

# THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—NO. 2.

---

APRIL, MDCCCLXXI.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE DOCTRINAL VARIOUS READINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

*Novum Testamentum* Græce et Latine. CAROLUS LACHMANNUS.  
Berlin: 1832, 1842.

TREGELLES on the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament.  
London: Bagster. 1854.

*Novum Testamentum* Græce. Edited by CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF.  
Leipsic: 1862.

*Authorised English Version of the New Testament, with Introduction and Various Readings from the three most celebrated Manuscripts of the Original Greek Text.* By C. TISCHENDORF. Tauchnitz Edition. Leipsic: 1869.

*Biblorum Codex Sinait. Petropolitanus, Fac Simile.* By CONSTANTINE TISCHENDORF. (Imperial Edition, Folio.) St. Petersburg. A. D. 1862.

The magnificent work, whose name stands last in this list, may be said to complete a marked stage in the progress, or at least in the rotation, of the art of *biblical criticism*. It very properly suggests, not only some inquiry into the value and authority of the Sinai manuscript introduced to the learned world by Dr. Constantine Tischendorf, but a review and comparison of the

VOL. XXII., NO. 2.—1.

## ARTICLE II.

## MEMOIR OF THE REV. SAMUEL B. MCPHEETERS, D. D.

*Memoir of the Rev. Samuel B. McPheeters, D. D.* By the Rev. JOHN S. GRASTY, Author of "Faith's Battles and Victories." With an Introduction by the Rev. STUART ROBINSON, D. D. Pp. 384, 12mo. St. Louis and Louisville. 1871.

This memoir, expected with so much interest, has now been some time before the Southern public. The history which it embodies is most noteworthy, and should not be allowed to sink into forgetfulness among Presbyterians. Our chief design is to attempt an estimate of those facts and principles which are illustrated in it. The character of the subject might indeed be selected as a topic of pleasing contemplation. He seems to have been a man singularly guileless, engaging and amiable in his temper, sparkling in his wit, and devout and sincere in his piety, as well as greatly honored by his divine Master and all his true people in his pastoral labors. The story, which would not be devoid of a romantic interest had it occurred in any other than our startling times, is told by Mr. Grasty with equal modesty and propriety. The volume is moreover enriched with much documentary material, for the collection of which in a permanent form the author deserves the thanks of every student of our late glorious history. But for the narrative we must refer our readers to the *Memoir* itself. We shall simply premise by recalling the salient points of the case as they were noted at the time of their occurrence by all our people.

At the beginning of the war for Southern independence, Dr. McPheeters, a native of Raleigh, North Carolina, and *alumnus* of Princeton Theological Seminary, was pastor of the Pine Street church, St. Louis, Missouri; but he was absent on a long tour for his health in New Mexico. Before his return he wrote a species of pastoral letter to his charge, announcing his purpose of standing wholly aloof from the strife, not only in his ministerial, but his private and civic character, and of devoting him-

self exclusively to the spiritual welfare of his people. On his return to St. Louis in the first year of the war he took an oath of allegiance to the United States, and also to the usurping government of the State, established by the bayonet upon the forcible expulsion of the legal governor, Mr. Jackson, and his legislature. Dr. McPheeters continued very faithfully to redeem the pledge of his pastoral letter, excluding political and military topics wholly from his prayers and sermons. Being a commissioner to the General Assembly of May, 1862, in Columbus, Ohio, he, with a few others, dissented from the action of that body, when, under the lead of Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge, it rushed into political deliverances and into religious persecution. After his return, a minute fraction of his hitherto peaceful charge, headed by one George P. Strong, a member of his session, (a man whose otherwise insignificant name is forever doomed to a "bad eminence" of infamy by his pertinacious connexion with this history,) demanded of Dr. McPheeters in writing that he should, as a pastor, show his hand concerning the war and politics. He calmly but firmly declined to do so, on the ground that the requirement was an unwarrantable intrusion into his spiritual independence, to which he could not accede consistently with principle. To this position he held throughout. The result of this and other persecutions on the part of Strong and his faction was that on the 19th of December one F. A. Dick, Military Provost Marshal of St. Louis, moved thereto undoubtedly by Strong, issued an order of ejection from his pulpit, and banishment within ten days from the State of Missouri against Dr. McPheeters and his wife, on the sole ground of *suspicion of disloyalty*. On the 28th of December the order of immediate banishment was withdrawn, leaving him strictly inhibited by military authority from all ministerial acts whatsoever. Strong and his party were also appointed by the same authority to the possession of the house of worship and the pastoral care of the Pine Street flock. Dr. McPheeters appealed in person to Lincoln, who, while disclaiming persecuting intentions, made only an ambiguous promise of redress at that time. He, however, was better than his promise; for in January of 1863 he sent to Gen.

Curtis, commanding in Missouri, a general order not to attempt to "run the churches," under which all Dr. McPheeters's disabilities should have been removed. His enemies, however, countenanced by Curtis, managed to deprive him of all knowledge and advantage of this order until the end of the year 1863, when, through the activity of some friends, Lincoln's attention was again called to the case and the military persecution arrested.

But, meantime, the Radical fragment of the Presbytery of St. Louis, sitting when all presbyters who were true to their principles were excluded from its meetings by the infamous "Rosecrans Order," dissolved Dr. McPheeters's pastoral relation, against the repeated protest of the church, and forbade his performing any ministerial act in that congregation, even by temporary invitation of the session. Against these decisions Dr. McPheeters appealed to the Synod of Missouri, and to the General Assembly. The latter court took up his case first, and in Newark, New Jersey, May, 1864, issued it by confirming all the acts of the "Rump" Presbytery against Dr. McPheeters and his church, by a vote of one hundred and seventeen against forty-seven. Geo. P. Strong, the zealous "familiar" of this Presbyterian Inquisition, pursued his meek pastor to Newark, and was allowed to pour forth, in the Assembly, seven hours' of vituperations, suspicions, and slanders against him.

Dr. McPheeters, now fatally broken in health, submitting to the decision of the Assembly, removed to a country charge in Shelby County, Kentucky, where he resumed his pastoral labors, for a time, as a member of Louisville Presbytery. Here he coöperated with Drs. Wilson and Robinson, and their friends, in issuing the "Declaration and Testimony." He was, with them, expelled from the Northern Presbyterian Church, by the Assembly of 1866; and, in March, 1870, finished his course by a peaceful death.

Our business with this touching narrative now is, to learn from its facts, what is the position which the Northern Presbyterian Church has deliberately taken and now holds, touching

the rights of conscience, the spiritual independence of Christ's Church, and his headship over it.

And the most obvious remark to be made is, that Dr. McPheeters's position happened to be one which perfectly eliminated every question, and every pretext of a question, save the naked right of conscience; so that in persecuting him, his brethren expressly assailed that right in its clearest phase. Dr. McPheeters had gone every possible length in propitiating their enmity. Many will still think that it would at least have been no crime in him to declare his just sympathy, as a man and citizen, with the men of his native State and kindred, in their struggle to defend, as citizens, those same sacred rights which he claimed as a Christian; but that sympathy he suppressed, in his care to give no offence. Many will still deem that he might have reasoned thus as a Christian minister: That neither the constitution of Christ's Church, nor of a Christian State, requires the Christian man to cease totally to be a citizen because he has become a pastor; that he, as still a citizen and patriot, had duties to perform, in the assertion of truth, and right, and justice, and public covenants, and the defence of invaded and essential liberties, which, although less important and sacred than his ministerial duties, were as clearly incumbent in their lower sphere; that while it would be sin for him to mingle these secular duties with his sacred functions by seeking to pervert his spiritual powers to secular ends, it was an equal confusion of the same diverse elements to make his sacred obligations the pretext for inhibiting his performance of his secular duties in his lawful secular sphere; that "duties never clash;" and if unreasonable or perverse men made his righteous performance of his civic duties a pretext to obstruct his pastoral usefulness, and thus to injure the precious Church of Christ, the guilt of that injury must rest on the heads of the assailants, and not on his. But he did not claim this right. He absolutely waived any secular responsibilities in order to run no risk of obstructing his spiritual duties. He took all their oaths; obeyed all their orders, civil and military. When unlawfully forbidden to

preach his divine Master's message, he did not say: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." But he remained silent in obedience to their requirement. So scrupulously did he abstain from all assertion of Southern rights, that the inquisition, which his enemies tyrannically and impiously made into his private sympathies, could find nothing for pretexts, save the frivolous fact that he had baptized an infant, at the request of the parents, with the honored name of Sterling Price; and an indelicate and cowardly intrusion into the private sentiments of a female member of his family. There was absolutely no overt act to charge, even by the usurping standard of his enemies. But for the suspicion of private sentiments adverse to those usurpations, he was, by a military provost marshal, visited with a heavy ecclesiastical penalty, as well as with the temporal penalty of banishment. And the former punishment was continued indefinitely by Gen. Curtis, (at the cost of insubordination,) solely because Dr. McPheeters refused to surrender his liberty of conscience. (See Memoir, pp. 187 to 189). Two things are worthy of note here, by every lover of human rights: First, the utter confusion of ecclesiastical with civil matters, the full union of Church and State, and express denial of religious liberty to Dr. McPheeters and his charge. Second, the intensely tyrannical usurpation made in assuming to *punish his thoughts*. This is the last extreme to which the most ruthless despotism has ever gone. The genius of American liberty had long before swept away the whole doctrine of constructive treason as the blackest engine of despotism. It was, indeed, the crowning sin of inquisitorial despotism. Every American constitution had forbidden the civil magistrate to elevate any opinions and feelings, however erroneous and sinful, into secular crimes or misdemeanors while not attended with illegal acts. But Dr. McPheeters was virtually convicted of treason for suspected opinions and feelings only. The saddest thing in this whole transaction is the ground on which all the professed Northern conservatives place Dr. McPheeters's defence. All of them, so far as we can find, the

provisional governor, Gamble, the St. Louis "Unionists" petitioning for the pastor's restoration, the conservative members of the Newark Assembly, as Dr. Geo. Junkin, in his speech for Dr. McPheeters, tacitly admit the odious tyranny. They plead that Southern thoughts had not been *proved on* Dr. McPheeters; that the baptism of the infant in the name of Sterling Price did not *prove* he admired that noble patriot; thus making the clear admission, that, had these thoughts been proved, the penalty would have been just. Whereas, the only ground which a worthy freeman should have deigned to take was this: that no secular authority under heaven had any right to call Dr. McPheeters to any account for Southern opinions and feelings, even on the hypothesis that the ultra federal theory of the powers of the United States were true; that, so far as their authority went, Dr. McPheeters had a perfect right to admire Sterling Price if he chose, no matter how perverse that admiration might in fact be; so long as he did not perform overt acts of force against the United States. Hence, it appears to be conceded by the most conservative minds of the North, that the doctrine of constructive treason is restored, and that freedom of thought no longer exists for American citizens; at least during any times whenever the violence or usurpations of the Government may have provoked any domestic or foreign disturbance.

But, to proceed to specific points of the history, we note second, that Dr. McPheeters's first unpardonable offence against radical Presbyterians, was his exercising his right, May, 1862, in the Columbus Assembly, of dissenting from its violating its own constitution by "handling and concluding things not ecclesiastical." The exercise of this right in a very modest form came nigh unto causing his arrest by the military authorities in St. Louis. It did open upon him the vials of wrath of the radical Presbyterians there. The enactment passed by the Columbus Assembly, involved the same fatal heresy with the "Spring Resolutions" of 1861. It differed from these only in carrying the usurpation of church power farther, and in its excessive vituperation. Nor is there a vital difference between these acts and the subsequent ones passed on the same subject

in 1863, 1864, and 1865, by both the Assemblies composing the Northern Presbyterian Church, and now held as its recorded doctrine by that large body. We are in no danger of error in our construction of the usurpation here resisted by Dr. McPheeters and the whole Southern Church, because it had been correctly defined for us in 1861 by the protest of Dr. Hodge himself. The point, then, was simply this: Collision having arisen between certain State Governments and the Federal, the Christian citizens in those States found it incumbent on them to exercise their conscientious discretion, in deciding whether their allegiance was primarily due to their State, or to the Federal Government. These usurping Assemblies pretended to think that those Southern Christians, who presumed to decide that question by the light of their own consciences, thereby committed the *ecclesiastical offence* involved in the "*sin of rebellion.*" Such was, and is, their pretension. Now, we do not stop with asserting simply that this pretension was unscriptural, and against the constitution of our Church: we assert moreover, that it is impossible those Assemblies could have really supposed their pretension scriptural; and that it was therefore only a conscious pretext for seizing upon the spiritual powers of Christ's Church to wield them for enforcing a factious secular end.

It is impossible that any of those Assemblies really believed a Southern Christian committed *the sin of rebellion* in deciding that his primary allegiance was due to his State; because this was clearly a question of secular rights, affecting the distribution of powers made by a merely human instrument of writing between certain contracting parties, and in no sense a question of the interpretation of God's revealed precepts; because nearly every State Government in the United States had formally decided it the very way the Southern Christians did, and most notably, the Northern States; because the decision claimed by these Assemblies as the only one not criminal, had never been conceded as a settled point among American statesmen; but an Attorney-General of the United States for instance, (Mr. Wirt), and a Northern statesman now at the head of the supreme judiciary of the United States, had decided it just as the South-



ern Christians decided it; because these very ministers and elders had already been extending to a multitude of Southern Christians (as Dr. Thornwell) who held the Southern opinion firmly, not only full ecclesiastical communion, but especial professions of Christian love and honor; and inasmuch as the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church does rightfully reach to opinions before they are carried out in overt act, if the decision afterwards made by us was criminal, then the express avowal of that political doctrine before made by Dr. Thornwell and others was disciplinable; because common sense shows that it is simply preposterous to represent the Christian conscience otherwise pure, (as in such a case as that of Robert E. Lee,) as defiled by making that decision, and it is what no sane man believes; and because these Northern ministers and elders have since offered Christian communion to us, who committed that offence (if it were an offence) and who avow no repentance. He who, in the face of these well known considerations, can believe that those Assemblies really deemed themselves authorised by God's word, and our Constitution, to decide as they did, must have a capacious credulity indeed. Why, the Northern coercionist politicians and generals did not then presume to call the action of the Southern States "*rebellion*:" the current term was "*secessionists*." Nor did they apply the former epithet, until taught to do so by the ecclesiastical usurpers. And were it necessary for Southern Christians further to defend their liberty of conscience in entertaining and deciding that question of allegiance as they did, they might now find abundant justification in subsequent events. They might point to the fact that subsequent infringements of their rights have been so clear and so vital, that many of their enemies have since declared their resistance would have been righteous had it been made only after these later developments of tyranny; among whom may be enumerated many Northern journals, a president of the United States, great constitutional lawyers, as R. J. Walker, and the supreme judicial authority of the country. Southern Christians, we repeat, in the face of such admissions, may surely argue that they cannot be convicted of sin in resisting when they did, because the whole extent of

their offending then was, that they estimated the true *animus* of their assailants correctly. But this defence may be omitted as superfluous.

The acts of these Assemblies, then, were not honest blunders, as to the extent of their scriptural powers; they were conscious attempts to wield the spiritual powers of Christ's kingdom to further secular purposes in which they felt an overweening concern. The gravity of the usurpation, then, could not be exaggerated. It contained in it the whole poison of the union between Church and State. It was most cruel towards its intended victims. It was profane towards Christ, their professed Head, in that it sought to misapply his blood-bought spiritual power over his elect, delegated to these Church courts for edification only, to the furtherance of a project then avowedly secular and political, and since characterised by its developments before the whole Christian world, as radical, disorganising, cruel, and mischievous. As to resistance to such ecclesiastical usurpation, no good man like Dr. McPheeters could hesitate. He felt that he could "give place by subjection, no, not for an hour," and signed his solemn protest. Southern Presbyterians had no other alternative than separation; and the whole guilt of the schism rested with those who necessitated the outward severance.

The great purpose of Southern Church courts then, in withdrawing from their aggressors, was defensive: it was to protect the spiritual liberty of their people. In asserting this liberty of conscience for them our Assemblies do not by any means decide the question of civic allegiance, nor even indicate how they think individuals should have decided it. They merely vindicate for individuals the inalienable right of deciding it in the light of their own consciences, without dictation from pretended spiritual authorities. For, we repeat, when the awful and immense powers of the spiritual sphere over the soul are successfully wielded to obstruct the exercise of secular rights by Christian citizens, then we have the most portentous enginery of despotism which oppressed the Dark Ages. Once persuade any man that he can only exercise temporal franchises at the cost of

his soul's everlasting damnation, and he is a slave thrice bound, helpless in the hands of those who apply this ghostly power and of the despots who use them as their tools. For "what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" The distinction is thus very clear between the action of the Southern and the Northern Assemblies. The one was designed to defend, the other to invade.

The charge has been often made that the Southern Assemblies have implicated themselves as clearly in political usurpations as the Northern. Some have even been shallow enough to argue that if the Radical Assemblies were guilty of making a political deliverance when they denied to private Christians the right of choosing between the State and Federal allegiance, our Assemblies were equally guilty in claiming that right for them. This is excessively foolish, and appears so from the facts last argued. Had the Southern Assemblies employed their spiritual power to coerce Christians to give their allegiance to the Southern Confederacy, (and had the latter been as despotic and usurping as the Federal authorities,) then this charge would have been true. But no Southern church court ever presumed to commit such an inconsistency. There is, however, another truth to be pointed out, to which many, even of our own people, seem to be partially blind. The conditions of the argument are totally different for the aggressors and the defendants in such a controversy. If a Northern Assembly goes out of its proper jurisdiction *for the purpose of invading* the reserved rights of Christian people, then their action makes it right and proper for a Southern Assembly to follow them into that foreign sphere for the praiseworthy purpose of defending the rights of Christians. The sin of intrusion belongs wholly to the aggressors. Their commission of that sin justifies and even necessitates defensive legislation on this foreign topic, where, otherwise, a consistent church court would have felt no mission to legislate. An actual historical illustration is at hand, which is perfect. At an Assembly at Indianapolis, a short time before the war, the overweening friends of total abstinence moved the Assembly to make their rule as to alcoholic beverages binding on the consciences of our people. Dr. Thornwell prop-

erly met them by arguing that the Assembly had no scriptural authority to bind the liberty of the people in this thing, that the Bible prohibited excess only, and not the use of strong drinks. The Assembly so enacted. What now would have been the absurdity if some advocate of the "Delavan theory" had arisen and charged the Assembly with going out of its sphere to authorise a particular sensual indulgence and to administer at least tacit encouragement to the manufacture and tipping of this national curse? The answer would have been very plain. Had not the scriptural liberty of its people been assailed, the Assembly would have found no mission to say one word for the manufacture and use of strong drinks. And now, that word was said, not for the encouragement of those acts in themselves, (they are merely secular, even where not sinful,) but for the protection of Christian liberty. And this object is strictly ecclesiastical.

Just so, the Southern church courts were, to a certain extent, properly dragged into the field of politics by the aggressions against the Christian liberty of the people; not for the sake of political objects, but for the sake of ecclesiastical rights. If, in such case, any of these courts had gone so far as to enact that their people *might conscientiously give their allegiance to the Southern Confederacy*, their act would have been, from its circumstances, totally different from the act of the Radical Assemblies in enacting that they might not. The one act was designed to defend ecclesiastical rights, the other to invade them. The one was justified by the other. Had there been such a church court in the South, it could have justified itself by the example of Dr. Thornwell, who, when the liberty of Christians was assailed, taught the Assembly to enact that Christians might drink *temperately*, and this, not for the sake of the manufacturer of drinks, but for the sake of rights. The language of the Assembly of 1864, at Charlotte, North Carolina, concerning slavery, (about which many unnecessary and some unmanly apologies have been made) receives the same explanation. The first Southern Assembly said that it assumed no mission either to preserve or to abolish slavery. The Assembly at Charlotte said that the

Christian people of the South recognised it as their mission (not their only one of course) to "conserve domestic slavery." The two declarations are perfectly consistent. Primarily the Church of Christ has no vocation to advocate any one organisation of labor as against another; for these are all secular, political concerns. But when once a particular organisation of labor which our Commonwealths had lawfully and righteously instituted for the people, was unscrupulously assailed by usurping ecclesiastics, with the weapons of wrested scriptures and perverted spiritual powers, *that assault created a vocation, a scriptural vocation, to defend the right of slaveholding in so far as it became a matter of Christian liberty, that is to say, of ecclesiastical concernment.* Such was precisely the case with the two Southern Assemblies. In 1861 the war was, in pretense, only for "restoring national unity;" and our ecclesiastical persecutors, (our late Presbyterian brethren,) professed to seek only that object (unlawful for them to seek). Accordingly the Assembly of 1861 met only that aggression. By 1864 the war had unmasked itself as a war of plunder, abolition, and the disorganisation of society, and our usurping ecclesiastics had begun to wield the powers of Christ's Church to effect that iniquity. The Assembly of 1864 therefore properly recognised its mission to meet that invasion of the ecclesiastical rights of its people. When it is added that the only "conservation" of domestic slavery intended was that of uttering the scriptural testimony for its lawfulness and the pious injunction of their relative duties on masters and slaves—that the Assembly never dreamed of meddling with any political or economical aspect of the institution—the defence is complete. In a word, the Charlotte Assembly asserted its vocation to "conserve slavery" precisely in the sense and manner in which the Apostle Paul does it in 1 Tim. vi. 1 to 5.

Dr. McPheeters's firm but temperate dissent from the spiritual usurpations we have discussed came near, as we have seen, provoking his immediate arrest. It was doubtless the signal for the assault of his domestic foes in his own charge. We are now introduced to the counterpart scene of the drama. Hitherto we

have witnessed the Church's assumption of secular powers. We shall now see the State's assumption of spiritual powers. The one naturally produces the other. Dr. McPheeters, indeed, in defending his appeal before the Newark Assembly, very clearly pointed out this sequence, "If Church courts 'will handle and conclude civil affairs which concern the commonwealth,' then an inexorable logic compels me to admit that the commonwealth has a right to know what they are handling, and how they conclude them." This is unanswerable. If the Church may direct its members, as citizens, in their political action, (and its powers over the conscience being spiritual, once heartily admitted, are irresistible), and if the Church is irresponsible to the State in giving that direction, then the Church is practically supreme over the State. For let the reader remember that if the private citizen, a Church member, may be thus directed, the magistrate, a Church member, may be equally, yea, even the chief magistrate. The regular result is the theory of Hildebrand, which taught that Pope to tread on the necks of kings. There cannot be two coördinate, supreme, and independent authorities, rightfully claiming the allegiance of the same people in the same sphere. The one must bow to the other; we must have the result either of Gregory VII. or of Erastus. The Church must dominate the State or the State the Church. The only escape from these conclusions, both monstrous, is the separation of the secular and spiritual spheres, as provided for in the Scriptures, and in the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church and of the United States.

In this case, as the temper of the Federalist party was not ripe for submission to the Hildebrand theory, the result was a flagrant Erastianism. The next things we hear of are the "Dix order," and the "Rosecrans order:" the one deposing Dr. McPheeters from his pastoral charge on the suspicion of certain political opinions; the other undertaking to enforce a secular qualification for spiritual rule in the Church, by exacting an oath of full support to all Federal usurpations. The intelligent Presbyterian needs no comments on these acts to show him that they invaded the very citadel of Christ's rights over his kingdom. It

is impossible that anything could be more inconsistent with religious liberty and the headship of the Lord. Both these acts were brought distinctly before the Old School General Assembly; the one by Dr. McPheeters, in 1864; the other by Dr. Farris, in 1865. *The Assembly deliberately approved the former, and allowed the latter.* Every element concurs to mark this as the most shocking defection which has occurred in modern times in any Protestant Church.

All moderate, secular men could see the enormity of them, although the church courts of Radicalism could not. The Radical President could at least see their impolicy from their utter opposition to every former idea of American liberty. The secular papers which retained any moderation, cried out in shame and astonishment against the enormity of the acts. Such was the language of the *New York Express*, of the *Journal of Commerce*, of the *Canadian Leader*, a journal which, although issued under a monarchy, could still judge this tyrannical policy from a dispassionate and Protestant point of view. Decent Union men in St. Louis itself, the *focus* of the excitement, were ashamed of the usurpations, and protested and petitioned against them. But the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, God's appointed guardian of spiritual rights and of Christ's headship, saw no wrong in them.

Another element of aggravation was, that the military were, in both cases, egged on and prompted to these usurpations, not by secular zealots, but by professed Presbyterians and brethren. It is obvious that Geo. P. Strong was the prime procurer of all Dr. McPheeters's troubles; and that he persecuted him under the mask of religious and patriotic zeal, but really at the prompting of revenge for Dr. McPheeters's act in refusing to prostitute his pastoral and spiritual influence to have him (Strong) appointed to a secular office of emolument. (Memoir, p. 276). It is the emphatic testimony of Dr. S. J. P. Anderson, (p. 292, 3), and of Dr. McPheeters, (p. 272), that there would have been no trouble about the military interference with the churches, had not the officers been persuaded and prompted by pretended Christians to intermeddle. Such was also the emphatic testi-

mony of those persons in Baltimore who were attempting to defend the independence of the Christian people: their trouble did not come from the military rulers themselves, but from brethren, falsely so-called, playing the *role* of delators and instigators. It is testified also, (Memoir, pp. 147, 148,) that in the attempt to make a show of dissatisfaction against Dr. McPheeters among his own charge, the most cruel, cowardly, and unjust means were employed by these religious persecutors to terrorize dissentients. Now these facts laid the Assembly under a solemn obligation to arrest the persecution and the whole career of usurpation, because all really sprung from men who were under its own spiritual jurisdiction. These facts should also have reminded the Assembly (as if they will teach us we are wise) of the especial malignity of religious tyranny, as contrasted with secular; because the sacred mask is always assumed by envy, malice, and bigotry, to work their foulest ends under the pretence of zeal for God.

Once more. It was a peculiarity of this case, that when it reached the Assembly, Dr. McPheeters's enemies had so juggled matters throughout, that *he had never once had a hearing in his own defence*, before he was condemned. In the case of Dix's ukase, of Gen. Curtis's, of the decisions of the "Rump Presbytery" against him, he had been uniformly condemned without having an opportunity to appear, on mere suspicion and the illegal allegations of persecutors. It was when he stood at last before the General Assembly of Newark, that he had the first (and that a bootless) opportunity to confront his accusers. Now had there been a particle of that natural fairness or sense of justice, which characterised the pagan Roman, or the burly John Bull, (or even John Bull's brute mastiff, which disdains to worry a dog when it is down,) the Assembly must have arrested the pursuit of McPheeters at his first appeal. They were bound to reverse every step, on the ground that however worthy he might prove to be of condemnation, he could not be condemned unheard.

Such was the enormity of the case in which the legitimate intervention of the supreme court of the Presbyterian Church



was solemnly invoked. It involved the most precious and sacred rights, secular and spiritual. It involved the most flagrant possible assault upon the blood-bought crown-rights of Jesus Christ. It was marked by every accessory of startling injustice. Had this Assembly been actuated by any sincere love of liberty, or clear and conscientious view of principles, it must have paused at this case. It must have said, in substance: "Here now is an attack upon everything dear to American Christians than which none can be graver." The pretensions of the Southern secessionists, even judged from our point of view, are a trifle in their results compared with these. They jeopardize a certain theory of centralisation which Northern power and ambition judges important. They threaten certain commercial advantages and gains attendant upon our ascendancy in the Federal Union. They, if successful, will impose certain political and public expenditures and inconveniences. They assail no spiritual right, no municipal right, no franchise of State or citizen, which enlightened liberty has ever regarded as fundamental. They merely propose a new relation of States *inter se*, disadvantageous to our interests as we conceive them. But here is an assault on the very corner-stone of all liberty; on all man's rights and interests for time and eternity. True, it has thus far been made to touch but a few humble fellow-citizens and brethren; but its principle is here openly asserted; and it must be here met. This does indeed touch the "life of the nation." Let this prevail, and we bid farewell to Republicanism, to Protestantism, to gospel, to liberty, and set out on that road to ruin, which conducts to the condition of a modern Rome under Cardinal Antonelli. Here, then, is a new issue, whose gravity supersedes all others. Until this is saved, we have no time, no thought, for "sustaining the Government," or "making Southern treason odious." The one duty is that of "self-preservation." Such must have been the answer of the Assembly, had it possessed any of the principles of Knox, of Melville, of Gillespie, of the Erskines, of Chalmers. "But it cared for none of these things." It had already yielded up to prostitution the bride of Christ, and had of course no zeal for her rescue. It is but too

manifest, that the Assembly cared for only one end—the success of the coercionist faction. Here, then, is confirmation of the charge, that the measures of 1861, 1862, and 1863, were not honest blunders, but conscious attempts to wield the spiritual powers of the Church for secular advantages.

There was, indeed, a little minority of forty-seven against this crime. A few voices were raised in argument against it; but on premises which made success impossible. They asserted informalities in the action of the Presbytery, they claimed the lawful operation of appeal in staying a decision; and in this they argued correctly enough. They also pointed out the Erastianism of the whole proceeding. But they made the fatal admission of a theory of despotism (the theory upon which the United States was then acting) in politics, which renders any plea for spiritual independence preposterous. All history proves that secular and religious liberty stand or fall together. There can be no free Church in an enslaved State. The natural attitude of the bride of Christ under the empire of a Nero is that of the martyr, protesting, suffering, but bound. If, as Dr. Junkin conceded, the *man* is a slave, it is vain to claim that the minister shall be free. If the citizen is subject of his own servant (the executive officer), instead of being sovereign; if he is rightfully subject as a man to an inquisitorial rule which deprives him of his personal independence of opinion, which subjects him rightfully to arbitrary arrest because he claims that independence, then it is absurd to demand for him spiritual independence. It is seeking harvests in the Zahara. Dr. Junkin complained that many doctors of divinity, of his brethren, could not see how he could concede the one and yet demand the other. To us their slavish premises seem to make their incompetency very natural. Their maxim, (not the maxim of the equitable and benevolent laws of Southern commonwealths, which secured to their slaves many rights,) is that "*The slave has no rights.*" After pronouncing themselves slaves, it is too late to claim spiritual rights.

Such are the principles involved in the "McPheeters case." We would remind our readers, as we intimated in the outset,

that we single this history out from among the thousands of glorious "martyrs and confessors" who suffered in the same cause, not because Dr. McPheeters suffered any more, or as much, nor because his sufferings were more meritorious than theirs, but simply because providential circumstances have made his peculiarly a test case for unmasking the real principles of Northern Presbyterianism. Many are the thousands of Southern Christians, as firm, as intelligent, as true to these sacred principles as he; who braved for them not only religious disfranchisement, but cold, and hunger, and sleet, and nakedness, and watchings, and the ghastly military prison, and death; who strove to defend "Christ's crown and covenant" not only by eloquent protest, but by "not loving their own lives unto the death." They will sleep in nameless graves, without eloquent biographers; but our right hands must forget their cunning and our tongues cleave to the roofs of our mouths before we can forget their heroic sacrifices for the truth.

Some may ask, why should the friends of Dr. McPheeters, why should we, write to perpetuate these unhappy events? They may say that years have passed since they occurred; that the passions of those sad days are passing away; that our conquerors have returned to their equanimity, are no longer raging against us, and even offer us their kindness. They may advise that all these memories be consigned to oblivion as speedily as may be. The answer to these sayings, (so astonishing from those who profess to uphold right views), is in the simple question: If the passions of 1864 are passing away, are the principles of that day passing away? Or was all the principle of these pretended advocates of fraternity but passion, in those days that tried men's souls when they professed to uphold God's cause with us? Was this the only grievance they had against Radical Presbyterianism—that *it had fretted them*? Then verily are they of wholly another mind from us! We have held all along that it was the least of our charges against that party in the Church that it had angered *us*, that it had assisted and approved the spoiling of *our* goods, that it had maligned *our* good name, even that it had "hounded on the dogs of war" which drank the blood of *our*

loved ones. The chief *gravamen* was that they assailed and betrayed the rights of Christ and his Church: rights committed to us as sacred trusts, to be defended to the end at the peril of our souls. Now then, if they cease to rage, and even fawn; if they no longer malign, or plunder, or kill; so far well. But if they still betray the sacred rights of the Church, it is our duty still to protest; and the solemn injunction of our Master, "From such withdraw thyself," must keep us firm to our places in the watchtower.

What, then, of the question whether only passions or also principles have changed among these men. Have they truly repented and denounced the sins they committed against their divine Head? Now, one who was familiar with their almost unanimous profession of adherence to right principles in 1845, who witnessed the seeming fidelity to the truth up to almost the beginning of the strife, and who then beheld the sudden, violent, persistent desertion of their own professions, which began as soon as the temptation occurred, might well be pardoned for viewing with mistrust the most earnest avowals of penitence or change which they could now utter, and for insisting on many "fruits meet for repentance" before his confidence was restored. But when there has been no admission of error, and on the contrary, in their very last Assembly, a contemptuous refusal of it; when we have seen the persecutions in 1866 set on foot and pursued in Kentucky and Missouri up to this hour; when we see not only the same men, but in many cases their church courts applauding the tyranny of their secular government over their conquered victims, tyranny more ruthless and cruel than any of the violences of the conquest itself; when we hear them explain their own advances of friendship, not as acts of righteous reparation, but as projects for consolidating party power, and that prominently secular power—we must be simply fools to misunderstand their present attitude. Not only is there no overt avowal of error, such as false pride might make even a generous mind slow to publish, after the sincere consciousness of error was admitted; but, on the contrary, there is unquestionably the firm, deliberate, determined retention of those Erastian principles for future use.

Who can doubt it? Their complacency is simply the satisfaction of triumphant, irresistible success. If there were any longer a successful resistance afoot, we should behold precisely the old fury. And whenever the time comes, (as come it will,) that they shall persuade themselves their interests require of us the surrender of any of the poor remains of rights left us, if we have then any effective means and will to resist, we shall see them resort to the same spiritual usurpation and to the same anger to carry those ends. In estimating their future proceedings and principles, we must not forget that since their fusion, Northern Presbyterianism is virtually New School, Abolition, Radical Presbyterianism. That union was plainly an absorption of the Old School by the New. If, then, we would know its present complexion, we must acquaint ourselves with the action of the New School Assemblies. We shall find, indeed, no McPheeters case, no excision of whole Synods without trial, because their tyranny had long before driven off all their conservative members, and they simply had none left to persecute. But we shall see the most determined fanaticism, Erastianism, and confusion of things secular and spiritual, before, during, and since the war. These, coupled with a clearly pronounced "Broad-churchism," are the ascertained characteristics of Northern Presbyterianism.

In conclusion, we may remark that the career of Dr. McPheeters illustrates very sufficiently that unhallowed confusion which some in our day seek to effect between Christian charity and adherence to principle. Of the former he had the fullest measure. He may indeed be pronounced another Moses, the "meekest of men." But when the question of principle was once clear to his apprehension, he was as uncompromising as the sourest of the "rebels." His meekness did not prevent his active coöperation with that "mighty man of war," Dr. S. R. Wilson of Louisville, in constructing the famous "Declaration and Testimony." Its testimonies against wrong were not too strong for the gentle McPheeters. May we not surmise that when some profess to find it "too bitter," it is partly because they sympathise with the sins which it exposes?