co-operation and progress. In 1867 similar action was taken on the report of the Joint Committee, and the Committee continued to prosecute the work in hand. The Joint Committee assembled in Philadelphia in March, 1868, and continued in session four days, and finally adjourned after adopting an explanatory paper and Terms of Reunion somewhat changed from the Terms as originally adopted. The First of these articles is the chief matter of interest to us in the issue now before us. It is in the following words :

1. "The reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; it being understood, that this Confession is received in its proper historical (that is the Calvinistic or Reformed) sense; it is also understood, that *various methods* of viewing, stating, explaining, and illustrating the doctrines of the Confession which do not impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system, are to be freely allowed in the united Church, *as they have hitherto been allowed in the separate Churches*; and the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity."

We reserve comment and proceed with the history. In 1868, these amended Terms of Reunion were approved by the O. S. Assembly and sent down to the Presbyteries for their action, by a vote of yeas 188, nays 70, excused 1. In the same year, in the N. S. Assembly, these Terms of Reunion were unanimously adopted, after some amendment, and sent down to the Presbyteries, four persons being excused from voting. In the O. S.

Assembly, Dr. Monfort moved, and the motion was adopted, that while approving the Terms of Reunion it preferred dropping all explanatory or restrictive expressions in the First Term, which we have just quoted, and *uniting on a mere adhesion to the Standards*. This motion was submitted at once to the New School Assembly; it was received with profound satisfaction, but declined, as coming too late in their sessions to make any change desirable. Consequently, the Terms of Reunion went down for the formal vote of the Presbyteries. In the meantime, a powerful protest, signed by 57 of the Old School Assembly, among whom are the names of Edward P. Humphrey, Robert J. Breckinridge, L. J. Halsey, Charles Hodge, Archibald Alexander Hodge and John C. Backus, was entered against the Terms of Union. That paper reads like a duplicate of the "Errors in Doctrine," in the Memorial of the Convention of May 11th, 1837, with some strong items of objection additional. The answer is along the same line of denial adopted by the New School from the beginning. These papers are of high importance, because they show that up to 1869 the same errors of New School Presbyterians were recognized *up to the very date of the reunion*. In 1869, at the regular May meetings of the Assemblies, the reports of the action of the Presbyteries were received. In the Old School Church, out of one hundred and forty-three Presbyteries, *one hundred and five opposed the Basis of Reunion*, most of them expressing "a desire for reunion, on terms that will not override the Confession of Faith with any special stipulations." In the New School Assembly, the Terms of Reunion were reported as accepted by a vote of Presbyteries well-nigh unanimous, one hundred out of one hundred and thirteen Presbyteries direct in favor, *four* against them. This division, the Old School Church against, the New School in favor of the Terms of Reunion, broke down the work of the Joint Committee entirely. The whole movement was in peril. The New School appeared to be more willing to give guarantees than the Old School to require them. In this critical state of the case, both Assemblies met in New York in May, 1869. On the first day of the Old School Assembly, Dr. Musgrave led the way to an entirely

new deal. The work of the Joint Committee was thrown aside; the Terms of Union proposed by them were rejected; a committee was appointed to draft a Basis merely on the Standards, which was at once adopted, in these words of the *Second* article:

2. "The reunion shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common Standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the Government and Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity."^{*}

These words were framed into a question to be answered categorically by the Presbyteries, which were to forward answers by November 1st, 1869. It was then provided that both Assemblies should adjourn, when their business was finished, to meet in Pittsburg on the second Wednesday of November, 1869, to receive the response of the Presbyteries and take action accordingly. If the Presbyteries accepted the new Basis, measures should be taken for the meeting of the General Assembly of the reunited Church, in May, 1870. Concurrent declarations of the two Assemblies were drawn up, covering the ground occupied by the bulk of the rejected Terms of Reunion, and a day of prayer recommended. This report of the New Committee on the Basis was adopted by the O. S. Assembly, yeas 285, nays 9; by the N. S. Assembly unanimously. This Basis was then sent down to the Presbyteries with peremptory orders to report before the 1st day of November to the Stated Clerk of the Assembly; both Courts taking this action. On the 10th of November, 1869, at 11 o'clock, a. m., both Assemblies met in Pittsburg, the Old School in the 1st Church, the New School in the 3d Church. The Stated Clerk of the Old School Assembly announced that out of one hundred and forty-four Presbyteries, one hundred and twenty-six had answered in the affirmative, three in the negative. In the New School Assembly, answers were received from all its one hundred and thirteen Presbyteries, all

^{*} Moore's Digest, p. 91.

in the affirmative. In three Presbyteries a single negative vote was given. Thus the Reunion was accomplished. Each Assembly adjourned on Friday, after calling a General Assembly of the reunited Church for May, 1870. They then met according to a fixed programme in a Joint Convention for solemn worship, communed together in the afternoon of the day, and after resolving to raise a Memorial Fund of \$5,000,000 to set forward their joint work with suitable *clat*, dispersed to their homes, their work, whether for good or evil, accomplished.

From this historical sketch of the Reunion proceedings, many striking lessons may be learned. We limit our comments to the few matters which concern us in the issue of organic union with this reunited Church, now forced upon our attention.

1. It is certain that the grave errors of New School theology in 1837 were still extant when this reunion took place in 1869, in the judgment of such men as Charles and A. A. Hodge, Robert Breckinridge, Edward P. Humphrey, John C. Backus and Henry J. Van Dyke, this last as we learn from a different source from the Minutes of the Assembly.

2. It is certain that Terms binding to a construction of the Standards in their proper, historical, that is, the Calvinistic or Reformed sense, and allowing "various methods of viewing, stating, explaining and illustrating the doctrines of the Confession which do not impair the integrity of the Reformed or Calvinistic system in the United Church, as they had been hitherto allowed in the separate Churches," were laid down by the Joint Committee in their "Terms of Reunion." These terms were *not satisfactory*, simply because they allowed each man to judge for himself whether his views did or did not impair the integrity of the Calvinistic system, and secondly, because the New School had always insisted that the distinctive New School views were in accord with the Calvinistic system. Under these terms, the New School ideas could be freely taught as before. Moreover, this was also fully assured by the agreement that various methods of *viewing*, stating and explaining doctrine current before the union in either separate Church, should remain current in the united Church. This specification gave an ample

and chartered franchise to every New School error. The limitation of not impairing the Calvinistic system was inept and powerless to check the free charter of error given in the continued liberty of various methods, as we have just seen. When Monfort's amendment to the *first* article of the Terms was suggested, several New School Presbyteries assented on condition that "all reasonable liberty in interpretation be not relinquished."* But strange to say, while the New School were willing to come under *some* terms of positive covenant apparently constricting the interpretation of the Standards, the Old School rejected the Basis of Terms elaborated by the Joint Committee. The New School accepted them. But the whole case was brought into imminent peril of total failure by the refusal of one hundred and five Old School Presbyteries to endorse the Terms proposed.

3. It is certain that the Basis finally offered by the Old School and eagerly accepted by the New, has given no assurance whatever on the common construction of the Standards. New School constructions are still chartered *without even the gossamer restrictions of the Joint Committee's Terms*, those Terms being thrown aside by both parties. It is absolutely clear from the history of the case, not only that the errors of New School theology in 1837, are, in the judgment of the signers of the Protest of Drs. E. P. Humphrey, Charles Hodge and others of equal trustworthiness in discerning error, still extant in the New School constructions of the Standards, *but that they have gained a franchise and chartered freedom of life and motion in the reunited Church of the North*. Now what is all this to us? The proposition of organic union invites us to share in that Basis and assume responsibility for these errors and the mistaken policy which has given them a treaty-standing in the Presbyterian Church of the North. If we do, what will be the consequences? Let us look before we leap.

1. It is perfectly clear that we differ from the Church we are invited to enter on the *fundamental condition of doctrinal fidelity*—the *creed principle* of a *single* construction of the Standards. A creed is a definition of doctrine and a covenant to

* Moore's Digest, p. 89.

maintain it. To allow of double and divergent constructions of a creed, is to *destroy it*. Under the principle of double construction it ceases to be a definition of doctrine, because it allows the doctrinal statement to be construed in two or more different ways. It ceases to be a covenant to maintain it, because there is no longer any settled truth to be maintained. If the Baptist creed upon immersion were allowed to be construed first as demanding immersion, and then as demanding something else, the Baptist creed on the ordinance of baptism would be destroyed. Moreover, the single construction of a creed is demanded by the fact that *the truth it defines is single*; and to allow it to be construed in two different ways is to *betray the truth itself*. To allow divergent constructions of the creed is to turn a witnessing Church with a clear, united and definite testimony into a *Broad Church* allowing varying and contradictory doctrines to be taught in it. It is to violate our covenant as a Church. It is to weaken our influence as a teaching institute. It is to break down the barriers that fence out error. It is to make ourselves responsible for errors which we do not hold. It is to betray our high duty to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and thus to sacrifice our most important interests. The principle of a single construction of the creed has always been a distinguishing peculiarity of the Presbyterian branch of the Kingdom of Christ. Can we in good conscience toward God now abandon it? This is the first grave sacrifice which organic union will demand at our hands—the *abandonment of our creed principle* of a single construction and a united testimony of our creed itself. Can we consent to destroy the noble creed of our Fathers by allowing it to be construed in different ways?

2. It is also clear that important doctrinal differences exist between us and the Church we are invited to enter, certainly with such an important element in it that we cannot enter into this fusion without a grave compromise of our own fidelity to the truth. We are under covenant to teach certain truths yielded by certain constructions of our Standards adopted from the Word of God. We are under covenant to resist all errors opposing these views. The New School constructions of the Standards

were resisted by our fathers fifty years ago, as yielding the errors which antagonized their views and ours. The Protest of Humphrey, Breckinridge, and the two great theologians of Princeton Seminary, Charles and A. A. Hodge, and more than fifty others, in 1869 recognized these errors as still extant among the New School Presbyterians. At all events, it is certain, that, even admitting the entire body of the New School to have receded from the theology of Barnes and Beman, and become genuinely orthodox, *still it is a chartered right of any man in the future* to teach, without the possibility of arrest, in all the various methods of viewing, stating and explaining the Standards, which did once obtain among the New School Presbyterians. If they are bound to teach nothing to impair the historical, Calvinistic, or Reformed sense, they are left still to construe their teachings, as they have always done, as *not impairing* the historical Calvinism of the creed. It is certain they secured "a liberty of interpretation." Although these explicit items in the "Terms of Reunion" of the Joint Committee were formally superseded by the basis of the Standards, merely, yet they remain as authoritative expositions of what was meant by adhesion to the basis of the Standards. The denial, now, of the New School claim to still apply the "various methods" to the construction of the Standards, is utterly impossible. The Southern Church and the United Synod came together on the basis of the Standards, but only after elaborate conferences had clearly shown a hearty agreement in construction. The Northern New and Old School came together on the basis of the Standards, after elaborate conferences, which settled terms of allowed variation in construction. Neither can retire from the obligations thus assumed, though not entering formally into the final covenant. The conclusion is resistless that the doctrinal differences which drove our heroic fathers into war in 1837, have re-entered the united Church of the North, and now stand guarded by treaty stipulations which secure the chartered freedom of the errors in question forever, within that body. The Southern Church would not now tolerate in her pulpits, in the deliverances of her Church Courts, or in the literature published under her responsibility, any of these errors. She is not

now at all responsible for them among our Northern brethren. To their own Master they stand or fall. We would never have opened our mouths to impeach their soundness unless it were forced upon us by some necessity not of our seeking. But when the proposal of an organic union with them is made, which will make us responsible, we are bound to investigate their status in relation to the doctrines allowed to be taught under their authority, and if they differ in doctrinal views from ourselves, fidelity to the truth as we solemnly receive it from the Word of God absolutely forbids our fusion with them *at the expense of our doctrinal covenant*. The independence of the Southern Presbyterian Church is absolutely demanded by our fidelity to the doctrines we profess and have solemnly covenanted to maintain.

3. Organic union with the Northern Church is also prohibited by a positive command of the Holy Ghost, until that Church can unite with us in the testimony which we are commanded in 1 Tim. 6 : 1-5, to bear on the relation of masters and servants. There is a deep and radical difference between us and at least the New School element of the Northern Church, on *the moral nature* of the relation of slavery. Up to the separation from the O. S. Church in 1861, that body was united in its testimony adopted in 1845 on this vexed and exciting topic. Differing in their estimate of the civil value of the peculiar institution, Northern and Southern Old School Presbyterians were united in their view of the *moral element* involved in it as determined by the Word of God. They were at one in construing the command of the Holy Spirit in the Epistle to Timothy :

“ Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren ; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness : from such withdraw thyself.”

The Old School accepted the same view of this command with ourselves up to the period of the separation in 1861. Whether they would be willing to renew that testimony of 1845, is, to say the least of it, exceedingly doubtful. It is absolutely certain the New School element would not do it. They have always stood upon the deliverance of 1818, and accepted the more extreme views on the moral nature of the relation of slavery. They drove out the United Synod, composed of their Southern members, on that very account, and to-day they are an unit in their testimony. The divergence of large masses of intelligent and Christian people on a point of morals, and the radical nature of their differences in interpreting the teachings of the Scriptures upon it, constitute one of the most remarkable problems of human thought. The difference in the *moral intuition* is mysterious, but may be partly accounted for by both parties looking at different faces of the shield, one seeing the golden, the other the silver side. The difference in the interpretation of Scripture springs from the same faulty narrowness of view, the one party confining attention to one part of the teaching, the other looking to another part of it, and accepting both parts as logically consistent. In one part of its deliverances on the subject, the Word of God pronounces servitude to be *a curse*. God himself denounced it as such upon Ham, and by his own judicial act subjected him to his brethren. It was an intended curse upon Ham, because it was the punishment of his sin. It was designed as a blessing to his brethren because it was the reward of their filial reverence. The relation created by the act was right because God appointed it. The same conception is enforced by many other definite proofs. He rewarded Abraham by giving him gold and silver, and camels and asses and men-servants and maid-servants. Of these servants, it is expressly said: "Some were born in his house and some bought with his money." Job is expressly noted as the master of slaves. In the only civil constitution ever given directly by God, a form of domestic slavery was introduced. Nay, in the very letter of the Ten Commandments, the relation is recognized in two distinct precepts, in the very words traced by the finger of God on the Tables of

Stone. The whole legislation and teaching of the New Testament is to the very same purpose. The Church was founded by the Apostles in slave-holding countries, yet they did not assail this relation as intrinsically sinful. They gave rules for its regulation, defined the mutual duties of masters and servants, and by irresistible implication sanctioned the relation itself. In the passage quoted from Timothy, they not only sanctioned the relation, but positively commanded that the instructions they had given and enforced by the honor of God himself, should be exhorted and taught. Now here are the two phases of Scripture teaching: one, *servitude, a curse*—the other *slavery, a lawful relation*. The great mass of modern Christians, departing from the views held by the Church for centuries, fix their attention exclusively on the one decision of servitude as a curse. The Church of Christ, under all its forms in the fifteen Southern States of the American Union, following the old views of the Christian Church, have accepted *both decisions* of the Word of God: servitude, a curse, and the relation of master and servant a lawful relation. These Southern Churches can see no inconsistency in the two instructions. The Bible, like the common-sense of all mankind, discriminates *between the condition of servitude and the relations it creates*. The condition of servitude in the poverty it implies—in the menial offices it involves—is a condition of lapsed humanity—an incident of the fall, and a part of the curse which follows it. But *the relations* it creates are right, whether those relations be the relation of a hireling or a slave—of hired or heritable service. Many similar incidents of the lapsed condition of the human race are patent in human society. Sickness and death are a part of the curse; but the relations they create—the relation of doctor and nurse—are absolutely right. War is a part of the curse; but the relations created by it—the relation of the soldier and the diplomat—are right. Civil government itself is an incident of the fall, an institute designed to restrain the evil impulses of a fallen race; yet all the relations of civil government are right. All servitude is a part of the curse; but to confound servitude with the relations it creates, is a blunder of modern philosophy, but not of the Scriptures. The testimony

of the Southern Church is now what it has always been. The reasons for their unalterable adhesion to this testimony are two fold: *first*, moral questions are unalterable; and *second*, the teachings of the Scriptures are to-day what they were a thousand years ago—what they will be a thousand years to come. They are as *authoritative* now as they have always been, and as they always will be. Their *utility* is as unchangeable as their *authority*. All Scripture is *profitable* as well as eternally obligatory. If the question is asked, why raise this issue now, the answer is ready. The command “These things teach and exhort” is still in force, and the Church is bound to obey it. But more than this, the principles underlying the teachings of the Scriptures, on the rightful subordination of men in the relations of society, are necessary to the preservation of domestic peace, property, and the rights of every class. The modern constructions put upon it have turned the grand maxim of civil freedom into the most dangerous and foolish rule that ever entered the brain of an enthusiast. Identical in form, the precept of Sydney, Locke and Jefferson, has been turned by the unchastened constructions of modern socialists into the ruinous maxim of the Communist and the Socialist. True in one remote and abstract sense, and as such valuable, it is false in twenty senses intensely practical, and as such is infinitely mischievous. The time is fast approaching when all Christendom will appreciate the *utility* of the Scripture teachings, which the Southern Christians are reproached for upholding. In this testimony on the relations of servitude, we are standing, first and foremost, in maintenance of the Word of God, and secondly, for the rights of property, for domestic peace, for social order, and for the rights of all classes of mankind as defined in their actual status in all human society. We cannot go back from this testimony. We must obey the unrepealed command, “These things teach and exhort. If the Northern Presbyterian Church will not unite in this testimony, organic union or co-operative union are impossible, unless we mean to rebel outright against the orders of the Holy Ghost. If they refuse to unite in this testimony, we must obey the command, “From such withdraw thyself.”

4. Organic union is likewise prohibited to us by the *number and gravity* of the points of *ecclesiastical usage and administration* on which the two Churches differ. A single point separated us at first from the Old School section of the Northern Church; a number of points separated us from the New School; and the Reunited Church has developed a similar phase of multiplied divisions of sentiment and practice. We will state these without discussion, except so far as may be necessary to explain. We differ,

(1). On the *construction* of the *spiritual character* of the Church. The formal re-acknowledgement of the authoritative paragraphs of the Confession of Faith by the Northern Synod of Missouri, lately approved in the Omaha Assembly, is absolutely without force, for the simple reason that those paragraphs are construed by them as fully consistent with the power to decide all sorts of political questions. The Omaha Assembly itself, on the very heels of its acknowledgement of the purely spiritual character of the Church, threw out an appeal from an act of the Synod of Pennsylvania recommending an amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The paragraphs were in the Confession when the notorious Spring Resolutions were passed; yet they were not and never have been construed as prohibiting these Resolutions. What is the use or the sound sense of claiming identity of principle on the spiritual character of the Church, when the *construction* of the principle is supposed, on one side, to warrant an unlimited interference with things secular, because the moral distinction can inhere in them; and on the other side, the principle is construed to limit such interference within brief bounds. The Northern principle—the Church has a right to interfere wherever the moral distinction is found—absolutely destroys all restraint upon interference with secular matters. It is identical with the Popish principle, the infallible right to decide all questions of doctrine and morals. It is altogether possible the Southern Church has not made a consistent application of her principle, and may have been guilty of more than one trespass beyond her spiritual limits. But the difference between her and her sister at the North is radical.

Whenever the Southern Church is convicted of such a trespass, *her principle* gives the right to call her to *account*, and imposes the obligation upon her to retrace her steps. But her Northern sister Church so construes her commission that no trespass can be arrested, no repentance can be demanded; because her construction of her principle has broken down, to all practical intents and purposes, all distinction between things secular and ecclesiastical. This view of the late action of the Omaha Assembly is confirmed by the view taken of it by the press of the Northern Church. The New York *Evangelist*, by one of its correspondents, says plainly: "The Northern Church cannot accept the Southern interpretation of the spiritual character of the Church." In simple truth, the paper of the Missouri Synod approved by the Omaha Assembly has not closed the division in the view of the real sphere of the Church by so much as a hair's breadth.

(2). We differ on our theories of the real sphere of the Church in relation to an indefinite number of things besides political matters. The principle of the Northern Presbyterians, the right to intervene wherever the distinction of right and wrong inheres necessarily, gives an unlimited charter to ecclesiastical action. The Church becomes an authorized agent to take the lead in every benevolent or humanitarian enterprise. She may as lawfully interfere with secular education, as with religious instruction. She may lead in legislative assaults upon the opium traffic, or recommend changes in favor of temperance, in State Constitutions, as readily as teach "the moral evils" of opium and whisky. All charitable enterprises, Masonic, Pythian, or Odd Fellow she has a right to patronize. The Church is a *Broad Church* in all things in which moral distinctions or religious obligation, can enter. The Southern view of the Kingdom of Christ limits its lawful functions to the spiritual work of propagating the Gospel, and allows the Church to meddle with secular things only so far as they are truly *incidental* and strictly ancillary to her own work. She may not fully understand all the applications of her maxim, and may sometimes overgo and sometimes fail to go as far as her principle will warrant. But the general notion is effective be-

tween a Church with functions practically unlimited, and a Church seeking, as her duty, to give safe bounds to her official action.

(3). We differ on the idea of the true nature of the Ruling Elder's office. In the North, the Rotary Eldership is popular and allowed. This empties the office of its grave and sacred character as a Presbyter of the Church, and makes it a mere office of convenience and temporary investiture. The very nature of the Church is implicated in this view of one of its fundamental elements. The Southern view makes the Ruling Elder a Presbyter called of God to as permanent an office as the ministry of the Gospel. In function of rule, they are construed as the same office. This difference of view is a serious one.

(4). We differ from Northern Presbyterians in our views of Romish baptism and, consequently, in our views of the great Roman apostacy. The Old School once agreed in our view; the New School differed; and the view of the United Church gives one more proof of the supremacy of the New School views in that body.

(5). There is also a difference between our views and practice and an allowed custom of considerable, we know not how great extent, in the use of boiled grape-juice in the stead of wine in the sacrament of the Supper. To us no practice could appear more seriously objectionable, or more worthy of peremptory prohibition by the courts of the Church.

(6). There is a difference between us also touching the relation of women to the *public* work of the Church. The inestimable work of Christian females, instead of being conducted in the private methods consonant to the retired sphere in which the New Testament defines the general scope of female energies, is formulated into a grand, distinct department, publicly recognized as exclusively womans. While discouragement has been thrown upon the formal assumption of the ministerial office by Christian females, their public appearance as reformers and workers is regarded with favor, and construed as no censurable departure from the true sphere of woman. The tendencies of such a policy are far from being approved by the conservative feeling of Southern Christians.

(7) A different rule prevails also in reference to the right of the Presbyteries to preserve themselves and the Churches under their care from the instruction of unsound men, by the *examination of ministers*. In the Southern Church, the rule is mandatory. In the Old School Church of the North, the same regulation prevailed. In the New School, its propriety was always disputed. In the Reunited Church, the rule is reduced to a mere privilege, unregulated by any positive prescriptions touching its use, and distinctly abolished *as law*.^{*} Organic union, laying open our Presbyteries and churches to the approach of New School men from the North, would disable the securities of sound doctrine. No Presbytery would risk the trouble of an appeal to the General Assembly by rejecting any man whose franchise was guarded by the well understood terms on which the Reunion of the New and Old School took place. Organic union would bring us serious hazards of corruption in our public testimony, or of difficulty in protecting our churches from error.

8. There is also a serious theoretic and a still more formidable practical difference between *the modes* of conducting the enterprises of the Church. Our method is to do it by *Committees*; their method is to do it by *Boards*. This distinction is reduced to entire insignificance by some, and is only recognized in the incorporated character of Boards and the incapacity of incorporation attributed to Committees. For years before the war, such thinkers as Breckinridge, Thornwell, and Stuart Robinson were profoundly convinced of the value of that distinction, and labored with intense solicitude to incorporate it into the actual organization of the Church. Would such men have laid such stress on a distinction so immaterial—reduced to a mere difference of size—and an unfounded allegation of incompetence to be incorporated? A Committee can be incorporated, as witness our Committee of Publication. It is still a Committee. The distinction between Boards and Committees lies in another direction. A Board is a conception born of the organic weakness of the Congregational system; it is a body apart from the organization which creates it, designed to do the work assigned

^{*} Moore's Digest, p. 80.

to that organization. In Congregationalism, such a body is necessary, springing from the essential weakness of the system. In a Presbyterian system, a Board is the product, not of organic weakness, but of a mistaken transfer to a body outside of the Church or engrafted upon it of the work assigned to the Church itself. Under a Committee, the Church does her own work with her own organic hand. The distinction is both plain and important. It was brought out by Robert Breckinridge in the very beginning of the reorganization of the Church after the disruption in 1838.* That seed-thought grew until it created the Committee of Church Extension in the unbroken Old School Church in 1855, and moulded the whole form of the Southern Church as it now exists. Great men do not misguide themselves or others by an unfounded distinction.

(9). Lastly, there is a difference between us and the Northern Presbyterians, on a matter of principle, involving a matter of practical importance so absolutely imperious as to be in itself, alone, an absolute bar to organic union, if no other objection lay to the project. This is the question of *a mixed Church of whites and blacks*. The Northern Church is fixed in the purpose to recognize the negro as an organic unit in the Church, and not to give form to an independent African Presbyterian Church. The Southern Church is determined on an independent African Church, in accordance with the preferences of the blacks themselves, and with their own deep convictions of the unqualified necessities of their social state, and, in the long run, of the purity of their blood. In the North this question is of no practical importance. The negro, at the North, is a factor in society absolutely insignificant, and carries no menace to the social conditions, the Church property, the moral advancement, or the race purity of the Northern people. In the South it is different. The negro is with us, by the million; and, relatively to the numbers of the whites, his thronging multitudes are all the more menacing. In other words, he is not only absolutely, but relatively, dangerous. Association in the Church, in her pulpits, in her courts, and in her congregational assemblies walk hand in hand with social rela-

* Critic, Vol. 1, p. 399.

tions, and these with all the horrors of ultimate amalgamation. The distinctions of race are drawn by the hand of God: He always acts upon sufficient reasons in all that He does: however unknown to us, they are guaranteed to us by His infinite perfection. The attempt to obliterate distinctions established by infinite wisdom is infinite folly. All measures tending to that result are, by that very fact, marked as resistance to a divine ordination, and an infinite peril to man. The law of love, so far from impeaching the policy of preserving our race purity untainted, absolutely demands it. Amalgamation between races stamped with the radical distinctions of the five great families of the human race, will result in the deterioration of the best qualities of both; and the law of nature requiring the maintenance of the distinction will re-establish it by the ultimate victory of the baser blood. The white race of the South, brought into close relations with the negro, owe no higher duty, through the long centuries to come, than to preserve the purity of their blood.

But it is supposed the unity of the Church of Christ demands the organic union with the negro race, because we are to call no man common or unclean. The National distinctions of Churches imply no violation of that precept. Denominational divisions in the kingdom do not imply it, where the communion of the saints, in sacrament and worship, is allowed. Organizations in sections of society differing in the social scale, in culture, in tastes, in social habits, are no violation of the precept. Why should organizations based upon race distinctions, and important to guard the great race distinctions created by Almighty God for the best interests of His creatures, be construed as violations of the precept? Neither does the *unity of the Church* require an organic fusion of races. In what does that unity consist? The principle of unity in the kingdom of Christ is exactly the same with the principle of unity in any other kingdom. *It is subjection to the crown.* To condition the unity of the kingdom on a single official or a class of officials under the crown is an absolute solecism. The Roman Church conditions, unity on the Pope and the Episcopal Church conditions it on the order of bishops. This is about as reasonable as it would be to condition the unity of the

German Empire on the Chancellor of the realm, or the unity of the British Empire on the clerks in the war-office. The unity of the kingdom of Christ is exclusively *in the crown of Christ*, and not in any mode or principle of organizing His subjects into a regular organic body. The unity of the kingdom is not at all inconsistent with its division into distinct branches. If this principle is denied, the Church is destroyed; it has long ago committed an act of *felo-de-se*; for these divisions have always existed, and have been occasions of infinite advantage. If this principle is true, then the unity of the kingdom is not broken by the separate organic arrangements of the kingdom, and any separate organization is not a question of law determined by unity, *but a question of expediency*. The formation, then, of an independent African Presbyterian Church will not violate the unity of the kingdom: it is demanded by the highest considerations of wisdom and absolute duty in these Southern States of the American Union. No Southern Christian ought to allow his conscience to be disturbed, for one moment, by the thought that he is violating the unity of the kingdom of Christ by demanding an independent ecclesiastical organization for the negro race. One of the most fatal objections to our organic union with Northern Churches, is that it will bring us into organic union with that very race. It will moreover put the decision of all questions arising along the course of years out of our relations to the negro, into the hands of a body of Northern men. This alone is decisive of the question. We cannot afford to do it, nor will we do it, if God please. We have these questions under our own control as long as the independence and autonomy of the Southern Church is preserved. That lost by organic union, our fate hangs suspended on the will of Northern men. They ought no more to desire than we ought to grant that favor. It would be madness pure and simple.

In conclusion, what ought our Church to do? In the first place, by deliberate study, master the considerations which demand the independence of the Southern church. They are not political; they are not the fruits of passion and prejudice; they are considerations of fidelity to our creed, to the truth of God, and to

the highest concerns of our social life and race purity. Settled in this view, we shall be able to stand in the future in a fearless attitude before all Christendom and in full confidence in God, our King. In the second place, let us hang resolutely together. Why should any Southern church abandon the Assembly of our faithful witnessing body, bearing steady testimony to the doctrine and moral teachings of the Word of God, to enter a broad Church like that of the North, destroying the noble Westminster creed of our fathers by their divergent constructions, and refusing to obey the voice of the Holy Ghost in His teachings on the relations of subordination and servitude among men? What will you gain by refusing to obey the command, "From such withdraw thyself?" In the third place, let us maintain our independence, if possible, without forfeiting the good-will of our Northern brethren. We differ from them in our interpretations of the Standards of the Church, and the teachings of the Scriptures on grave issues of doctrine and morals. But we respect them as a noble branch of the Kingdom of our Lord. We bid them God-speed in their grand endeavors to save the souls of lost men. Nay more, we welcome their presence and work for our own dear Southern countrymen. They proclaimed their mission among us, once, in the terms of war. We are ready to welcome them in terms of peace. The more souls of our dear countrymen they can bring to Jesus, and draw through legitimate conquests of faith and prayer into their churches, the more we shall rejoice. Nay, if any of our suffering churches can find relief among them which we, in our poverty, cannot give, we shall sorrowfully acquiesce in their loss to us. All we ask is fair play, no illegitimate interference with our churches or our work. Give us a noble competition in generous rivalry; give us real friendship under professed fraternity; and the blue banner will float high in the Southern heavens over two branches of the Kingdom doing their work in the unity of the Spirit and the bonds of peace. Let each answer to his own Lord.

C. R. VAUGHAN.