

THE Union Seminary Magazine.

Vol. XIV.

APRIL—MAY, 1903.

No. 4.

I. Literary.

THE PASTOR AS A LEADER.

BY REV. THOS. R. ENGLISH, D. D.,

Professor Pastoral Theology, Union Theological Seminary, Virginia.

THE church is an organization, having members, officers, and rules. It is not merely an aggregation of individuals, but an army brought together and trained for the establishment of Christ's kingdom upon earth. The local church is a company, so to speak, in that army, and the leader and commander thereof is the pastor. As a leader there are certain duties devolving upon him, and upon the proper discharge of these duties will depend, in a large measure, the success of that church.

First, then, the pastor must *plan* for his church. If its efforts are to be intelligent and well directed, there must be some one to do the thinking, and to plan the campaign. There is no one so well fitted for this work, by his position and training, as the pastor, and if he fails to do it, the church will probably drift along aimlessly, or some incompetent hand will lay hold upon the helm. He must thoroughly acquaint himself with the work to be done, the conditions to be met, the resources of the church, and will plan to accomplish the very best results with the means at hand. Just here many pastors fail; and while they may be able expounders of the word, and faithful in looking after the individuals of the flock, yet, by reason of the lack of a masterful leadership, the energies of the church are dissipated, and it accomplishes little in advancing the kingdom of God.

In the second place, the pastor must *train* those under his

THE DOCTRINAL LIKENESS BETWEEN THE DUTCH REFORMED AND THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

BY REV. JNO. W. STAGG, D. D., *Pastor First Church, Charlotte, N. C.*

WHAT is known as the scientific method may be said to have already become a characteristic of modern ways of doing things. The possibility of mistake is eliminated, as far as possible, by ascertaining what things are and what may be done with them. To be able to tell what a thing is, and what it is not, is tantamount to saying a thing is known. To work with anything without such a knowledge is no longer to be tolerated. The waste of ignorance is now considered criminal. Money is the most sensitive of all things to abuse. A waste of money, through ignorance or prejudice, can no longer be justified in the eyes of wise men. The kingdom of Christ is dependent, to a great extent, upon money for its growth; and the church will be asked more and more for sound reasons for the separation of communions that are alike, when it takes more money to maintain them separately than united. If there is an unlikeness in any vital tenet, then there is reason for separation now, as well as in any age of the church of God. To try to put unlikes in one class is to be unscientific; and to try, on the principle of economy, to compel divergent ecclesiastical bodies to be one, is as impossible and as unwise as to try to compel oil and water to be one. But when there is oneness, the methods and ways of modern life will discover it; and if no good reason can be assigned for a separate existence, money will demand a union, in spite of prejudice or fear of consequences.

When asked to prepare this article on the doctrinal likeness between the Dutch Reformed and our Southern Presbyterian Church, I felt that it possibly might be of service in at least showing that unlikeness in doctrine, the most impassible of all barriers, does not exist; and that unless unlikeness is shown in some other vital particular, that, on the ground of the expenditure of money alone, the world will be asking for the

reason in maintaining separate and ponderous machinery for the work in the home and foreign field.

There is so much in common in the history of the origin of the doctrinal standards of the Dutch Reformed and those of the Presbyterian Church, that one familiar with this history would expect to find a likeness in the doctrines themselves. For instance, the Articles of the Synod of Dort, while strenuously opposing Pelagians, Arians and Socinians, and severely condemning them, yet does not state Calvinism offensively. Mosheim allows that the triumph of the Synod was that of the Sublapsarians, not only over the Arminians, but over the Supralapsarians also.

I apprehend that the purpose in the mind of the Editor of this Magazine, when I was requested to write on this subject, will be met if I shall set out from the standards of the Dutch Reformed Church the statement of some of the distinctive points of Calvinism.

The Magazine in which this is published circulates most largely among those who are thoroughly acquainted with our own standards and system of doctrine, and who will readily recognize the bearing of the quotations which follow. Assuming this, I shall spare the reader any lengthy comment on the Articles of Faith of the Reformed Church, from which I quote.

The Articles of the Synod of Dort on the doctrine of Divine Predestination read as follows:

"That some, in time, have faith given them by God, and others have it not given, proceeds from his eternal decree: For, 'known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world.' (Acts xv. 18; Eph. i. 11.) According to which decree he graciously softens the hearts of the elect, however hard, and he bends them to believe; but the non-elect he leaves, in just judgment, to their own perversity and hardness. And here, especially, a deep discrimination, at the same time both merciful and just, a discrimination of men equally lost, opens itself to us; or that decree of election and reprobation which is revealed in the Word of God. Which, as perverse, impure, and unstable persons do wrest to their own destruction, so it affords ineffable consolation to holy and pious souls.

"But election is the immutable purpose of God, by which, before the foundations of the world were laid, he chose, out of the whole human race, fallen by their own fault from their primeval integrity into sin and destruction, according to the

most free good pleasure of his own will, and of mere grace, a certain number of men, neither better or worthier than others, but lying in the same misery with the rest, to salvation in Christ; whom he had, even from eternity, constituted Mediator and Head of all the elect, and the foundation of salvation; and, therefore, he decreed to give them unto him to be saved, and effectually to call and draw them into communion with him, by his own word and Spirit; or he decreed himself to give unto them true faith, to justify, to sanctify, and at length powerfully to glorify them, having been kept in the communion of his Son; to the demonstration of his mercy, and the praise of the riches of his glorious grace, as it is written: 'God hath chosen us in Christ before the foundations of the world were laid, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love, having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will. To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath freely made us accepted to himself in that Beloved One.' (Eph. i. 4-6.) And in another place, 'Whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.' (Rom. viii. 30.)

"This election is not multiform, but one and the same of all that shall be saved, in the Old and New Testament, seeing that the Scripture declares the good pleasure, purpose, and counsel of the will of God, by which he has, from eternity, chosen us to grace and glory: both to salvation and the way of salvation, which he hath 'before prepared that we should walk in it.'

"This same election is not made from any foreseen faith, obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality and disposition, as a prerequisite cause or condition in the man who should be elected, but unto faith, and unto the obedience of faith, holiness, etc. And, therefore (or truly, *proinde*), election is the fountain of every saving benefit; whence faith, holiness, and the other salutary gifts, and finally, eternal life itself, flow as its fruit and effect, according to that word of the apostle, 'He hath chosen us' (not because we were, but) 'that we might be holy, and without blame before him in love.' (Eph. i. 4.)

"Now, the cause of this gratuitous election is the sole good pleasure of God: not consisting in this, that he elected into the condition of salvation certain qualities or human actions, from all that were possible, but in that, out of the common multitude of sinners, he took to himself certain persons as his peculiar property, according to the Scripture: 'For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, etc., it is said' (that is, to Rebecca), 'The elder shall serve the younger, even as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.' (Rom. ix. 11-13.) And, 'As many as were ordained (*ordinati*) to eternal life, believed.' (Acts xiii. 48.)"

The foregoing paragraph is a clear word on the doctrine of unconditional election, called here "gratuitous election," which John Calvin considered the heart of his system.

On the death of Christ and the redemption of men the Articles read:

"God is not only supremely merciful, but also supremely just. And his justice requires (according as he hath revealed himself in the world) that our sins committed against his infinite majesty should be punished, not only with temporal, but also with eternal sufferings—of soul as well as of body; which punishment we cannot escape, unless the justice of God be satisfied.

"But as we cannot satisfy it, and deliver ourselves from the wrath of God, God of infinite mercy gave to us his only-begotten Son as a Surety, who, that he might make satisfaction for us, was made sin and a curse on the cross for us, or in our stead.

"This death of the Son of God is a single and most perfect sacrifice and satisfaction for sins; of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world.

"For this was the most free counsel, and gracious will and intention of God the Father, that the life-giving and saving efficacy of the most precious death of his own Son should exert itself in all the elect, in order to give them alone justifying faith, and thereby to lead them to eternal life: that is, God willed that Christ, through the blood of the cross (by which he confirmed the new covenant), should, out of every people, tribe, nation and language, efficaciously redeem all those, and those only, who from eternity chosen to salvation, and given to him by the Father; that he should confer on them the gift of faith; (which, as well as other saving gifts of the Holy Spirit, he obtained by his death;) that he should cleanse them by his own blood from all sins, both original and actual, committed after, as well as before faith; that he should preserve them faithfully to the end; and at length present them glorious before himself, without any spot and blemish."

The reader will note here, not only a fine statement of the expiatory nature of the atonement, but also the doctrine of limited redemption. It is probably from this that Dr. Hodge obtained his famous dictum, "Sufficient for all, efficient for the elect."

Man's corruption is set out as follows:

"Man, from the beginning was created in the image of God, adorned in his mind, with the true and saving knowledge of his Creator and of spiritual things, with righteousness in his will

and heart, and purity in all his affections, and thus was altogether holy; but, by the instigation of the devil and his own free will (*libera sua voluntate*), revolting from God, he bereaved himself of these inestimable gifts; and, on the contrary, in their place, contracted in himself blindness, horrible darkness, and perversity of judgment in the mind; malice, rebellion, hardness, in the will and heart; and finally, impurity in all his affections."

Dr. Shedd's doctrine of imputation is nowhere better stated than in the following paragraph:

"And such as man was after the fall, such children also he begat: namely, being corrupted, corrupt ones; corruption having been derived from Adam to all his posterity (Christ only excepted); not by imitation, as the Pelagians formerly would have it, but by the propagation of a vicious nature, through the just judgment of God."

The doctrine of total depravity is so stated as to steer clear of all Arminian tendency:

"Therefore, all men are conceived in sin, and born the children of wrath, indisposed (*inepti*) to all saving good, propense to evil, dead in sins, and the slaves of sin; and, without the grace of the regenerating Holy Spirit, they neither are willing nor able to return to God, to correct their depraved nature, or to dispose themselves to the correction of it."

The doctrine of effectual calling:

"And that others, who are called by the ministry of the gospel, do come and are converted, this is not to be ascribed to man, as if distinguishing himself by free will (*libero arbitrio*) from others, furnished with equal or sufficient grace for faith and conversion (which the proud heresy of Pelagius states), but to God, who, as he chose his own people in Christ from eternity, so he also effectually calls them in time; gives them repentance and faith; and, having been rescued (*erutos*) from the power of darkness, translates them into the kingdom of his Son, that they may declare his energies (*virtutes*) who called them out of darkness into this marvellous light, and glory not in themselves, but in God: the apostolic Scripture everywhere testifying this."

"And this is that regeneration, which is so much declared in the Scriptures, a new creation, a resurrection from the dead, a giving of life (*vivificatio*), which God without us (that is, without our concurrence) worketh in us. And this is by no means effected by the doctrine alone sounding without, by moral suasion, or by such a mode of working that, after the operation of God (as far as he is concerned), it should remain in the power of man to be regenerated or not regenerated, converted or not converted; but it is manifestly an operation supernatural, at the same time

most powerful, and most sweet, wonderful, secret and ineffable in its power, according to the Scripture (which is inspired by the Author of this operation) not less than, or inferior to, creation, or the resurrection of the dead: so that all those, in whose hearts God works in this admirable manner, are certainly, infallibly and effectually regenerated, and do actually believe."

The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, in its shortest summary, is:

"That such as have once received that grace by faith can never fall from it, finally or totally, notwithstanding the most erroneous sins they can commit."

The reader will readily note that we have here separate expositions of the five points of Calvinism, Unconditional Election, Total Depravity, Limited Redemption, Irresistible Grace, and the Final Perseverance of the Saints, and the expression of these doctrines is in perfect accord with the Westminster Standards. These form an admirable confession of faith in brief compass.

The Heidelberg Catechism owes its origin to the Calvinistic teaching on the Lord's Supper. It may not, therefore, be improper to call attention to its history, and also to give a brief outline of the work here: Soon after the introduction of Protestantism into the Palatinate in 1546, the controversy between Lutherans and Calvinists broke out, and for years, especially under the Elector Otto Heinrich (1556-1559), it raged with great violence in Heidelberg. Frederick III., who came into power in 1559, adopted the Calvinistic view on the Lord's Supper, and favored that side with all his princely power.

The eightieth question is not found in the first edition. A part of it is found in the second edition, but in the third, of 1563, it is given in full as follows:

"What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass? The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that by the Holy Ghost we are ingrafted into Christ, who with his true body is now in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is to be there worshipped. But the Mass teaches that the living and the dead have not forgiveness of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is still daily offered to them by the priest; and that Christ is bodily under the form of bread and wine, and is therefore to be worshipped in them. (And thus the Mass at bottom is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Christ, and an accursed idolatry.)"

The decree of the Council of Trent touching the sacrifice of the mass, Sept. 17, 1562, probably caused the change in the question. The Catechism, in its present form, consists of 129 questions and answers. It is divided into three parts: 1. Of the misery of man. 2. Of the redemption of man. 3. Of the gratitude due from man (duties, etc.). The arrangement of the matter is admirable, looking not simply to logical order, but also to practical edification.

Dr. Schaff untruly said in the *American Presbyterian Review*, July, 1863:

"The Catechism is a true expression of the convictions of its authors; but it communicates only so much of these as is in harmony with the public faith of the church, and observes a certain reticence or reservation and moderation on such doctrines (as the twofold predestination), which belong rather to scientific theology and private conviction than to a public church confession, and the instruction of youth."

Dr. B. B. Warfield, of Princeton University, thus characterizes Dr. Schaff's performance:

"There is, therefore, a grave overstatement involved in, for example, Dr. Schaff's representation that 'the Thirty-nine Articles, the Heidelberg Catechism, and other German Reformed Confessions, indorse merely the positive part of the free election of believers, and are wisely silent concerning the decree of reprobation, leaving it to theological science and private opinion;' and much more in the heightened form which he gives this representation later, when he says that 'the most authoritative' of the Reformed creeds, 'as the Helvetic Confession of Bullinger, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Brandenburg Confessions (also the Scotch Confession of 1560), teach only the positive and comforting part of predestination, and ignore or deny a separate decree of reprobation, thus taking the ground practically that all that are saved are saved by the free grace of God, while all who are lost are lost by their own guilt.' Of denial of the doctrine there can be no question here; it was certainly not denied by the authors of the documents which omit to mention it or mention it only allusively; men such as Zwingli, Calvin, Knox, Ursinus, Bullinger (at the close of his life), not only held, but strenuously defended it. Of 'ignoring' it, in any proper sense of that word, there can be no more question. Only in the case of the Brandenburg Confession (which are assuredly as far as possible from ignoring it) can we speak even of an attempt in that case proceeded only by focussing attention on 'positive reprobation' (concerning which some things are denied which no

one of the Reformed wished to affirm of it), and withdrawing it from 'negative reprobation' (of which some of the things denied of 'positive reprobation' are affirmed by the Reformed system), with the effect of betraying to the informed reader a wish to distract attention from controverted points rather than to deny any item of the Reformed faith. It is plausible only with reference to the English Articles to talk of a purposed ignoring; and even there doubtless only plausible. The broad fact is simply that the doctrine of reprobation fails to receive explicit treatment in a few of the Reformed creeds, just as predestination itself does; and that this simple omission to treat it is best explicable in the one case as in the other from the scope and special object of the creeds in question, and from the confidence of their writers in the necessary implication of the omitted doctrine in what is said. Similarly it is left unnoted in the Westminster Shorter Catechism, after the most explicit insistence on it in the Confession of Faith and the Larger Catechism—for no other reason, of course, than the different specific objects and audiences held in view in the several cases."

It is sufficient to the display of the kinship of the Belgic Confession to that of the Articles of the Synod of Dort and the Heidelberg Catechism to cite the following:

"We believe that this good God, after he had created all things, did not abandon them to chance or fortune, but directs and governs them in such manner, according to his holy will, that nothing happens in this world without his appointment, although nevertheless God is not the author of nor chargeable with the evil that occurs, for his power and goodness are so great and incomprehensible that he ordains and executes his work well and righteously, even when the devil and wicked men act unrighteously. And as to what he does surpassing human understanding, we will not curiously inquire into it farther than our capacity will admit of, but in all humility and reverence adore the righteous judgments of God which are hidden from us, contenting ourselves that we are disciples of Christ, to learn only when he reveals to us by his Word, and not transgressing these limits. This doctrine affords us an unspeakable consolation, since we are taught by it that nothing can befall us by chance, but by the ordinance of our good heavenly Father, who watches in our behalf, with a paternal care, holding all his creatures subject to him, so that not a hair of our head (for they are all numbered), nor even a sparrow can fall to the ground without the will of our Father. In whom we trust, knowing that he holds the devils in restraint, and all our enemies, and that they cannot injure us without his permission and good will.

"We believe that, the whole race of Adam being thus pre-

precipitated into perdition and ruin, by the sin of the first man, God hath manifested himself such an one as he is, that is to say, merciful and righteous: merciful in delivering and saving from this perdition those whom, in his eternal and immutable counsel, he has elected and chosen, by his pure goodness, in Jesus Christ our Lord, without any regard to their works; righteous in leaving the rest in their ruin and fall wherein they have precipitated themselves. (Thus he declares himself a merciful and clement God to those whom he saves, since he owed them nothing; as likewise he declares himself a righteous judge by the manifestation of his just severity towards the rest. Nor does he do the latter any injustice. For that he saves some is not because they are better than the rest, for all were sunk into certain ruin, and God distinguishes and frees them according to his eternal and immutable counsel, which was established in Jesus Christ before the world was created. No one, then, according to this judgment, can attain to this glory of himself, since of ourselves we are not capable of thinking any good thing, unless God precedes us by his grace and mere goodness, so corrupt is our nature."

The reader will readily appreciate that it has been necessary, in a magazine article, to limit the points of comparison. I have, therefore, chosen what I regard as the distinctive doctrines, and also those about which there has been the greatest amount of disputation, believing that likeness here would perforce convince of likeness elsewhere. As to a kinship in other matters, it is not necessary to do more than recite the remarks of Thomas Scott, in 1818, in reference to the Belgic churches at the Synod of Dort:

"All the Belgic churches were, from the first, Presbyterian, in government and discipline; and constituted, according to that plan, with classes, presbyteries, provincial synods, and general synods of all the federated provinces; and with all those rules and methods for admission into the ministry, and to the pastoral charge in distinct congregations; as also to situations in universities and schools of learning, which form a constituent part of it; as well as of that strict discipline connected with it, implying not only excommunication of lay members, but the suspension, or silencing of pastors; and excluding from their office, academical teachers and professors on account of heresy in doctrine and gross inconsistency of conduct proved against them in their classes or synods. Through the whole history, it appears that no other form of government was proposed, even by the Remonstrants, nor anything mentioned about toleration in that respect, though their measures evidently tended to subvert the whole system. All the funds, likewise, reserved for religious

purposes, were appropriated entirely in consistency with the Presbyterian model, and all academical honors and distinctions were conferred in that line."

This kinship has for a long time been recognized, and the efforts for union of the past are the most confirming evidence. On May 20, 1871, the Southern Assembly was in session at Huntsville, Ala., with Dr. Plumer as Moderator. Rev. Dr. J. A. Todd, of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, was in attendance, by appointment. On that occasion he said:

"There is a story, Mr. Moderator, which I have understood is sometimes told good-naturedly among the ministry of our church, and with which you are said to have had some connection, which I should like to repeat here, and then add a little to it. The story is that the Rev. Dr. Plumer, in allusion to a national Dutch habit, once made the remark that the ministers of the Reformed Dutch Church were, in one respect at least, like Moses, they received their theology in the clouds—of smoke."

"You have another name, but not another faith. You live under a different sky, but you and we are equally near to the common heaven of our hopes, and the same glorious Master, Jesus Christ, whom we both love and honor, is equally near to both. 'One Lord, one faith, and one baptism,' is yours and ours. The banners that wave over our separate hosts as they move on to act their part in the great struggle, with the powers of darkness, have but one motto; that truth which is the power of God and the wisdom of God to salvation—'Jesus Christ and him crucified.' We do not propose, therefore, to make any admissions to you. We do not propose that you shall make any admissions to us. We do propose to meet you as Christian men should meet Christian men, on the broad platform of Christian charity and love, to hold out to you the right hand of Christian fellowship with our hearts in it, and to invoke the cultivation of a natural sympathy for each other while prosecuting the work which a common Master has committed to our hands. On this basis it does seem that we can and ought to unite."

In 1872, when the Assembly was in session in Richmond, Va., on May 16th, the Rev. Dr. Van Zandt said:

"Sir, you know, as well as I, that there are certain cycles of religious thought, which, though they have not the fixed periodicity, yet as certainly bring round sooner or later particular phases of popular opinion and feeling, as the revolution of the heavenly bodies bring around the alterations of heat and cold, summer and winter. Some one truth, or half truth, seizes upon

the public mind, and is magnified until it fills the whole field of vision, to the obscuration of every other truth, until, in turn, it gives place to another exaggeration. Hence, the recurrence of what may be styled religious epidemics, more or less widespread and virulent, but happily not of long duration. The epidemic now prevalent in many quarters, springing out of the exaggeration of a false conception of Christian union, is the desire for an indiscriminate fusion of all evangelical churches in one grand conglomeration. The 'seamless robe of Christ' is made a cover for all sorts of error of those who yet claim to hold the Head. And his prayer that his people 'may all be one,' which will certainly be fulfilled because it is his, is expected to find its accomplishment in the external organic union of the most discordant elements. Ignoring that inspired challenge to the common sense of mankind, 'how can two walk together except they be agreed,' the nominal union of those of every shade and complexion of opinion and practice is counted the grand desideratum which is to introduce the millennial glories of the church. Hence that spurious catholicity 'rejoiceth not in the truth,' but would eliminate all that is distinctive in doctrine or practice for the empty sound of union and the aggregation of numbers.

"It is not from any sympathy with that boastful liberality, which is illiberal only to those who are true to their convictions; it is not from any desire or purpose to absorb your organization into ours, or to be absorbed by you, that we have extended to you our fraternal greetings, and opened this correspondence. Though there are no differences between us sufficient to hinder our cordial coöperation as a united church; though in doctrine identical, and in order not dissimilar, and, as I believe, one in spirit, yet I should regard a mutual fusion into a single church as a calamity to both. What the changes of time and 'the logic of events' may bring about in the future is not for us to forecast. But at present we believe we have a mission which justifies our distinctive organization, and we are willing to concede a like conviction to you."

"The changes of time" and "the logic of events" seem to have brought about a decided difference in union from what Dr. Van Zandt proposed from the following:

Dr. J. S. Grasty, speaking before the Synod of Missouri, Oct. 10, 1872 (O. S.):

"Moderator, those who were present in Richmond, Va., and heard the eloquent words—the words of doctrinal accord—of overflowing sympathy—which fell from the lips of that brother (Van Zandt), can never recall the occasion without recurring sentiments of thankfulness and emotion. For I am persuaded

that in that vast assembly of spectators and commissioners not a heart was unmoved, scarcely a cheek which did not moisten with a tear. It was felt in every bosom that the delegate himself, and that noble communion which he represented—in symbols, in doctrine, in principles, and in witness for the truth—are so essentially one with ourselves, the line of demarcation so impalpable, and the elements of attraction so large, that organic union between the bodies is an event of unavoidable fulfilment. Mutual confidence, identity of aim obliterate the thin shadow of ecclesiastical divergence, and already an effort has been made to substantiate any difference that divides the one from the other. With this homogeneity of government, the oneness of faith and of spirit, it is impossible, I repeat, in the nature of things, that we can longer exist apart. And the union of the Dutch Reformed Church—renowned, in its ministers and its congregations, for soundness of doctrine and purity of life—with the Presbyterian Church in the United States, will be an event fruitful of rejoicing to every lover of truth and fraternity throughout the land. God speed the day.”

In further conformation of kinship in doctrine the *Memphis Presbyterian* of 1872 said:

“ ‘My kingdom is not of this world.’ It is refreshing in these days of Caesarism to find two bodies of Christians who have warmly supported opposite sides in the political quarrel which has convulsed this country, able to approach each other in perfect kindness. Such is the case with our brethren of the Reformed Synod and our own General Assembly. We understand each other thoroughly. They were almost unanimously Federal in sentiment, and we Confederate. But both bodies have kept politics out of church affairs, and so now, that the war is over, there is no barrier betwixt us. We can correspond fraternally, or, should Providence favor it, we can unite organically without compromising anybody’s principles. And among the motives which seem to render this proposed union desirable, not the least is the sublime testimony it shall bear to the supremacy of the Redeemer and the separateness of his kingdom from all secular concerns.”

After Dr. Grasty’s statements of the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, and his willingness to acknowledge the kinship between these two great bodies of the church universal, it seems useless to make further inquiry for marks of similarity in the doctrines of the respective churches.

I have had it given me as the private opinion of one well qualified to speak, that the reason that organic union with the

Dutch Reformed Church was deferred was in view of the fact that any effort, on the part of the Reformed Church, to propagate itself in the South would have involved the race problem, and hence negotiations looking to union were abandoned.

If there ought to be a separate existence for the Southern Church, let us have it. If there is no reason for it, let us justify ourselves to the world in the matter of spending money for extending the kingdom of Christ.