





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL 1840.

No. I.

Chas. L. Burleigh.

ART. I.—*Davies's State of Religion among the Dissenters
in Virginia.*

AMONG the papers communicated to the Rev. Dr Green, as chairman of the committee appointed many years ago to prepare a history of the Presbyterian church, there are several relating to the settlement and difficulties of the Rev. Mr. Davies in Virginia. They consist principally of a correspondence between Mr. Davies and the bishop of London, and Drs. Doddridge and Avery in England. Some of these letters are so much injured by having long since been exposed to moisture, as to be in a great measure illegible. Others of them however are in good preservation. The most important is a long communication from Mr. Davies to the bishop of London, which we propose to print entire. In order however to understand it, it is necessary to recollect that the Episcopal church was by law established in Virginia, and non-attendance upon its services made a penal offence. To make provision however for dissenters, the legislature had adopted the English Act of Toleration, and given it the force of law in that colony. It was on this ground that Mr. Davies recognized that act, and appealed to it for protection. This he states distinctly in a letter dated May 21st, 1752, and addressed to Dr. Avery. He there says, "I am fully satisfied,

sir, that, as you intimate, the act of uniformity and other penal laws against non-conformity are not of force in the colonies, and consequently that the dissenters have no right nor indeed any need to plead the act of toleration as an exemption from those penal laws. But, sir, our legislature has passed an act of the same kind with those laws (though the penalty is less) requiring all adult persons to attend on the established church. As this act was passed since the revolution, it was necessary that protestant dissenters should be exempted from its obligation, and tolerated to worship God in separate assembly (though indeed at the time of its enactment, viz: the 4th of Queen Anne, there was not a dissenting congregation except a few Quakers, in the colony), and for this purpose our legislature thought fit to take in the act of parliament made for that end in England, rather than to make a new one peculiar to this colony. This, sir, you may see in my remonstrance to the governor and council, which I find has been laid before you. Now it is with a view to exempt ourselves from the obligation of the above law made by our legislature, that we plead the act of toleration; and we plead it not as an English law, for we are convinced that it does not extend hither by virtue of its primitive enactment, but as received into the body of the Virginia laws by our legislature. And though for some time, some pretended to scruple and others denied that the act of toleration is in force here, even in this sense, yet now I think it is generally granted, and all the question is about the intent and meaning of this act; and particularly whether a dissenting congregation, that is very much dispersed, and cannot meet at one place, may claim a right by virtue of said act, to have a plurality of places licensed for the convenience of sundry parts of the congregation; and whether it allows a dissenting minister to divide his labours among two congregations at sundry meeting houses when, by reason of the scarcity of ministers, each congregation cannot be furnished with one."

At first there was no difficulty made on this subject, as the Presbyterian dissenters had obtained licenses for five places of worship before Mr. Davies visited them in 1747. But when in consequence of the faithful and eloquent preaching of that distinguished man, the number of dissenters began to increase, the Episcopalians took the alarm, and began to throw difficulties in the way of granting such licenses. They at first, it seems, took the ground that the Act of Toleration was not in force in Virginia, and that the dissenters were

without any legal protection. When driven from this ground they restricted the sense given to the act, and wished to confine one congregation to one place of meeting, and one minister to one congregation. Against this the Presbyterians remonstrated as an invasion of the rights secured to them by the laws of the colony. The Episcopalians applied to the Bishop of London for his interpretation of the act, as appears from the following extract of a letter addressed to him from Virginia, and by him communicated, together with his answer, to Dr. Doddridge. The bishop's correspondent, under the date of July 27, 1750, writes to him: "Seven meeting houses situated in five counties have been licensed by the general court for Mr. Samuel Davies. In those counties there are eight ministers of the established church. The justices of New Kent county lately granted him a license to have a meeting in St. Peter's parish, but their order has been superceded by the general court, it being judged that this affair is not within the jurisdiction of county courts. The instruction alluded to in the answer of Peyton Randolph Esq. attorney general of Virginia, to the first question, is as follows. 'You are to permit a liberty of conscience to all persons except papists, so that they be contented with a quiet and peaceable enjoyment of the same, not giving offence or scandal to the government.' I earnestly entreat the favour of your lordship's opinion, whether in licensing so many meeting houses for one teacher, they have not granted him a greater indulgence than either the king's instructions or the act of toleration intended. It is not to be dissembled that several of the laity as well as of the clergy are uneasy on account of the countenance and encouragement he has met with; and I cannot forbear expressing my own concern to see schism spreading itself through a colony which has been famous for the uniformity of religion. I had almost forgot to mention his holding forth on working days to great numbers of poor people, who generally are his followers. This certainly is inconsistent with the religion of labour, whereby they are obliged to maintain themselves and families; and their neglect of this duty, if not seasonably prevented, may in process of time, be sensibly felt by the government."

To the above communication the bishop replied: "As to Davies's case, as far as I can judge your attorney general is quite in the right, for the act of toleration confines the preachers to a particular place, to be certified and entered; and so the practice here has been; and it was so far admitted to be the case

that the dissenters obtained a clause in the 10th of Queen Anne, to empower any dissenting minister to preach occasionally in any other county but that in which he was licensed.

“I observe in one of the licenses (a copy of which you sent me) Davies is permitted to assemble, &c. at several meeting houses *to be* erected on the lands of Joseph Skelton, &c. Now the act of toleration requires that the places of meeting shall be certified and registered, but how houses that are not in being can be certified and registered I cannot understand.

“The Act of Toleration was intended to permit dissenters to worship in their own way, and to exempt them from penalties, but it never was intended to permit them to set up itinerant preachers, to gather congregations where there were none before. They are by the act of Wm. and Mary to qualify in the county where they live, and how Davies can be said to live in five different counties they who granted the license must explain.

“In the act of Wm. and Mary, the justices of the peace can admit of the teachers qualification, which is the reason I suppose of your justices acting in the present case. If this power be lodged with the governor, as your attorney-general takes it to be, I do not see how the justices can interfere, unless they suppose they can do whatever the justices in England can do, under the special authority of an act of parliament, which in many instances would be an absurd claim.

“Since I received yours I have been confined at home, and as the ships are now going out, I have not time to advise on this subject, and therefore what I have said must be taken only as my private opinion; but as this case concerns the church abroad very much, I will soon learn what the sense of the lawyers is here.”

These extracts were inclosed to Dr. Doddridge in the following letter, from which it appears the Dr. had sent the bishop an extract of a letter from Mr. Davies to himself. The bishop writes thus:

“*London, 11 May, 1751.*

“*Rev. Sir,*

“I am very much obliged to you for the open and candid manner in which you have communicated to me, the case of Mr. Davies, and an extract of his letter upon the subject. I wish all cases of this sort could be as fairly stated: it would exclude frivolous complaints, and bring the rest to be understood, which often times they are not. The best return I

can make you, is to send you extracts, verbatim from the account I received from Virginia, and from the answer I returned. You have them enclosed.

“The question upon Mr. Davies’s case, as far as it appears yet, relates to the meaning and construction of the act commonly called the Toleration Act. What I conceive the meaning to be, appears in the extract from my answer. If you consider the act, and the circumstance under which it was granted, you will not, I believe, see reason to think me mistaken. If you judge the liberty granted not sufficient, and that you, and every body, have a natural right to propagate their opinions in religion in such a manner as they approve themselves, that is quite another point, and in which Mr. Davies, who claims under the Act of Toleration, has no concern.

“If you suppose the Church of England to be (which I am persuaded you do not), in the same state of corruption as the Romish church was at the time of the Reformation, there wants indeed no license, nor authority from the government to justify the methods of conversion which Mr. Davies is pursuing, and which the Methodists now do and long have pursued. But if the Act of Toleration was desired for no other view than to ease the consciences of those who could not conform—if it was granted with no other view, how must Mr. Davies’s conduct be justified, who, under the colour of a toleration to his own conscience, is labouring to disturb the consciences of others, and the peace of a church acknowledged to be a true church of Christ? He came 300 miles from home, not to serve people who had scruples, but to a country where the Church of England had been established from its first plantation, and where there were not above four or five dissenters within one hundred miles of it, not above six years ago. Mr. Davies says, in his letter to you, ‘We claim no other liberties than those granted by the Act of Toleration.’ So that the state of the question is admitted, on both sides, to be this: How far the Act of Toleration will justify Mr. Davies, in taking upon himself to be an itinerant preacher, and travelling over many counties, to make converts in a country, too, where till very lately, there was not a dissenter from the Church of England?

“You will observe in the extract from my letter, that I promised to take the opinion of lawyers upon the case; but I have not done it; which I tell you that you may not think I have an opinion and conceal it from you.

“Mr. Davies says, sundry of the people have been indicted and fined, and it is upon this information, I suppose, that you express yourself apprehensive that methods of severity, not to say of oppression, may be used. Of this I have heard nothing; but give me leave to set you right on one thing, and to tell you that my name neither is nor can be used for any such purpose. The Bishop of London, nor his commissaries, have no such power in the plantations, and I believe never desired to have it; so that if there be any ground for such complaint, the civil government only is concerned.

“There is another part of Mr. Davies’s letter which gives me great concern. I mean the character he gives of the clergy and laity in Virginia. I dare say you have so much candor as to deduct something from the general character; knowing how hard it is not to suspect and charge corruption of principles, upon those who differ in principles from us. I have no such account of the clergy of Virginia as will justify this character; though there may be reason in some cases for very just complaints, and how can it be expected to be otherwise, considering the state of the Church of England abroad: the care of it as an Episcopal church, is supposed to be in the Bishop of London. How he comes to be charged with this care, I will not inquire now, but sure I am that the care is improperly lodged: for a bishop to live at one end of the world, and his church at another, must make the office very uncomfortable to the bishop, and, in a great measure, useless to the people. With respect to ordinances, it has a very ill effect; the people of the country are discouraged from bringing up their children for the ministry, because of the hazard and expense of sending them to England to take orders, where they often get the small pox, a distemper fatal to the natives of those countries. Of those who are sent from hence, a great part are of the Scotch or Irish, who can get no employment at home, and enter into the service more out of necessity than choice. Some others are willing to go abroad, to retrieve either lost fortunes, or lost character. For these reasons, and others of a less weight, I did apply to the king, as soon as I was bishop of London, to have two or three bishops appointed for the plantations, to reside there. I thought there could be no reasonable objection to it, not even to the dissenters, as the bishops proposed were to have no jurisdiction, but over the clergy of their own church; and no more over them than should enable them to see the pastoral

office duly performed; and as to New England, where the dissenters are so numerous, it never was proposed to settle a bishop in the country.

“You are probably no stranger to the manner in which the news of this proposal was received in New England. If you are, I will only say, that they used all their influence to obstruct the settling of bishops in the Episcopal church of England. Was this consistent even with a spirit of toleration? Would they think themselves tolerated, if they were debarred the right of settling ministers among themselves, and were obliged to send all their candidates to Geneva or Scotland for orders? At the same time that they exert this opposition, they set up a mission of their own for Virginia, a country positively Episcopal, by authority of their synod; and, in their own country, where they have the power, they have persecuted and imprisoned several members of the church, for not paying towards supporting the dissenting preachers, though no such charge can, by any colour of law, be imposed upon them. This has been the case in New England. I am sorry to add, that some here, for whose characters and abilities I have due esteem, have not upon this occasion given signs of the temper and moderation that were expected from them.

“I do not willingly enter into these complaints even to you, who I am confident will make no ill use of them. I wish there was no occasion for them. In this wish, I am sure of your concurrence, from the love you bear to our common Christianity.

“I am, Sir,

“Your most affectionate friend, and

“Very humble servant,

“THOS. LONDON.”

Dr. Doddridge having sent this letter to Mr. Davies, the latter wrote the following letter to the bishop:—

“*My Lord,*

“My little name would probably never have been made known to your lordship in this manner, were I not constrained by such reasons as, I humbly presume, will acquit me from the censure of a causeless intrusive application. Your lordship’s general character, and the high sentiments of your candour and impartiality your valuable writings have inspired me with, persuade me your lordship is a patient searcher after truth, both in matters of speculation and fact; and, therefore,

will patiently bear the following representation, though unavoidably tedious; especially when it is intended to reflect light upon a case which, in your lordship's own judgment, concerns the church abroad very much, and help to bring it to an impartial determination: and, though my being unaccustomed to such addresses, may render me awkward or deficient in some of the decent and precedented formalities with which I should approach a person of your lordship's dignity; yet I flatter myself my inward affectionate veneration will naturally discover itself in such genuine indications as will convince your lordship of its sincerity and ardour, and procure your indulgence to my involuntary imperfections.

“When his honour the president of this colony, the late Col. Lee, first informed me, that the case of the Protestant dissenters here had been laid before your lordship, I drew up a representation of it, with all possible impartiality, in a letter intended for your lordship, dated August 13, 1750. I had no suspicion that either the president or the Rev. Dr. Dawson had knowingly and wilfully misrepresented it; yet I had reason to conclude their representation was imperfect; as they were not thoroughly acquainted with the circumstances of the dissenters in these parts. This supposed imperfection I attempted to supply in that letter. But upon farther deliberation, I concluded it would answer no valuable end to send it; as I had then no opportunity of procuring the attestation of others, and I knew a person's speaking in his own behalf is generally deemed a sufficient ground to suspect his veracity. Accordingly I kept it by me till about three months ago, when I sent it, with some other papers upon the affair, to a correspondent in London; leaving it wholly to his judgment, whether to present it to your lordship or not. I have not received any intelligence from him as yet, what he has thought proper to do; and, therefore, lest your lordship should not have received it, I shall as far as I can recollect, lay the substance of it before you, together with such additional remarks as have been suggested to me by occurrences since that time.

“I informed my worthy friend Dr. Doddridge, of the state of affairs here with respect to the dissenters, about a year and a half ago; and by his answer, I find he has laid a large extract of my letter before your lordship. I wrote it with all the unreserved freedom of friendship; as I did not expect it would have been presented to your lordship's eyes: yet I am glad you have seen it; as, by comparing it with this,

which, it may be presumed, I write with more caution, your lordship may be convinced I do not act in disguise, but make substantially the same naked, artless representation of truth to all parties.

“Dr. Doddridge has sent me a copy of your lordship’s letter to him, with the extracts of the letters from and to Virginia enclosed, as the fullest and easiest method of informing me of your lordship’s sentiments. This, my lord, will not, I trust, weaken your ‘confidence that he would make no ill use’ of your lordship’s freedom with him, since the matter is of a public nature; and the reason of his writing to your lordship was, that he might inform me of your sentiments. And I find some misrepresentations in your lordship’s letter, and the extracts enclosed, which, I apprehend, I can rectify. I hope, my lord, you will not suspect I have so much arrogance as to encounter your lordship as a disputant, if I presume to make some free and candid remarks upon them. My only design is to do justice to a misrepresented cause, which is the inalienable right of the meanest innocent; and as an impartial historical representation will be sufficient for this purpose, it is needless to tire your lordship with tedious argumentation.

“The frontier counties of this colony, about an hundred miles west and south-west from Hanover, have been lately settled by people that chiefly came from Ireland originally, and immediately from the northern colonies, who were educated Presbyterians, and had been under the care of the ministers belonging to the synod of New York (of which I am a member), during their residence there. Their settling in Virginia has been many ways beneficial to it, which I am sure most of them would not have done, had they expected any restraints in the inoffensive exercise of their religion according to their consciences. After their removal, they continued to petition the synod of New York, and particularly the presbytery of New Castle, which was nearest to them, for ministers to be sent among them. But as the ministers of said synod and of the country were few, and vastly disproportioned to the many congregations under their care, they could not provide these vacancies with settled pastors. And what, my lord, could they do in this case? I appeal to your lordship, whether this was not the only expedient in their power, to appoint some of their members to travel alternately into these destitute congregations, and officiate among them as long as would comport with their circumstances? It was

this, my lord, that was the first occasion, as far as I can learn, of our being stigmatized *itinerant preachers*. But whether there was any just ground for it in these circumstances, I cheerfully submit to your lordship. The same method was taken for the same reason, (as I shall observe more particularly hereafter) to supply the dissenters in and about Hanover before my settlement among them; and this raised the former clamour still higher. There are now in the frontier counties at least five congregations of Presbyterians, who, though they have long used the most vigorous endeavours to obtain settled ministers among them, have not succeeded as yet by reason of the scarcity of ministers, and the number of vacancies in other parts, particularly in Pennsylvania and the Jerseys: and we have no way to answer their importunate petitions, but by sending a minister now and then to officiate transiently among them. And as the people under my charge are so numerous and so dispersed, that I cannot allow them at each meeting-house such a share of my ministrations as is correspondent to their necessity, the said synod has twice or thrice, in the space of three years, sent a minister to assist me for a few sabbaths. These, my lord, are the only itinerations that my brethren can be charged with in this colony; and whether they should not rather run the risk of this causeless charge, than suffer these vacancies, who eagerly look to them for the bread of life, to perish through a famine of the word of the Lord, I cheerfully submit to your lordship.

“But as I am particularly accused of intrusive schismatical itinerations, I am more particularly concerned to vindicate myself: and for that purpose, it will be sufficient to inform your lordship of the circumstances of the dissenters in and about Hanover, who are under my ministerial care.

“The dissenters here, my lord, are but sufficiently numerous to form two distinct organized congregations, or particular churches; and did they live contiguous, two meeting-houses would be sufficient for them, and neither they nor myself would desire more. But they are so dispersed, that they cannot convene for public worship, unless they have a considerable number of places licensed; and so few that they cannot form a particular organized church at each place. There are meeting-houses licensed in five different counties, as the letter from Virginia, I suppose, from the Rev. Dr. Dawson informs your lordship. But the extremes of my congregation lie 80 or 90 miles apart; and the dissenters under

my care are scattered through six or seven different counties; the greatest number of them, I suppose about an hundred families at least, is in Hanover, where there are three meeting-houses licensed; about twenty or thirty families in Henrics; about ten or twelve in Caroline; about fifteen or twenty in Goochland; and about the same number in Louisa; in each of which counties there is but one meeting-house licensed; about fifteen or twenty families in Cumberland, where there is no place licensed; and about the same number contiguous to New Kent, where a license was granted by the court of that county, but afterwards superseded by the general court. The counties here are large, generally forty or fifty miles in length, and about twenty or thirty miles in breadth; so that though they lived in one county, it might be impossible for them all to convene at one place; and much more when they are dispersed through so many. Though there are now seven places licensed, yet the nearest are twelve or fifteen miles apart, and many of the people have ten, fifteen or twenty miles to the nearest, and thirty, forty, or sixty miles to the rest; nay, some of them have thirty or forty miles to the nearest. That this is an impartial representation of our circumstances, I dare appeal to all that know any thing about them.

“Let me here remind your lordship that such is the scarcity of ministers in the synod of New York, and so great the number of congregations under their care, that though a part of my congregation have, with my zealous concurrence, used repeated endeavours to obtain another minister amongst them, to relieve me of the charge of them, yet they have not succeeded as yet. So that all the dissenters here depend entirely on me to officiate among them; as there is no other minister of their own denomination within two hundred miles, except when one of my brethren from the northern colonies is appointed to pay them a transient visit, for two or three sabbaths, once in a year or two: and as I observed, they cannot attend on my ministry at one or two places by reason of their distance; nor constitute a complete particular church at each place of meeting, by reason of the smallness of their number.

“These things, my lord, being impartially considered, I dare submit it to your lordship:

“Whether my itinerating in this manner, in such circumstances, be illegal? And whether, though I cannot live in five different counties at once, as your lordship observes, I

may not lawfully officiate in them, or in as many as the peculiar circumstances of my congregation, which though but one particular church, is dispersed through sundry counties render necessary?

“ Whether contiguity of residence is necessary to entitle dissenters to the liberties granted by the Act of Toleration? Whether when they cannot convene at one place, they may not, according to the true intent and meaning of that act, obtain as many houses licensed as will render public worship accessible to them all? And whether, if this liberty be denied them, they can be said to be tolerated at all? i. e. whether *dissenters are permitted to worship in their own way*, (which your lordship observes was the intent of that act), who are prohibited from worshipping in their own way, unless they travel thirty, forty, or fifty miles every Sunday? Your lordship grants we would have no reason to think ourselves tolerated, were we obliged to send our candidates to Geneva or Scotland to be ordained; and is there any more reason to think so when great numbers are obliged to journey so far weekly for public worship?

“ Whether when there are a few dissenting families in one county, and a few in another, and they are not able to form a distinct congregation, or particular church at each place, and yet all of them conjunctly are able to form one, though they cannot meet stately at one place; whether, I say, they may not legally obtain sundry meeting houses licensed, in these different counties, where their minister may divide his time according to the proportion of the people, and yet be looked upon as one organized church? And whether the minister of such a dispersed church, who alternately officiates at these sundry meeting-houses should, on this account, be branded as an itinerant?

“ Whether, when a number of dissenters, sufficient to constitute two distinct congregations, each of them able to maintain a minister, can obtain but one by reason of the scarcity of ministers, they may not legally share in the labours of that one, and have as many houses licensed for him to officiate in, as their distance renders necessary? And whether the minister of such an united congregation, though he divides his labours at seven different places, or more, if their conveniency requires it, be not as properly a *settled* minister as though he preached but at one place, to but one congregation? Or (which is a parallel case) whether the Rev. Mr. Barret, one of the ministers in Hanover, who has

three churches situated in two counties, and whose parish is perhaps sixty miles in circumference, be not as properly a settled parish minister, as a London minister whose parishioners do not live half a mile from his church?

“ I beg leave, my lord, farther to illustrate the case by a relation of a matter of fact, and a very possible supposition.

“ It very often happens in Virginia, that the parishes are twenty, thirty, forty, and sometimes fifty or sixty miles long, and proportionably broad; which is chiefly owing to this, that people are not so thick settled, as that the inhabitants in a small compass should be sufficient for a parish; and your lordship can easily conceive that the inhabitants in this infant colony, are thinner than in England. The legislature here has wisely made provision to remedy this inconvenience, by ordering sundry churches or chapels of ease to be erected in one parish, that one of them at least may be tolerably convenient to all the parishioners; and all these are under the care of one minister, who shares his labours at each place in proportion to the number of people there. In Hanover a pretty populous county, there are two ministers, one of them has two churches, and the other, as I observed has three; the nearest of which are twelve or fifteen miles apart. And in some of the frontier counties the number of churches in a parish is much greater. And yet the number of churches does not multiply the parish into an equal number of parishes; nor does the minister by officiating at so many places, incur the odious epithet of an itinerant preacher, a pluralist or non-resident. (Here again my lord, I appeal to all the colony to attest this representation). Now, I submit it to your lordship, whether there be not at least equal reason that a plurality of meeting houses should be licensed for the use of the dissenters here, since they are more dispersed and fewer in number? The nearest of those licensed are twelve or fifteen miles apart; and as, if there were but one church in a parish, a great part of it would be incapable of attending on public worship; so if the number of my meeting houses were lessened, a considerable part of the dissenters here would be thrown into a state of heathenism, wholly destitute of the ministrations of the gospel, or obliged to attend stately on the established church, which they conscientiously scruple. And indeed this will be the case with some of them, if more be not licensed, unless they can go twenty, thirty, or forty miles every sabbath. And here, my lord, it may be proper to observe, that in the Act of Toleration it is expressly pro-

vided 'That all the laws made and provided for the frequenting divine service on the Lord's day—shall be in force and executed against all persons that offend against the said laws, except such persons come to some congregation or assembly of religious worship, allowed or permitted by this act.' So that the dissenters are obliged, even by that Act which was made designedly in their favour, to attend on the established church, unless they come to some dissenting congregation; and this obligation is corroborated, and the penalty increased by an act of our assembly, which enjoins all adult persons to come to church at least once a month, excepting as is excepted in an act made in the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary,' &c. But how, my lord, is it possible for them to comply with this injunction, if they are restrained to so small a number of meeting houses, as that they cannot attend them? If the Act of Toleration imposes this restraint upon them, does it not necessitate them to violate itself? And if our magistrates refuse to license a sufficient number, and yet execute the penal laws upon them for the profanation of the sabbath, or the neglect of public worship, does it not seem as though they obliged them to offend that they may enjoy the malignant pleasure of punishing them? The Act of William and Mary, my lord, does not particularize the number of houses to be licensed for the use of one congregation; but only requires, in general, that all such places shall be registered before public worship be celebrated in them; from which it may be reasonably presumed, the number is to be wholly regulated by the circumstances of the congregation. It is, however, evident that such a number was intended as that all the members of the congregation might conveniently attend. But to return, I submit it also to your lordship, whether there be not as little reason for representing me as an itinerant preacher, on account of my preaching at so many places for the conveniency of one congregation, as that the minister of a large parish, where there are sundry churches or chapels of ease, should be so called for preaching at these sundry places, for the conveniency of one parish? Besides the reason common to both, the distance of the people, there is one peculiarly in my favour, the small number of our ministers; on which account almost the half of the congregations that have put themselves under our synodical or presbyterial care, are destitute of settled pastors: which is far from being the case of late, in the established church in Virginia. I shall

subjoin one remark more. 'Tis very common here, my lord, when a parish which has had sundry churches in it under the care of one minister, is increased, to divide it into two or more, each of which has a minister. And I submit it to your lordship, whether my congregation may not be so divided, when an opportunity occurs of obtaining another minister? And whether till that time I may not, according to the precedent around me in the established church, take the care of all the dissenters at the places already licensed, and at that petitioned for, when I do it for no selfish views, but from the unhappy necessity imposed upon me by present circumstances, and am eager to resign a part of my charge, as soon as another may be obtained to undertake it, which I hope will be ere long?

“ I know but little, my lord, how it is in fact in England: but I will put a case. Suppose, then there are fifteen families of dissenters at Clapham in Bedfordshire, fifteen at Wotten in Northamptonshire, fifteen at Kimbolton in Huntingdonshire, and fifteen in the north corner of Buckinghamshire, (if these places are not so pertinent as others that might be supposed, your lordship can easily substitute others and your candour will overlook my blunder, as I have never seen England but in a map), and suppose, that these families, not being able to form a distinct church in each shire and maintain a minister at each place, agree to unite into one organized church, and to place themselves under the care of one minister, who shall proportion his labours at sundry meeting-houses, one being erected in each shire for the conveniency of the families resident there. I humbly query whether in this case such a congregation may not according to the act of Wm. and Mary, claim a license for a meeting house in each of these shires? Whether this could justly be suspected as an artifice ‘ To gather dissenting congregations where there were none before, to disturb the peace of the church?’ Whether the minister of such a dispersed congregation should be stigmatized an itinerant?—Or (to adapt the illustration yet more fully to the case) suppose twice the above number in five contiguous shires or counties, capable of constituting two particular churches, and maintaining two ministers, and suppose the number of ministers so small, that they can obtain but one to settle among them, may they not in these circumstances unite in one church, and place themselves conjunctly under the care of one minister, sharing his labours among them, at seven meeting-houses, in five counties, in propor-

tion to there number at each place? And would not such a minister be justly looked upon as a settled minister? Or, would he be limited to one county in this case, because the Act of Toleration requires him to qualify in the county where he lives? And this, my lord, suggests to me a remark in your lordship's letter to Virginia: 'They' [the dissenting ministers] 'are, by the act of William and Mary, to qualify in the county where they live, and how Davies can be said to live in five different counties, they who granted the license must explain.' You know, my lord, it is the judgment of our attorney general, that county courts here have no authority in such matters; and your lordship has not declared your dissent from him. The council also has published an order, prohibiting county courts to administer qualifications to dissenting ministers, and appropriating that authority to the governor or commander in chief. And how is it possible, my lord, we should qualify in the county where we live, since the governor does not live there? It is hard if, after we are prohibited to qualify in county courts, as we desire, the validity of our qualifications should be suspected, because we did not qualify there. As for myself, I was required to qualify by his honour the governor in the general court, which consists of the governor and council; and as the epithet *general* intimates, it is the supreme court of the whole province, and what is done therein is deemed as valid through the whole colony, as the acts of a county court in a particular county: and consequently, I look upon myself, and so does the government, as legally qualified to officiate in any part of the colony where there are houses licensed.

"To all this, my lord, I may add, that though the Act of Toleration should not warrant my preaching in so many counties; yet since, as your lordship observes, 'the dissenters obtained a clause in the 10th Queen Anne, to empower any dissenting preacher to preach occasionally in any other county but that where he was licensed;' and since the reason of the law is at least as strong here as in England, and consequently it extends hither, my conduct is sufficiently justified by it.

"All these things, my lord, furnish a sufficient answer to your lordship's question: 'How far the Act of Toleration will justify Mr. Davies in taking upon himself to be an itinerant preacher, and travelling over many counties to make converts in a country too where, till very lately, there was not one dissenter from the Church of England?' And it

appears to have been stated upon misinformation; when impartially stated, it would stand thus:

“How far the Act of Toleration will justify Mr. Davies, in sharing his labours at sundry places in different counties, among professed dissenters, who constitute but one particular church, though dispersed through so many counties and incapable of meeting at one place? Or, thus:

“Whether legally qualified protestant dissenters, who are dispersed through sundry counties, and cannot meet at one place, and by reason of the scarcity of ministers, cannot obtain but one among them, may not legally share in the labours of that one, and have so many houses licensed for him to officiate in, as that all of them may alternately attend on public worship? And were the question considered in this view, I confidently presume, your lordship would determine it in my favour, and no longer look upon me as an itinerant preacher, intent on making converts to a party.

“But I find I have been represented to your lordship, as an uninvited intruder into these parts; for your lordship, in your letter to Dr. Doddridge, writes thus: ‘If the Act of Toleration was desired for no other view but to ease the consciences of those that could not conform; if it was granted with no other view, how must Mr. Davies’s conduct be justified? who, under the colour of a toleration to his own conscience, is labouring to disturb the consciences of others. He came three hundred miles from home, not to serve people who had scruples, but to a country where there were not above four or five dissenters within an hundred miles, not above six years ago.’

“To justify me from this charge, my lord, it might be sufficient to observe, that the meeting-houses here were legally licensed before I preached in them, and that the licenses were petitioned for by the people, as the last license for three of them expressly certifies, as your lordship may see: which is a sufficient evidence that I did not intrude into any of these places to gain proselytes where there were no dissenters before.

“But to give your lordship a just view of this matter, I shall present you with a brief narrative of the rise and increase of dissenters in and about this county, and an account of the circumstances of my settling among them. And though I know, my lord, there may be some temptations to look upon all I say as a plausible artifice to vindicate myself, or my party; yet I am not without hopes that one of your lordship’s

impartiality, who has found it possible, by happy experience, to be candid and disinterested even when self is concerned, will believe it possible for another also to be impartial for once in the relation of plain public facts, obvious to all, though they concern him and his party; especially when he is willing to venture the reputation of his veracity on the undeniable truth of his relation, and can bring the attestations of multitudes to confirm it.

“About the year 1743, upon the petitions of the Presbyterians in the frontier counties of this colony, the Rev. Mr. Robinson, who now rests from his labours, and is happily advanced beyond the injudicious applauses and censures of mortals, was sent by order of Presbytery to officiate for some time among them. A little before this, about four or five persons, heads of families in Hanover, had dissented from the established church, not from any scruples about her ceremonial peculiarities, the usual cause of non-conformity, much less about her excellent articles of faith, but from a dislike of the doctrines generally delivered from the pulpit, as not savouring of experimental piety, nor suitably intermingled with the glorious peculiarities of the religion of Jesus. It does not concern me at present, my lord, to inquire or determine whether they had sufficient reason for their dislike. They concluded them sufficient; and they had a legal as well as natural right to follow their own judgment. These families were wont to meet in a private house on Sundays to hear some good books read, particularly Luther’s; whose writings I can assure your lordship were the principal cause of their leaving the church; which, I hope, is a presumption in their favour. After some time, sundry others came to their society, and upon hearing these books, grew indifferent about going to church, and chose rather to frequent these societies for reading. At length, the number became too great for a private house to contain them, and they agreed to build a meeting-house, which they accordingly did.

“Thus far, my lord, they had proceeded before they had heard a dissenting minister at all. (Hear again, I appeal to all that know any thing of the matter, to attest this account.) They had not the least thought at this time of assuming the denomination of Presbyterians, as they were wholly ignorant of that church: but when they were called upon by the court to assign the reasons of their absenting themselves from church, and asked what denomination they professed

themselves of, they declared themselves Lutherans, not in the usual sense of that denomination in Europe, but merely to intimate that they were of Luther's sentiments, particularly in the article of justification.

"Hence, my lord, it appears that neither I nor my brethren were the first instruments of their separation from the church of England: and so far we are vindicated from the charge of 'setting up itinerant preachers, to gather congregations where there were none before.' So far I am vindicated from the charge of 'coming three hundred miles from home to disturb the consciences of others—not to serve a people who had scruples, but to a country where there were not above four or five dissenters' at the time of my coming here.

"Hence also, my lord, results an inquiry, which I humbly submit to your lordship, whether the laws of England enjoin an immutability in sentiments on the members of the established church? And whether, if those that were formerly conformists follow their own judgments, and dissent, they are cut off from the privileges granted by law to those that are dissenters by birth and education? If not, had not these people a legal right to separate from the established church, and to invite any legally qualified minister they thought fit to preach among them? And this leads me back to my narrative again.

"While Mr. Robinson was preaching in the frontier counties, about an hundred miles from Hanover, the people here having received some information of his character and doctrines, sent him an invitation by one or two of their number to come and preach among them; which he complied with, and preached four days successively to a mixed multitude; many being prompted to attend from curiosity. The acquaintance I had with him, and the universal testimony of multitudes that heard him, assure me, that he insisted entirely on the great catholic doctrines of the gospel (as might be presumed from his first text—Luke, xiii. 3), and did not give the least hint of his sentiments concerning the disputed peculiarities of the Church of England; or use any sordid disguised artifices to gain converts to a party. It is true, many after this, joined with those that had formerly dissented; but their sole reason at first, was the prospect of being entertained with more profitable doctrines among the dissenters than they were wont to hear in the parish churches, and not because Mr. Robinson had poisoned them with bi-

gotted prejudices against the established church. And permit me, my lord, to declare, with the utmost religious solemnity, that I have been (as I hope your lordship will be in the regions of immortal bliss and perfect uniformity in religion), the joyful witness of the happy effect of these four sermons. Sundry thoughtless impenitents, and sundry abandoned profligates, have ever since given good evidence of a thorough conversion, not from party to party, but from sin to holiness, by an universal devotedness to God, and the conscientious practice of all the social and personal virtues. And when I see this the glorious concomitant or consequent of their separation, I hope your lordship will indulge me to rejoice in such proselytes, as I am sure our Divine Master and all his celestial ministers do; though without this, they are but wretched captures, rather to be lamented over than boasted of. When Mr. Robinson left them, which he did after four days, they continued to meet together on Sundays, to pray and hear a sermon out of some valuable book, read by one of their number; as they had no prospect of obtaining a minister immediately of the same character and principles with Mr. Robinson. They were now increased to a tolerable congregation, and made unwearied application to the presbytery of New Castle, in Pennsylvania, for a minister to be sent among them, at least to pay them a transient visit, and preach a few sermons, and baptize their children, till they should have opportunity to have one settled among them. The presbytery complied with their petitions, as far as the small number of its members, and the circumstances of their own congregations, and of the vacancies under their presbyterial care, would permit; and sent ministers among them at four different times in about four years, who stayed with them two or three sabbaths at each time. They came at the repeated and most importunate petitions of the dissenters here, and did not obtrude their labours upon them uninvited. Sundry, upon hearing them, who had not heard Mr. Robinson, joined with the dissenters; so that in the year 1747, when I was first ordered by the presbytery to take a journey to Hanover, in compliance with the petitions of the dissenters here, I found them sufficiently numerous to form one very large congregation, of two small ones; and they had built five meeting-houses, three in Hanover, one in Henrico, and one in Louisa county; which were few enough considering their distance. Upon my preaching among them, they used the most irresistible importunities with me to settle

among them as their minister, and presented a call to me before the presbytery, signed by about one hundred and fifty heads of families; which, in April, 1748, I accepted, and was settled among them the May following. And though it would have been my choice to confine myself wholly to one meeting-house, especially as I was then in a very languishing state of health; yet, considering that hardly the one-half of the people could possibly convene at one place, and that they had no other minister of their own denomination within less than two hundred miles, I was prevailed upon to take the pastoral care of them all, and to divide my labours at the sundry meeting-houses.

“ And now, my lord, I may leave yourself to judge, whether the informations were just upon which your lordship has represented me as not ‘coming to serve a people that had scruples, but as disturbing the consciences of others, under the colour of a toleration to my own, and intruding into a country where there were not above four or five dissenters,’ &c. Your lordship must see, if this account be true (and thousands can attest it), that I had not the least instrumentality in the first gathering of a dissenting church in these parts. Indeed, I was then but a lad, and closely engaged in study. And I solemnly assure your lordship, that it was not the sacred thirst of filthy lucre, nor the prospect of any other personal advantage, that induced me to settle here: for sundry congregations in Pennsylvania, my native country, and in the other northern colonies, most earnestly importuned me to settle among them, where I should have had at least an equal temporal maintenance, incomparably more ease, leisure, and peace, and the happiness of the frequent society of my brethren; never made a great noise or bustle in the world, but concealed myself in the crowd of my superior brethren, and spent my life in some little service for God and his church, in some peaceful corner; which would have been most becoming so insignificant a creature, and most agreeable to my recluse natural temper: but all these strong inducements were preponderated by a sense of the more urgent necessity of the dissenters here; as they lay two or three hundred miles distant from the nearest ministers of their own denomination, and laboured under peculiar embarrassments for want of a settled minister; which I will not mention, lest I should seem to fling injurious reflections on a government whose clemency I have reason to acknowledge with the most loyal gratitude.

“It is true, my lord, there have been some additions made to the dissenters here since my settlement, and some of them by occasion of my preaching. They had but five meeting-houses then, in three different counties, and now they have seven in five counties, and stand in need of one or two more. But here I must again submit it to your lordship, whether the laws of England, forbid men to change their opinions, and act according to them when changed? And whether the Act of Toleration was intended to tolerate such only as were dissenters by birth and education? Whether professed dissenters are prohibited to have meeting-houses licensed convenient to them, where there are conformists adjacent, whose curiosity may at first prompt them to hear, and whose judgments may afterwards direct them to join with the dissenters? Or whether, to avoid the danger of gaining proselytes, the dissenters in such circumstances must be wholly deprived of the ministration of the gospel?

“For my farther vindication, my lord, I beg leave to declare, and I defy the world to confute me, that in all the sermons I have preached in Virginia, I have not wasted one minute in exclaiming or reasoning against the peculiarities of the established church; nor so much as assigned the reasons of my own non-conformity. I have not exhausted my zeal in railing against the established clergy, in exposing their imperfections, some of which lie naked to my view, or in depreciating their characters. No, my lord; I have matters of infinitely greater importance to exert my zeal, and spend my time and strength upon; to preach repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ; to alarm secure impenitents; to reform the profligate; to undeceive the hypocrite; to raise up the hands that hang down, and to strengthen the feeble knees. These are the doctrines I preach; these the ends I pursue; and these my artifices to gain proselytes; and if ever I divert from these to ceremonial trifles, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth. Now, my lord, if people adhere to me, on such accounts as these, I cannot discourage them without wickedly betraying the interests of religion, and renouncing my character as a minister of the gospel. If the members of the church of England come from distant places to the meeting-houses licensed, for the use of professed dissenters, and upon hearing join with them, and declare themselves Presbyterians, and place themselves under my ministerial care, I dare say your lordship will not censure me for admitting them. And if these new proselytes live at

such a distance that they cannot meet stately at the places already licensed, have they not a legal right to have houses licensed convenient to them, since they are as properly professed dissenters, in favour of whom the Act of Toleration was enacted, as those that have been educated in non-conformity? There is no method, my lord, to prevent the increase of our number in this manner, but, either the prohibiting of all conformists to attend occasionally on my ministry; which neither the laws of God nor of the land will warrant; or the Episcopal ministers, preaching the same doctrines which I do; as I humbly conceive they oblige themselves by subscribing their own articles; and had this been done, I am verily persuaded there would not have been one dissenter in these parts; or my absolutely refusing to receive those into the community of the dissenters, against whom it may be objected that they once belonged to the church of England; which your lordship sees is unreasonable. It is the conversion and salvation of men, I aim to promote; and genuine Christianity, under whatever various forms it appears, never fails to charm my heart. The design of the gospel is to bring perishing sinners to heaven; and if they are but brought thither, its ministers have but little cause of anxiety and contention about the denomination they sustain in their way. Yet my lord, I may consistently profess, that as I judge the government, discipline and modes of worship in the dissenting church, more agreeable to the divine standard than those in the Episcopal, it cannot but afford me a little additional satisfaction to see those that agree with me in essentials, and are hopefully walking towards the same celestial city, agree with me in extra-essentials too; though this ingredient of satisfaction is often swallowed up in the sublimer pleasure that results from the other more noble consideration. And here, my lord, that I may unbosom myself with all the candid simplicity of a gospel minister, I must frankly own, that abstracting the consideration of the disputed peculiarities of the established church, which have little or no influence in the present case, I am verily persuaded, (heaven knows with what sorrowful reluctance I admit the evidence of it), those of the church of England, in Virginia, do not generally enjoy as suitable means for their conversion and edification as they might among the dissenters. This is not because they are of that communion, for I know the gospel and all its ordinances may be administrated in a very profitable manner, in a consistency with the constitution of that church; and

perhaps her ceremonies would be so far from obstructing the efficacy of the means of grace, that they would rather promote it, to them that have no scruples about their lawfulness and expediency, though it would be otherwise with a doubtful conscience; but because the doctrines generally delivered from the pulpit, and the manner of delivery, are such as have not so probable a tendency to do good, as those among the dissenters. I am sensible, my lord, 'how hard it is,' as your lordship observes, 'not to suspect and charge corruption of principles on those who differ in principles from us.' But still I cannot help thinking that they who generally entertain their hearers with languid harangues on morality or insipid speculations, omitting or but slightly touching upon the glorious doctrines of the gospel, which will be everlastingly found the most effectual means to reform a degenerate world; such is the corruption of human nature, in its present lapsed state; the nature of necessity of regeneration, and of divine influences to effect it; the nature of saving faith, evangelical repentance; &c.* I cannot, I say help thinking that they who omit, pervert or but slightly hint at these and the like doctrines, are not likely to do much service to the souls of men: and as far as I can learn by personal observation, or the credible information of others, this is too generally the case in Virginia. And on this account especially, I cannot dissuade persons from joining with the dissenters, who are desirous to do so; and I use no other methods to engage them, but the inculcating of these and the like doctrines.

"I beg leave, my lord, to make one remark more to vindicate the number of my meeting-houses, and as a reason for the licensure of that in New Kent. That in a large and scattered congregation, it may be necessary, the minister should officiate occasionally in particular corners of his congregation, for the conveniency of a few families that lie at a great distance from the places where he stably officiates for the conveniency of the generality. This, my lord, is frequently practised, in the parishes in the frontier counties, which are very large; though not equal to the bounds of my congregation. It is no doubt unreasonable, that the minister should

* "I do not intend this, my lord, for a complete enumeration of evangelical doctrines, as I intimate by the, &c. annexed. For your lordship's farther satisfaction, I must refer you to Dr. Doddridge's practical writings, particularly to his *Rise and Progress of Religion*, his sermon on the *Power and Grace of Christ*, and on *Regeneration*; which I heartily approve as to matter and manner, and would imitate as far as my inferior genius will admit.

consult the conveniency of a few rather than of the majority; and therefore I preach more frequently at one of the meeting-houses in Hanover, where the dissenters are more numerous, than at all the other six. But, my lord, is it not fit I should so far consult the conveniency of a few families, who live in the extremities of the congregation, at a great distance from the place where I stately officiate, as to preach occasionally among them four or five times a year? Though one or two of a family may be able to attend at the stated place of meeting, yet it is impossible that all should; and why may not a sermon be preached occasionally in their neighbourhood where they may all attend? Again; though the heads of families may be capable of attending on public worship, at a great distance themselves, yet it is an intolerable hardship that they should be obliged to carry their children thirty, forty or fifty miles to be baptized. And is it not reasonable, my lord, I should preach among them occasionally, to relieve them from this difficulty, once in three or four months? And may not houses be legally licensed for this purpose? The meeting-house in New Kent was designed for such occasional meetings: and when I have given an account of the affair, I doubt not but your lordship will justify the procedure of the county court in granting a license for it. Some people in and about that county, particularly two gentlemen, of good estates, and excellent characters, who had been justices of the peace, and officers in the militia, told me, that as they lived at a great distance from the nearest place where I stately officiate, and therefore could not frequently attend there, they would count it a peculiar favour, if I would preach occasionally, at some place convenient to them, though it were on other days. I replied, that though I was wholly unable to perform ministerial duties fully to the people at the places already licensed, yet I should be willing to give them a sermon now and then, if they could obtain a license for a place. Whereupon they presented a petition to the county court, signed by fifteen persons, heads of families, and professed Presbyterians, which, (as your lordship has been informed) was granted; but afterwards superseded by the council. Hence, my lord, you may see what was the occasion and design of this petition; and that it was not an artifice of mine as an itinerant, 'to gather a congregation where there was none before;' but wholly the act of the people, professed dissenters, for their own conveniency.

"I am surprised, my lord, to find any intimations in the

letter from Virginia, about the validity and legality of the licenses for seven meeting-houses, granted by the general court, especially if that letter came from the commissary. These were granted by the supreme authority of this colony; and can not be called in question by the council, without questioning the validity of their own authority, at least the legal exercise of it in this instance. And the Rev. Dr. Dawson himself (whom I mention with sincere veneration), sat as a judge in the general court, (for he is one of his majesty's council here) when the licenses were granted, and did not vote against it. Whether I have since forfeited them by my public conduct, I dare appeal to himself, and whether there be any limitations of the number of meeting-houses, for the conveniency of one congregation, in the Act of Toleration, or his majesty's private instructions to the governor, I dare submit to any one that has seen them.

“What I observed above concerning my preaching occasionally on working days, and the reason of it, reminds me, my lord, of an unexpected charge against me in the letter from Virginia, expressed in terms contemptuous enough. ‘I had almost forgot to mention his *holding forth* on working days, to great numbers of poor people, who generally are his only followers. This certainly is inconsistent with the religion of labour, whereby they are obliged to maintain themselves and families; and their neglect of this duty, if not seasonably prevented, may in process of time be sensibly felt by the government.’ Here, my lord, imaginary danger is traced from a very distant source; and I might justify myself by an argumentum ad hominem. My people do not spend half so many working days, in attending on my holding forth the word of life, as the members of the church of England are obliged to keep holy according to their calender. But I know recrimination, though with advantage, is but a spiteful and ineffectual method of vindication. I therefore observe, with greater pleasure, that as I can officiate but at some one of my meeting-houses on Sundays, and as not any one of the seven is tolerably convenient to the half of my people; many of them cannot have opportunity of hearing me on Sundays, above once in a month, or twice, and I have no way to make up their loss in some measure but by preaching in the meeting-house, contiguous to them, once or twice in two or three months on working days. And can this, my lord, have the least tendency to beggar themselves, and families, or injure the government, especially when such meetings are

chiefly frequented, (and that not oftener than once in a fortnight or month) by heads of families, and others, who can easily afford a few hours for this purpose, without the least detriment to their secular affairs? I can assure your lordship a great number of my hearers are so well furnished with slaves, that they are under no necessity of confining themselves to hard labour; and that they redeem more time from the fashionable riots and excessive diversions of the age, than they devote to this purpose: and I wonder there is not an equal clamour raised about the modish ways of murdering time, which are more likely to be sensibly felt by the government, and, which is worse, to ruin multitudes forever. *The religion of labour* is held sacred among us, as the temporal circumstances of my people demonstrate; which are as flourishing as before their adherence to me, except that some of them have been somewhat injured by the fines and concomitant expenses imposed upon them, for worshipping God inoffensively in separate assemblies. But this hardship, my lord, I will not aggravate, as I verily believe it was not the effect of an oppressive spirit in the court, but of mis-information, and the malignant officiousness of some private persons.

“I am fully satisfied, my lord, were there a pious bishop resident in America, it would have a happy tendency to reform the Church of England here, and maintain her purity: and therefore upon a report spread in Virginia some time ago, that one was appointed, I expressed my satisfaction in it; and my poor prayers shall concur to promote it. I know this is also the sentiment of all my brethren in the synod of New York, with whom I have conversed. I am therefore extremely surprised at the information your lordship has received concerning the reception of this proposal in New England, and ‘that they used all their influence to obstruct it.’ I never had the least intimation of it before, though some of the principal ministers there maintain a very unre-served correspondence with me; and I have also the other usual methods of receiving intelligences from a country so near. If it be true, I think, with your lordship, that it is hardly consistent with a spirit of toleration: but it appears so unreasonable, and so opposite to the sentiments of all the dissenters whom I am acquainted with (and they are many, both of the clergy and laity), that the informers must be persons of undoubted veracity before I could credit it. However, my lord, I am not concerned: the synod of New York to which I belong, I am confident, have used no means to

oppose it; but would rather concur to promote it, were it in their power; and, therefore, if your lordship deal with us *secundum legem talionis*, we expect favourable usage. The same things I would say concerning the prosecution and imprisonment of sundry members of the church in New England. I never heard so much as an uncertain rumour of it; and I am sure it is neither approved nor practised in the bounds of the synod of New York. Were your lordship acquainted with the members of that synod, you would own them as strenuous advocates for the civil and sacred rights of mankind, and as far from a bigotted intolerant spirit as perhaps any in the world. And here, my lord, let me correct a small mistake (the effect of imperfect or false information, I suppose), in your lordship's letter to Dr. Doddridge: Your lordship takes the persons in New England, who have been accessory to those prosecutions, to be members of the synod which sent me as a missionary to Virginia; whereas I am a member of another synod, two or three hundred miles distant; and do not in the least act in concert with or subjection to the ministers in New England.*

* This letter was sent by Mr. Davies to Mr. Maudit, in London, to be communicated to Drs. Doddridge and Avery (the melancholy news of Doddridge's death not having then reached this country)—“after correction, to be sent, if you judge it proper, to the bishop.” It is thus, Mr. Davies wrote to Dr. Avery, May 21, 1752. When Dr. Avery received the letter, he wrote to Mr. Davies that he was surprised at his stating to the bishop that he and his Presbyterian friends in America were decidedly favourable to the mission of bishops to this country. This statement he said, was in direct contradiction of all the information which he had received from other quarters on this subject. It is no doubt Mr. Davies was misinformed as to the state of feeling and opinion as to this point. The opposition to the establishment of an American episcopate was very general and decided; and was as warm among a portion of the Episcopalians themselves as among the people of other denominations. This opposition would have been very unreasonable had the bishops been invested with no other authority than that contemplated by Mr. Davies, or that of which the bishop of London speaks in his letter to Dr. Doddridge, quoted on a previous page. But there was so much reason to expect that they would be invested even in colonies, where the Episcopalians were a small minority, with the powers and jurisdiction of their brother prelates in England, that the opposition to the plan was a natural and justifiable precaution against an increase of that oppression to which the non-episcopal denominations were, in so many of the colonies, already exposed.

When Mr. Davies learned that his friends in England were dissatisfied with that portion of his letter, he wrote to Dr. Avery, saying: “Since I received yours, I have been uneasy lest my letter to his lordship should be put into his hands without your approbation; as my sentiments therein expressed, concerning the mission of bishops to North America, were different from yours in your letter to me. When I expressed my satisfaction at the proposal, I spoke in the simplicity of my heart, and according to my judgment, which I have had no reason to alter since, but only your dissent; in which I put an implicit confidence, as you

“Your lordship huddles me permiscuously with the Methodists, as though I were of their party. I am not ashamed to own, that I look upon Mr. Whitefield as a zealous and successful minister of Christ; and, as such, to countenance him. I love him, and I love your lordship, (the profession, I hope, will not be offensive), because I hope you are both good men: and if my affection to him proves me of his party, I hope your lordship will conclude me one of your own too: yet I am far from approving sundry steps in Mr. Whitefield’s first public conduct; and I am glad to find, by some of his late writings, that he does not approve of them himself. The eruptions of his first zeal were, in many instances, irregular; his regulating his conduct so much by impulses, &c. was enthusiastical; and his freedoms in publishing his experience to the world in his journals, were, in my opinion, very imprudent. As to the rest of the Methodists, I know but little of them; and therefore must suspend my judgment concerning them.

“Our loyalty to the government is so well attested, and universally known, that I presume none have ventured to surmise the contrary to your lordship; and this renders it needless for me to offer any thing to demonstrate it. Thus,

have better opportunities to discover the consequences of such a mission than I have. That a settlement of a bishop in dissenting colonies would be injurious to them I easily see; but I find, from the bishop of London’s letter to Dr. Doddridge, that this was not proposed. And I was not able to discover what injury the settlement of a bishop in Virginia or Maryland, where the Church of England is established, would be to the few dissenters in them; and I was not without hopes it might tend to purge out the corrupt leaven from the established church, and restrain the clergy from their extravagancies, who now behave as they please, and promise themselves impunity, as there is none to censure or depose them on this side the Atlantic. However, dear sir, if you think me mistaken, you may take what measures you please to prevent any ill consequences that may be occasioned by the unreserved declaration of my opinion in my letter to the bishop. And as I shall hereafter impose upon you the trouble of receiving and revising the papers I may find occasion to transmit to England, I not only allow, but request you, sir, to correct or suppress them, as your superior judgment may direct you. As I judge the matter is of great importance to the interest of religion in the colony, I would not willingly incur guilt by omitting any means in my power to reflect light upon it. But for want of judgment, and a more thorough acquaintance with the state of things in England, I may sometimes fail in the right choice, or prudent use of means for that purpose; and therefore, to prevent any ill consequences, I must call in the assistance of your judgment, and that of the committee.” The committee here mentioned, was the “Committee of the Deputation of Protestant Dissenters,” established in London, to watch over their interests, and to be the organ of their communication with the government.

my lord, in the simplicity of my heart, I have laid before your lordship an impartial view of the state of affairs relating to the dissenters here, as it appears to me: and made some remarks on your lordship's letter to Dr. Doddridge, and the letters from and to Virginia. I please myself with the persuasion that I have not indulged the contradictious angry humour of a contentious disputant; nor the malignant partiality of a bigot: and it will afford me peculiar satisfaction, if it should be equally evident to your lordship. All the apologies I could make could not atone for my tediousness, were it impertinent or avoidable; but as one that has not naturally a concise method of communicating his thoughts, could not fully represent the matter in fewer words, I promise myself your lordship's forbearance.

"I am persuaded, my lord, were you convinced the representation I have given is just, your lordship would turn advocate for the dissenters here, that the matter might be determined in their favour. I am, therefore, anxious to take some method to convince your lordship it is so; and I can think of no better method than to give those that may look upon themselves concerned to refute me, an opportunity to make the experiment, by publishing this letter to the world. This I should undoubtedly have done, and sent your lordship a printed copy, had I not been scrupulous of making so free with your private letters without your consent. If your lordship approve of this expedient, I shall, upon the first intimation of it, send it to the press.

"May the Great Shepherd and Bishop of souls shed the richest blessings of his providence and grace upon you; and long continue your lordship to be consumed in pious services for the church of God! Whatever reception this letter meets with, this shall be the ardent wish and perpetual prayer of,

"My Lord,

"Your Lordship's

"Most dutiful servant,

"SAMUEL DAVIES.

"*Hanover, in Virginia, Jan. 10. 1752.*"

"POSTSCRIPT.

"I am heartily sorry, my lord, that the character I gave of the clergy and laity, in Virginia, in my letter to Dr. Doddridge has given your lordship great concern. I have no doubt of its sincerity, though I am uncertain whether it was occasioned by a suspicion of calumniating partiality in me,

or of truth in my account, or both. There was no part of your lordship's letter that affected me so deeply as this; yet I thought to have past it over in silence, and accordingly made no remarks upon it in the preceding letter; because as I have not been so happy since as to see reason to retract my former account, I could not relieve your lordship from your pious anxiety; and as it is a tender point, and the information comes with a poor grace from me, I thought the mentioning the many unwelcome evidences of its justice, which force themselves upon me all around, would but increase your lordship's concern, and confirm the suspicion of my partiality, which you intimate in your letter to the Dr. though with tenderness. But considering that I write to one that will not officiously spread the account, to the disregard of religion; and who may be able to administer remedies to so deplorable a case, if seasonably informed of it; and that your lordship's correspondents here may be under as strong a temptation to extenuate such matters, as I may be supposed to be, to aggravate them; and consequently a medium between the two may appear to your lordship to be most just: considering also that it seems necessary for my own vindication, though I do not desire to build my reputation on the infamy of others: I have determined to give your lordship the following brief account, which I am willing should pass under the severest scrutiny.

“ I am sensible, my lord, ‘ how hard it is not to suspect and charge corruption of principles upon those who differ in principles from us,’ and how natural it is to a party spirit (and alas! parties are generally animated with such a spirit) to magnify the practical irregularities of other denominations; sensible of this, and how inconsistent such a temper is with the generous religion of Jesus, I have conscientiously kept a peculiar guard upon my spirit in this respect: and yet (with shame I confess it) I have not been entirely a stranger to its malignant workings; though I am conscious that my prevailing and habitual disposition is candid and generous, otherwise I should be self-condemned in pretending to be a minister or even follower of the Lamb of God. At present, my lord, I feel myself calm and impartial; and could I make my letter the transcript of my heart, your lordship would believe me. I solemnly profess I am conscious of no indulged party spirit; however I am so sensible of my own weakness, that I may implicitly suspect I may be imperceptibly tinctured with it; and therefore your lordship may at the venture ‘ deduct something

from the general character.' I shall say but little of the differences in speculation betwixt me and the clergy, and others here; both because such errors may not be so pernicious, as various practices and the neglect of religious and moral duties; and because these are more disputable, and I may be more liable to mistakes about them. But, my lord, I cannot indulge an implicit suspicion of my partiality so far as to rush into universal scepticism about plain, public, indisputable facts, obvious to my senses. I can see, I can hear, with certainty. I cannot be so infatuated with prejudice as to be incapable of distinguishing between a religious and profane life, between a relish for divine things, and a contemptuous neglect of them, between blasphemy and prayer, drunkenness and sobriety, &c. And I shall chiefly take notice of such obvious facts, about which there is no dispute between the church of England and the dissenters. I would also have it noticed, my lord, that I would not have this account looked on as a history of the state of the religion in Virginia in general; but only in those counties, (and they are not very few) where I have had opportunity of personal observations: and these, if I may believe general fame, are not more degenerate than the rest.

“I confess, my lord, with pleasure, that there are sundry of the laity, in the sphere of my acquaintance, in the Church of England, who are persons of good morals, and have a veneration for religion; and some of them, I doubt not, are sincere Christians, whom I cordially love; and that with more ardent affection than those of my own denomination who appear destitute of real religion; and alas! there are many such, I fear. These pious conformists can witness, that I have not been officious in endeavouring to proselyte them to my party; and that, when conversant with them, I rather choose to dwell on those infinitely more important and delightful subjects in which we agree, than those little angry peculiarities in which we differ. I also cheerfully own (nor is the concession forcibly extorted from me), that sundry of the established clergy are gentlemen of learning, parts and morality, and I hope honestly aiming at the salvation of men; though I cannot but disagree with them in some doctrines, and humbly conceive their public discourses generally are not well adapted to promote their pious end. But, my lord, notwithstanding these concessions, religion may be in a very languishing situation, and vice triumphant in this colony. There may be a few names even in Sardis,

who have not defiled their garments; and yet the majority have at best but a name to live, while they are dead. I must therefore now lay before your lordship the disagreeable part of the character, and if I expatiate more largely upon it than the former, it is not because I take a malignant pleasure in so doing, but because my present design urges me on the unwelcome task.

“If I am prejudiced in favour of any church, my lord, it is of that established in Scotland; of which I am a member in the same sense that the established church in Virginia is the Church of England; and, therefore, should I give your lordship an account of the state of religion there, you would not suspect it of excessive severity. Now, my lord, suppose I had resided four years in Scotland, preached frequently, and obtained a pretty extensive acquaintance in five different counties, gone sometimes as a hearer to the established kirk, and been occasionally at courts, and the like public conventions; spent a week at sundry times in the metropolis, and a day or two in some of the principal towns; lodged in private families frequently, in various parts of the country; and (which I may mention as of some weight, in conjunction with the other opportunities of personal observation) received frequent and well attested informations from multitudes, from various parts, and of different denominations; your lordship would grant that I had sufficient opportunities to make some observation on the state of religion, and could not suspect that my partiality would render me so implicitly confident that religion was in a flourishing state, as that I should take no notice of obvious public facts that obtruded themselves upon my senses; or so pervert my judgment as to conclude all was well in spite of the most glaring evidence. Suppose, then, my lord, that by all the discoveries I can make in these circumstances, I find the generality grossly ignorant of the nature of living Christianity, and of the most important doctrines of the gospel: if I find a general unconcernedness about their eternal states discovered in their discourse and practice; and no religious solemnity, no relish for divine things, no proper anxieties about their spiritual state, intimated by those genuine indications which nature gives of such dispositions: if concern about such things, and a life of strict holiness, even in a member of the established Church, be generally ridiculed as a fanatical singularity: if the sabbath is prostituted by many to trifling amusements or guilty pleasures: and if worldly discourse be

the usual entertainment without the sanctuary, before and after divine service: if by far the greatest number of families call not upon God, nor maintain his worship in their houses: if, in parishes where there are many hundreds of adults, there be not above fifty or sixty communicants, and sundry of these, too, persons of abandoned characters: if multitudes, multitudes toss the most sacred and tremendous things on their daring tongues, by profane oaths, and shocking imprecations; and beastify themselves with excessive drinking, as though it were a venial sin: if I get me to the great men, and find that these also generally have burst the bonds, and broken the yoke; that they discard serious religion as the badge of the vulgar, and abandon themselves to lawless pleasures, to gaming, cock-fighting, horse-racing, and all the fashionable methods of killing time, as the most important and serious business of life: if public worship be frequently neglected, or attended on with trifling levity; and yet the most build their hopes of heaven on these insipid formalities, regardless of the manner of their devotion: in a word, if the trifles of time and sense engross all the thoughts and activity of the generality; and the infinite concerns of eternity be neglected, or attended on as matters by the by: if, my lord, I should find this to be the state of affairs in Scotland, could my prejudice in favour of that church so far bias me that I could not see religion to be in a most deplorable situation in her? Or would my character of Virginia, in my letter to Dr. Doddridge, be too satirical in such a case?

“This, my lord, is the just character of the generality of the laity here: my senses tell me so, and I cannot doubt of it more than of my own existence. I do not mean that all the parts of this character are generally complicated in one person; but that one part of it is the character of some, and another of others, and that the whole promiscuously is the character of the generality of the laity here: and were I as much prejudiced in favour of the church established in Virginia as I may be supposed to be of that established in Scotland, I could not conscientiously give a better account of it.

“Further: suppose, my lord, on observing religion in so melancholy a situation in Scotland, I have opportunity of observing also, what measures are taken by the established clergy there, for its revival, and to promote a general reformation, and find, to my sorrowful surprise, that the generality of them, as far as can be discovered by their common

conduct and public ministrations, are stupidly secure and unconcerned, as though their hearers were crowding promiscuously to heaven, and there were little or no danger; that they address themselves to perishing multitudes in *cold blood*, and do not represent their miserable condition in all its horrors; do not alarm them with solemn, pathetic, and affectionate warnings, and expostulate with them with all the authority, tenderness, and pungency of the ambassadors of Christ to a dying world, nor commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God; that their common conversation has little or no savour of living religion, and is not calculated to excite thoughtfulness in the minds of the unthinking creatures they converse with; that instead of intense application to study, or teaching their parishioners, from house to house, they waste their time in idle visits, trifling conversation, slothful ease, or at best excessive activity about their temporal affairs; that sundry of them associate with the profane, and those that are infamous for the neglect of religion, not like their professed Master, to reform them, but without intermingling any thing serious in their discourse, or giving a solemn check to their guilty liberties; nay, that some of them are companions with drunkards, and partakers in their sottish extravagancies; that they are more zealous and laborious in their attempts to regain those that have joined with other denominations, or to secure the rest from the contagion, by calumniating the dissenters, than to convert men from sin to holiness: if, my lord, I should find this to be the general character of the clergy in Scotland, how could I avoid the unwelcome conclusion, that such are not likely to be the successful instruments of a general reformation? And who, that has not sacrificed to bigotry all his regard to the immortal weal of mankind, would not rejoice in this case to see a reformation carried on in Scotland, by a minister of the Church of England? For my part, I solemnly profess I would; for, though by this means sundry would fall off from the established church, yet there would be a greater probability of their escaping eternal destruction, and being made members of the church triumphant in the regions of bliss; which would be infinitely more than a reparation of that little breach of a party.

“What I now suppose, my lord, in Scotland, is evident matter of fact in Virginia, unless my eyes and my ears deceive me, and I see phantoms instead of men. The plain truth is, a general reformation *must* be promoted in this colony by

some means or other, or multitudes are eternally undone: and I see, alas! but little-ground to hope for it from the generality of the clergy here, till they be happily changed themselves. This is not owing to their being of the Church of England, as I observed before; for were they in the Presbyterian church, or any other, I should have no more hopes of their success; but it is owing to their manner of preaching and behaviour. This thought, my lord, is so far from being agreeable to me, that at times it racks me with agonies of compassion and zeal intermingled; and could I entertain that unlimited charity which lulls so many of my neighbours into a serene stupidity, it would secure me from many a melancholy hour, and make my life below a kind of anticipation of heaven. I can boast of no high attainments, my lord; I am as mean and insignificant a creature as your lordship can well conceive me to be; but I dare profess I cannot be an unconcerned spectator of the ruin of my dear fellow mortals; I dare avow, my heart at times is set upon nothing more than to snatch the brands out of the burning, before they catch fire and burn unquenchably. And hence, my lord, it is, I consume my strength and life in such great fatigue in this jangling, ungrateful colony.

“Hence, my lord, you may collect my sentiments concerning an absurdity, your lordship mentions in your letter to Dr. Doddridge, that I should attempt to make converts in a church which I acknowledge in the mean time to be a church of Christ. I freely grant the church of England, to be a church of Christ: but when I see multitudes ready to perish, and no suitable means used for their recovery, can it comfort me to think they perish in a church of Christ? The articles, and constitution of the established church are substantially good, and her ceremonies are little or no hindrances, as I observed before, to the edification of those that do not scruple them; but her members in this colony are *in fact* generally corrupted; and I think, were I one of her ministers, I should rather ten thousand times see them pious dissenters, than graceless conformists. It is true, had I no other objection against conformity but the present degeneracy of the members of the church, it would be my duty to endeavour to promote a reformation in her communion: but as I cannot conscientiously conform on some other accounts, the only practical method for me to attempt the reformation of her members, is that which I now pursue.

“I shall only add, my lord, that I humbly conceive the

informations or personal knowledge upon which your lordship has characterized a great part of the clergy in Virginia, may afford you equal concern with my character of them. I dare avow a more noble spirit than to catch at it with a malignant satisfaction as a confirmation of mine: and therefore I humbly request, nay, demand, as a piece of justice, that your lordship would not look on my remark on it as the language of such a disposition. I only remind you of it for my own defence, and it shall never be officiously propagated by me. If, as your lordship observes, 'of those that come from England,' (and the most of them come from thence), '*a great part are of the Scotch or Irish, who can get no employment at home, and enter into service more out of necessity than choice;*' if 'others go abroad to retrieve either lost fortunes, or lost characters;' how can it be expected, my lord, that persons who enter into holy orders, or come to Virginia, from such sordid views as these, should deserve a better character than I gave of them, to the Dr. more than I have now given your lordship? But I forbear, your lordship will forgive the inaccuracies of this postscript, as I have written it in unavoidable haste."

Samuel Wilkinson

ART. II.—*A concise History of the Commencement, Progress, and Present Condition of the American Colonies, in Liberia.* By Samuel Wilkinson. Washington, Madisonian Office. 1839. pp. 88.

THE subject of African Colonization was at first considered by many a scheme so impracticable and visionary, that they gave it no serious attention. But now, when the practicability of the thing is no longer a problem, but a matter of fact, the subject begins to assume an importance in the eyes of all; and as the scheme advances, both friends and enemies became more animated; the former in its support and advancement, the latter in virulent hostility, viewing it as conceived and prosecuted with the design of perpetuating slavery where it exists, and rendering the slaves more profitable by a removal of all free persons of colour from among them. Now it is reasonable to believe, that different persons may have had different means and motives, in promoting this enterprise.

Some of these may be purer and nobler than others: this is the undisputed fact in regard to most things in which men engage. Even the profession of the Christian religion, and zeal for its support, proceed from different motives in different persons. Every undertaking or institution should be judged of, not by the motives of some who may engage in its prosecution, but by its own merits. The scheme for colonizing the western coast of Africa, by the free people of colour, was commenced in Great Britain, by men whom none will suspect of a design to perpetuate slavery. They were the very men whose zeal in seeking the abolition of the slave trade had inclined them to devote their lives, their influence and their talents to this one object. Before colonization was thought of in the United States, the colony of Sierra Leone was firmly established and in a flourishing condition. And before any society was formed in America for this object, the business of conveying free coloured persons to Africa was commenced by a single individual, himself a coloured man of New England. As early as the year 1815, *Paul Cuffee*, whose name will be indelible in the annals of the free republic rising now in Africa, carried out emigrants from New England to the colony of Sierra Leone. This remarkable man was born at New Bedford, Mass., in 1759. He was descended from the two races of people who have been so deeply injured by Europeans and their American descendants; for while his father was an African, his mother was one of the aboriginal tribes of this country. His early years were spent in poverty and obscurity, but possessing a religious mind, by industry and perseverance, guided by practical good sense, he rose to wealth and respectability. He was largely engaged in navigation, and in many voyages to foreign countries commanded his own vessel. His desire to raise his coloured brethren of this country to civil and religious liberty, in the land of their forefathers, induced him to offer some of the free people of colour a passage to the western coast of Africa. About forty embarked with him at Boston, and landed at Sierra Leone, where they were kindly received.

Only eight of these were able to pay their passage; the whole of the expense of the remainder amounted to a sum a little less than four thousand dollars. Here was an example of philanthropy which has never been exceeded in this or any other country. Here was a single coloured man, born in obscurity and poverty, who undertook, without aid or encouragement from any society, or as far as appears, from any

individual, to transport thirty-two persons to the western coast of Africa, at his own expense! And this was but the commencement of a colonization enterprise, which he would have prosecuted to a far greater extent, had not his life been cut short. His death occurred the following year, in which year the secret resolution was passed in the Virginia legislature requesting Mr. Jefferson, to endeavour to obtain, through the general government, a territory on the coast of Africa or elsewhere, for the colonization of the free negroes of Virginia. In the close of this year the Rev. Dr. Finley went to Washington, and by the aid of several friends, who entered warmly into his views, instituted "The American Colonization Society," which dates from December, 1816. It appears then that the scheme of colonizing the free people of colour did not originate among the slave holders in the south, as ex-president Adams has published to the world to be the fact, but was commenced in his own state by a man who deserves to be as much honoured for his noble, elevated and disinterested views as any man, to whom the Bay State ever gave birth. Yes; posterity shall know that *Paul Cuffee* is of right the father of the noble scheme of American colonization: and we verily believe, that the name of this humble but noble-minded man, will stand out in bold relief in the history of colonization, when many other names, once celebrated, shall be covered with the rust of oblivion.

And it will be here proper to remark, that we have good reason for believing, that it was the noble and disinterested enterprise of Paul Cuffee, which suggested to the Rev. Dr. Finley of Baskingridge, New Jersey, the idea of forming a society for colonizing the free people of colour; and not any knowledge which he had obtained of the secret resolution of the Virginia legislature. For besides, that this was secret and had not transpired, so as to come to his ears, before he had his mind occupied with this object, it was by no means probable that he should feel disposed to interfere with a plan devised by the legislature of a large slave holding state which was yet in its infancy. We feel that we have a right to speak of the views and motives of Dr. Finley, in relation to this matter; as during the time that he was engaged in meditating this benevolent scheme, we were in habits of intimate intercourse with him, and have heard him repeatedly expound his accurate views of the benefits to be derived from the successful prosecution of this enterprise; and although many of his friends were of opinion that he was en-

thusiastic, and that his projected plan never could be realized; yet they were and are now unanimous in believing, that his motives were of the purest and noblest kind. Few men have possessed the confidence of all their friends in a higher degree than Dr. Finley. Possessing good talents, and having received a finished education, he entered the sacred ministry, and became one of the most powerful and successful preachers that we have known. He was also an eminent instructor of youth; for when he settled as a pastor, finding that a good classical school was needed in Baskingridge, he engaged in the enterprise of erecting an academy, which he superintended for many years with unrivalled skill and success. Many of his pupils, are among the first men of the country for solid learning and well disciplined minds. Among these it will not be considered invidious to mention a Frelinghuysen, a Southard, and a Lindsly. We recollect to have heard Dr. Finley speak in the warmest terms of admiration, of the benevolent enterprise of Paul Cuffee, but never heard him mention the secret resolution of the Virginia legislature, which was a thing then utterly unknown to us, though in frequent correspondence with many persons residing in Virginia. We conclude then, that the true father of American colonization was *Paul Cuffee*; and the proper founder of the American Colonization Society, was the Rev. *Robert Finley*, D.D. After the gentleman last named had conversed freely and fully with his brethren and friends, respecting this project, which had taken complete possession of his mind, he appointed a public meeting in this place, which was held in the Presbyterian church, at which some of us attended, and assisted him in explaining to the people who had assembled, the benefits which might be expected from the success of such a plan. Among those who attended, we well remember that there were a number of respectable and intelligent Quakers, of the neighbourhood. The benefits expected from this scheme were, first, the melioration of the condition of the free people of colour, by removing them from a country in which they could never rise to respectability, or equality with the whites, to the country of their forefathers, where, by the blessing of a kind providence, they might enjoy all the privileges of freemen; and where they would be no longer pressed down by feelings and prejudices, from the effect of which they cannot escape while they remain in this country. The second benefit expected from this plan of colonization, by its founder, related to Africa.

It was confidently expected by him, that the successful establishment of a colony on the western coast of Africa, would be the means of introducing the gospel, and, consequently, civilization into that dark continent. It was also believed that colonies along the coast would have a salutary effect, as far as they should acquire strength, in checking the nefarious traffic in slaves along the whole extent of the western coast of Africa. As to slavery, it was the deliberate purpose of Dr. Finley not to meddle with the subject, nor to have it in any measure implicated with the plan of colonization, which related solely to the free people of colour. No doubt, he foresaw that one effect would follow the success of this enterprise as it relates to slavery; namely, that such persons as were prevented from manumitting their slaves, only by the want of a place to which they could send them, would be able, when this plan was carried into operation, to accomplish their wishes, or to relieve their consciences. It was well known that many slave-holders were in this situation, and they have evinced the sincerity of their professions by availing themselves of the opportunity which this society has offered of emancipating their slaves and sending them to Liberia. Still the American Colonization Society has nothing to do with slavery; for it cannot recognise any persons as properly within the constitutional sphere of its operation, until they are free. Yet it is true, and we do not wish to conceal it, that many of the friends of the society greatly rejoice in this collateral effect of the institution. And who can possibly find fault with the society on this account? Who is there, that would wish to prevent those who, from principles of benevolence, or from conscientious motives, wish to liberate their own slaves, from having an opportunity of doing so in a way satisfactory to their own minds? As to any other effect which the institution of this society would have on slavery, such as has been ascribed to its organization, it certainly never entered into the benevolent mind of Dr. Finley. He had no desire to see slavery perpetuated in this, or any other country. With all enlightened patriots and politicians, he lamented it as an evil, for the removal of which Providence had not yet opened any safe way.

It is true, that at the meeting of a number of distinguished men in Washington, to form this society, there were some things said by some of the distinguished speakers, of which a great advantage has been taken by the assailants of the so-

ciety; as though these sentiments had been the common opinions of all concerned in the institution; whereas they were the peculiar views of the persons who uttered them. It would, indeed, be a hard case, if every society was responsible for every word which its advocates may say in its defence, either in their speeches or writings. But really, when the offensive sentiments uttered on that occasion come to be weighed and analyzed, there is very little in them which ought to give offence. It was argued that the removal of the free people of colour from among the slaves, would render the latter more valuable, and so be a benefit to the slave-holder himself. But how? In no other way than by removing a powerful temptation to theft and robbery out of his way, and rendering him more contented with his condition. The very same objection might be made to preaching the gospel to the slaves; for it is an acknowledged fact, even among infidel masters, that those slaves who are truly religious make the best servants: and how can it be otherwise if they obey the plain precepts of the gospel? Instructing the slaves in the doctrines of the Christian religion, may be said, with as much reason, to have the effect of rendering slavery perpetual, because it tends to make them better servants, as the Colonization Society, which cannot possibly have the effect charged upon it in any other way than by making the slaves better men, and so better servants than they are when mingled with the free people of colour.

While we have accorded the honour of originating colonization in these United States to Paul Cuffee, and the plan of the American Colonization Society to Dr. Finley, a native of our own town, and an alumnus of our own college, of which he was a faithful trustee for many years, we feel constrained by a regard to truth and justice, to bring to public notice the plans and exertions of another excellent man in favour of the African race: and although he did not actually form a colonization society, he did form the plan of a missionary society, to send back to Africa several natives of that continent, who had been brought here, and sold as slaves in this country. The person to whom we allude, is the late Rev. Samuel Hopkins, D. D. of Newport, Rhode-Island, a man as much distinguished for his philanthropy as for his piety and theological knowledge. We have been surprised that the facts which we are about to relate, have never been brought before the public, in any of the Colonization papers which have been published; especially, as they are contain-

ed in the history of this eminent man's life, published in New England, by John Ferguson, ten years ago. For some parts of the following narrative, however, we are indebted to the "Life of Mrs. Osborne," by Dr. Hopkins himself.

Newport, Rhode Island, where Dr. Hopkins resided, was the centre of that trade by which so many unfortunate Africans were brought to this country. Before coming to this place, he never had his attention turned to the iniquity of this traffic in human beings. But having the subject now daily obtruded on his notice, he began seriously to reflect on the injustice and cruelty of the trade; and the result was a deep and abiding conviction of the enormity of its guilt. This conviction set his benevolent mind to work to devise some method of checking the evil, and, as far as possible, of repairing the injury inflicted on unhappy Africa. In a sermon addressed to his own congregation, and delivered before the war of the revolution, he undertook to expose the iniquity of the slave-trade. This was at that time a bold undertaking; for this traffic was then the source of wealth to the state of Rhode Island; and his own congregation, as well as the whole town, were deeply engaged in it. But though at first he hesitated, yet after carefully studying the subject, and viewing it on all sides, he resolved to follow the dictates of his conscience, and, in dependence on the strength of the Lord, to make a decided and consistent stand. Contrary to all his fears and expectations, instead of the bitter opposition which he had anticipated, his first sermon only excited wonder in the majority of his hearers that they had never seen the subject in the same light before. His arguments produced a clear conviction of the evil which they had been so long ignorantly practising, and their future conduct was regulated in accordance with their new views; for his church soon after this, passed the following resolution: "Resolved, That the slave-trade, and the slavery of the Africans, as it has existed among us, is a gross violation of the righteousness and benevolence which are so much inculcated in the gospel, and, therefore, we will not tolerate it in the church." Whether Dr. Hopkins was not the very first man, on either side of the Atlantic, who openly denounced the injustice and cruelty of the slave trade, we are not able positively to determine. But if he was not the first witness against this crying sin, he was undoubtedly among the earliest.

But Dr. Hopkins's views were not restricted to the point of inducing men to cease from doing this great evil; but

were extended to the devising some plan for repairing the injury which had been done, as far as this was possible. He therefore conceived the design of educating and qualifying some pious Africans to return to their own country as missionaries. Accordingly, a missionary society was formed for this object; and when a collection was taken for its support, this conscientious man contributed the exact sum which he had received for a slave which he sold when resident at Great Barrington, Conn. In the town of Newport were several Africans, who had become truly pious since their arrival in this country. These Dr. Hopkins was exceedingly desirous to educate and send back to Africa, as missionaries to their countrymen. For the money necessary to redeem one of these young men, he became personally responsible; though always a very poor man. He also made a vigorous effort to procure the freedom, and provide for the education of three more. To interest benevolent men in this enterprise, he wrote letters to the society in Scotland for promoting Christian knowledge, and to several gentlemen in England of known benevolence. One of these was Granville Sharpe, Esq. who was so much distinguished as the friend of Africa. Dr. Hopkins also endeavoured to engage his own countrymen in the scheme which he had formed; and made an earnest appeal to the public for pecuniary aid, to enable the society to obtain the emancipation of such persons as it would be desirable to send to Africa; and to educate them at some literary institution. As this paper, dated August 31, 1773, is preserved, and is exceedingly interesting, we cannot but lay it entire before our readers. It is proper, however, to observe, that the Rev. Doctor Stiles, then also the pastor of a congregational church in Newport, but afterwards president of Yale College, united cordially with Dr. Hopkins in this enterprise; and we find his name subscribed to the subjoined circular.

TO THE PUBLIC.

“ There has been a design formed, and some attempts have lately been made, to send the gospel to Guinea, by encouraging and furnishing two men to go and preach the gospel to their brethren there. A memorial was drawn up about three years since with this view; and a number of copies were circulated. It is now offered to the public.

“ To all who are desirous to promote the kingdom of Christ on earth, in the salvation of sinners, the following narrative

and proposal are offered, to excite and solicit their charity and prayers.

“There are two coloured men, members of the first congregational church* in Newport, on Rhode Island, named *Bristol Yamma*, and *John Quamine*, who were hopefully converted some years ago: and have from that time sustained a good character as Christians, and have made good proficiency in Christian knowledge. The latter is the son of a rich man in Annamboe, and was sent to this place by his father, for an education among the English, and then to return home. All this the person to whom he was committed engaged to perform, for a good reward. But instead of being faithful to his trust, he sold him as a slave for life. But God in his providence has put it into the power of both of them to obtain their freedom. The former is, however, fifty dollars in debt, as he could not purchase his freedom under two hundred dollars; which he must procure by his labour, unless relieved by the charity of others.

“These persons, thus acquainted with Christianity, and apparently devoted to the service of Christ, are about thirty years old: have good natural abilities; are apt, steady, and judicious, and speak their native language—the language of a numerous, potent nation in Guinea, to which they both belong. They are not only *willing* but *very desirous* to quit all worldly prospects and risk their lives in attempting to open a door for the propagation of Christianity among their poor, ignorant, perishing, heathen brethren. The convenience of all these things has led to set on foot a proposal to send them to Africa, to preach the gospel there, if upon trial they shall appear in any good measure qualified for this business. In order to this they must be put to school, and taught to read and write better than they now can, and be instructed more fully in divinity, &c. And if upon trial, they appear to make good proficiency, and shall be thought by competent judges to be fit for such a mission, it is not doubted that many may be procured, sufficient to carry the design into execution.

“What is now wanted and asked, is money to pay the debt mentioned, and to support them at school, to make the trial, whether they may be fitted for the proposed mission.

“As God has in his providence so far opened the way to

* Dr. Hopkins was the pastor of this church.

this, by raising up these persons, and ordering the remarkable concurring circumstances and events which have been mentioned, and there is most probably no other instance in America, where so many things conspire to point out a mission of this kind, with such encouragement to pursue it; may it not be hoped it will have the patronage of the pious and benevolent?

“And it is humbly proposed to those who are convinced of the iniquity of the *slave trade*, and are sensible of the great inhumanity and cruelty of enslaving so many thousands of our fellow men every year, with all the dreadful and horrid attendants; and are ready to bear testimony against it, in all proper ways, and do their utmost to put a stop to it; whether they have not a good opportunity of doing this, by cheerfully contributing, according to their ability, to promote the mission proposed; and whether this is not the best compensation we are able to make the poor Africans, for the injuries they are receiving constantly by this unrighteous practice, and all its attendants.

“But aside from this consideration, may it not be hoped, that all who are heartily praying, ‘*thy kingdom come,*’ will liberally contribute to forward this attempt to send the glorious gospel of the blessed God, to the nations who now worship false gods, and dwell in the habitations of cruelty, and the land of the shadow of death; especially since the King of Zion has promised that whosoever parts with any thing in this world ‘for the kingdom of God’s sake, shall receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.

“EZRA STILES.

“SAMUEL HOPKINS.

“*Newport, R. I., Aug. 31, 1773.*”

The effect of the above sensible, sober, and pious circular, was, that contributions, to the amount of more than a hundred pounds, New England money, were sent in; of which fifty-five pounds were collected in New England; thirty pounds were granted by the society in Scotland for promoting Christian knowledge; and five pounds, sterling, were the donation of a gentleman in London.

Several ecclesiastical bodies expressed their cordial approbation of the enterprise; particularly, the presbytery of New York, and several of the associations of Connecticut.

The answer to the circular from the society in Scotland,

by Mr. Forrest their clerk, deserves to be preserved. It is as follows, "The perusal of this memorial, gave great satisfaction to the directors, while it excited their admiration at the various secret, and seemingly most unlikely means, whereby an all-wise Providence sees meet to accomplish his gracious purposes. At the same time, they rejoiced at the fair prospect now afforded, to extend their Mediator's kingdom, to those nations, who dwell at present in the habitations of cruelty, and in the land of the shadow of death. After saying so much, it is almost unnecessary to add, that the plan suggested in your memorial received the warmest approbation of the directors of the society; and that they highly applauded your pious zeal in this matter, which they earnestly wish and hope may be crowned with success!"

We were, from the first notice which we observed of these two Africans, greatly interested in them, and the pious enterprise connected with their proposed return to their native country; but when in the sequel of the story we read, that they had spent a year at this very spot, under the tuition of Dr. Witherspoon, we felt a thrill of surprise; and the thought immediately occurred, how little do we know of what was contemplated and transacted by those who have gone before us, and often in the very place where we reside! How few men in New England have been aware, that more than sixty years ago, a missionary society was formed in Newport Rhode Island, to send the gospel to Africa, to be preached by natives of the country? Here truly we have the original germ of the Colonization Society; and although the pious enterprise which so warmly engaged the zeal, and for so many years, called forth the exertions of Dr. Hopkins, was not permitted to be carried into effect; yet who knows but there may be discovered a secret connexion between this incipient effort, and the plans of colonization which have been more successfully put into execution of late? If we mistake not, such a connexion may with some probability be traced, as we shall endeavour to show hereafter. At present we feel as if this zeal for colonization should be revived in Princeton, where Yamma and Quamine, the first missionaries designed and educated for Africa, studied; and where doubtless they offered up many fervent prayers for their wretched and benighted countrymen.

But our readers will be anxious to learn what was the result of this promising scheme, and what became of these two African men? With regret we learn, that when they had

completed such an education as was thought necessary, and were ready to take their departure to Africa, the coming on of the war of the revolution raised an insurmountable obstruction in the way of sending them. Alas! how often have wars prevented the propagation of the gospel! O that the time were come when men should learn war no more, but shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning hooks! There was also a deficiency of funds for carrying the enterprise into effect.

Dr. Hopkins, having learned that there was, at Cape Coast Castle, a native of Guinea, who was not only converted from paganism to Christianity, but was a preacher of the gospel, and acted as a missionary, under "The Society in London for the Propagation of the Gospel," wrote to him, to make inquiry respecting the family of John Quamine; and at the same time, informed him of the circumstances of this man's being sold into slavery, and described particularly the several members of his family whom he had left behind, as he had received the account from Quamine himself. Philip Quaque, for that was the name of the missionary, upon the reception of this letter, made all the inquiries which he was requested to make, and with complete success. His letter, addressed, we presume, to Dr. Hopkins, is so interesting that we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of laying a copy of it before our readers:

"It is with inexpressible pleasure and satisfaction, that I acquaint you that my inquiries after the friends and relations of that gentleman have met with the desired success. The minute account he entertained you with, of his family and kindred, is just. For, by inquiring, I find his father's name to be the same which you mention, who has been dead many years. His mother's name is as you have written it, who is still alive, and whom I had the pleasure of seeing. But the bowels of maternal affection—in truth do I declare it—seem ready to burst, and break forth in tears of joy, like Jacob, when he heard that his beloved son Joseph was yet alive. The joy it kindled, on the occasion, in expectation of seeing once more the fruit of her loins, before she, with her grey hairs, goes down to the grave, throws her into ecstasies resembling Jacob's; and in raptures she breaks forth, and says, 'It is enough! my son is yet alive—I hope, by God's blessing, to see him before I die.' His uncle is called by the same name mentioned in your favour. In short, every cir-

cumstance is agreeable to the description given in your letter.

“A great personage in his family, whose name is Oforee, and now enjoys his father’s estate, desires, with great importunity, that I should certainly petition you that he may be returned to them, as soon as may be; and promises that nothing shall be wanting to make him and all about him, comfortable and happy among his own kindred. And the whole family join in requesting me to render you all the grateful acknowledgments and thanks they are able to return, for your paternal care and affection exercised towards him; and beg me to tell you that it is not in their power to requite you for all your trouble; they, therefore, hope that the good God of heaven will recompense you hereafter for your labour of love bestowed on him.”

In another letter, this same person writes:

“The mother is still looking with impatience for the return of her son, once dead and lost. She, and the principal cousin, who possesses the estate of his father, join in earnestly entreating you would, in your Christian love and charity to them, send the lad again, that he may receive their cordial embraces—looking upon themselves sufficient to support him.

“I received the charitable proposals, and sincerely thank you therefor. And I am joyful to hear there are Africans with you who partake of the blessings of the gospel, and in time, may be the means of promoting the greatest and best interests of Africans here. I wish to God for its speedy accomplishment, when the nation who are now not called the children of Jehovah, shall become the prophets of the Lord, and the children of the living God.

“May the benediction of the Almighty prosper all their undertakings to the saving of many souls!”

It will be cheering to the friends of colonization on the coast of Africa, and to the friends of African missions, to learn, that before they were born, there lived, and preached, and prayed, on the coast of Guinea, such a man as Philip Quaque, a coloured man, and a native of the country. His prayers and labours are now coming into remembrance before God, who is turning the hearts of many of his servants towards that dark and desolate region; and some have already taken their lives in their hands, and gone thither to instruct the ignorant and miserable children of Africa. Let no man’s heart be discouraged in regard to Africa, on account of the disastrous result of some of our missions. God is putting the faith of his people to the trial; but he will

arise and cause his light to shine upon this dark region. The time is drawing near, when "Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hands unto God." And we trust, that it will not be long before Guinea—much injured and greatly degraded Guinea—shall rise from the dust, and take her stand among Christian nations. Let the pious reader not cease to pray for Africa, that the time of her redemption may draw nigh.

Some time after this information, respecting the family of John Quamine, was received, a native of Annamboe, and a relation of his family, arrived at Newport, and confirmed all the accounts above given. He appeared to be a sensible, inquisitive man, and of good moral character. He expressed a desire to learn to read, and to be instructed in the Christian religion. He appeared sensible that his countrymen were destitute of the knowledge of the true method of pleasing God, and obtaining his favour; and said, that he had heard that Christians were in possession of a revelation from him; and he desired to become acquainted with its contents. He moreover said that there were many young men in his country, who had a strong desire to learn to read and write, and would even come to America, to be educated, if they were not afraid of being deceived and sold, as was Quamine. He appeared to be much pleased when informed that there was a plan in contemplation for sending back some of the African race, to teach the people.

Besides the two already mentioned, who were now ready to go on their mission as soon as the way should appear to be opened, there was a third, named Salmar Nuba, a member of the Second Congregational Church of Newport, then under the pastoral care of the Rev. Ezra Stiles, D. D., a promising young man, of about twenty years of age, possessing good talents, and apparently ardently pious. This young man had his freedom given to him, and was greatly desirous of attempting in some way to promote the spread of the gospel among the Africans. It was desired to prepare this promising youth to be a school master, or a missionary among the native Africans; but the funds which the society had been able to collect were inadequate, and an application was made to the Christian public for further aid, and another circular addressed to them, containing the fore-mentioned facts. There is an expression of so much encouragement and confidence in part of this address, and it is so seasonable in the present circumstances, that we will again trespass on the patience of the reader by transcribing it.

“Since it has pleased God so far to succeed this design in his providence, and in such a remarkable manner to open the way from step to step, and give such hopeful prospects, and good encouragement to pursue it, we think it our duty still to prosecute it, and we ask the benefactions of all who shall be willing to promote an undertaking in itself so benevolent; and which, though small in its beginning, may hopefully issue in something very great, and open the way to the happiness and salvation of multitudes; yea, of many nations, who are now in the most miserable state, ready to perish in the darkness of heathenism.

“We beg leave also to observe that the present state of our public affairs is so far from being a reason for neglecting this proposal, that it seems rather to afford strong reasons to encourage it. For, while we are struggling for our civil and religious liberties, it will be peculiarly becoming and laudable, to exert ourselves to obtain the same blessings for others, as far as it is in our power. And when God is so remarkably interposing, and ordering such a series of events in our favour, in this time of general distress, is there not a special call to pay this tribute to him, according as he has prospered us, as one likely method to obtain the continuance of his favour and protection?”

This circular, addressed to the public, was subscribed, as was the former one, with the names of Ezra Stiles and Samuel Hopkins, and bore date April 10, 1776, at Newport, Rhode Island. Soon after this, the war fell heavily on the town of Newport, and upon Dr. Hopkins's church and people. He, and most of his flock, were driven from their homes, and his pious Africans from their studies. In addition to all these discouraging circumstances, one of the designated missionaries died before a peace was concluded; and by the disasters of the war, not only all opportunity of sending missionaries to Africa was cut off, but the pecuniary resources of the society were exhausted, and the members scattered. Thus this very promising enterprise of piety and benevolence appeared to be frustrated: but the effect produced on the public mind by this unusual effort, was considerable, both in Great Britain and America, and has had a real, but unnoticed influence on the benevolent plans of missions and colonization of the present day. But we intimated, that there existed some probable evidence of a more particular connexion between Dr. Hopkins's exertions, and the more modern schemes of colonization. The circumstances are briefly these. It is an ascertained fact, that Dr. Hopkins

corresponded with Granville Sharp, Esq. on the subject of sending these missionaries back to Africa, and that this distinguished friend of the African race highly approved the plan. It is also well known, that this gentleman acted a leading part in forming and executing the plan of a colony at Sierra Leone; and that the original settlers in this colony had been slaves in the United States, who joined the British army on a promise of liberty. Now, we say it is probable that the idea of planting a colony of these people on the coast of Africa, was suggested to Mr. Sharp, by the correspondence of Dr. Hopkins. Such at least is our conjecture.

After the British had evacuated Rhode Island, and Dr. Hopkins was permitted to return to Newport, he still retained his zeal for the African cause. Besides publishing a pamphlet to show that it was the interest and duty of the American states to emancipate their African slaves, he continued to foster the society which he had instituted before the war. And, indeed, his liberality was so unbounded that he found it expedient to keep some of his principal benefactions secret. At the close of the war, his resources were much exhausted; but "when in his old age he received nine hundred dollars for the copy right of his *System of Divinity*, he contributed one hundred from the amount to the objects of that society."

In Dr. Hopkins's life of Mrs. Susanna Osborn, we find him still encouraging himself and his friends to proceed in their benevolent enterprise. "The way," says he, "to the proposed mission yet lies open, and the encouragements to it are as great as ever. All that is wanting is money, exertion, and missionaries to undertake it. There are religious blacks to be found who understand the language of the nations in those parts; who might be employed, if they were properly encouraged. And if they were brought to embrace Christianity, and to be civilized, it would put a stop to the slave-trade, and render them happy. And it would open a door for trade, which would be to the temporal interest of both Americans and Africans. As attention to spreading the gospel appears to be now spreading and increasing in America, it is hoped that the eyes of many will be opened to see the peculiar obligations they are under to attempt to send the gospel to the Africans, whom we have injured and abused so greatly: even more than any other people under heaven; it being the best and only compensation which we can make them."

But although Dr. Hopkins was disappointed in his plan of sending Yamma and Quamine as missionaries to Africa, it is a remarkable fact that two of those young men of the African race, instructed by him, have gone, in extreme old age, to the colony at Liberia; one of these is the man known in New England, and especially in Boston, by the appellation of Deacon Gardner. The history of this man is not only remarkable, but somewhat romantic. He was a native of Africa, and brought as a slave to this country, in 1760, when only fourteen years old. He very soon manifested uncommon talents, and learned to read by his own unaided efforts, after receiving a few elementary lessons. In the same way he learned music, in which art he became such an adept, that he composed a large number of tunes, some of which have been highly approved by good judges, and was a highly popular teacher of vocal music in Newport, where many resorted to his school for improvement in this delightful accomplishment.

But the most extraordinary thing of the kind, which we have ever heard of, was that though only a boy of fourteen when he was brought from Africa, he could, at the age of thirty, speak his native language with fluency. His uncommon powers of mind attracted the attention of Dr. Hopkins; and his ardent piety gained his love and esteem. He therefore marked him out as a suitable person to be sent as a missionary to Africa, originated a plan for obtaining his freedom, and aided and encouraged him in its prosecution. There is a fact connected with this subject, the mention of which will to some, perhaps, appear to savour of enthusiasm; but it shall be related, and every one may interpret it as it pleases him. Deacon Gardner was the slave of Captain I. Gardner, of Newport, Rhode Island, and by the indulgence of his master, was allowed to labour for his own profit, whatever time he could save by diligence. All that he thus gained was devoted to the object of obtaining his own and his family's freedom. A deacon of Dr. Hopkins's church advised him to try the efficacy of fasting and prayer, and see if he would not get along further than by labour alone. Accordingly, having gained a day, he determined to spend it in fasting and prayer, and communicated his purpose to none but Dr. Hopkins, and a few pious friends. His master, totally ignorant of his slave's occupation, sent for him about four o'clock, in the afternoon; but was told that Gardner was engaged about his own business, this being his gained day. "No matter, call him," said his master; when the slave ap-

peared, he put into his hand a paper on which was written, "I, James Gardner, of Newport, Rhode Island, do this day manumit, and release forever, Newport Gardner, his wife and children," &c. &c. Some conditions were annexed which could be easily performed. Deacon Gardner of course felt and expressed warm gratitude to his earthly master, who had now become his benefactor, but still greater gratitude to his Father in heaven, who had so signally answered his prayer for freedom, even before he had finished his supplication.

During his whole life this man had his heart turned towards Africa, and when the opportunity of returning occurred, he joyfully embraced it, although he was now advanced to the eightieth year of his age. With a view to his going to Liberia, he and several others were in Boston, constituted into a Christian church, of which he was immediately ordained a deacon, together with Salmar Nubia, another of Dr. Hopkins's promising young men, of whom mention has already been made.

The solemn exercises connected with the constitution of this church, were conducted by the Rev. Dr. Jenks, Dr. Wisner, Dr. Edwards, and Dr. S. E. Dwight. The service was closed by an anthem composed by deacon Gardner, and set to words selected from various passages in the Bible, and exceedingly appropriate to the occasion. On the 7th of January, 1826, he set sail in company with the Rev. Horace Sessions for Liberia, in Africa. This undertaking at his advanced years, was not the effect of a sudden impulse; it was only the breaking out of that flame of love to Christ, and to his kinsmen according to the flesh, which had been enkindled by the fire-side of Dr. Hopkins's study, fifty years before.

Thus, after an absence of more than threescore years, this patriarchal man went back to his native shores, to assist in laying the foundation of an infant colony, which we trust will be the first step towards a series of efforts in this country for the redemption of Africa from her deeply degraded and wretched state; and also of opening a comfortable asylum for thousands of the African race in this land, who, though free, are without a country which they can call their own, and without a standing in society proportioned to their intelligence and moral worth.

What was the close of this venerable man's career, or whether he is still living, we have not been informed. In all probability, however, he has long since finished his pil-

grimage; and has left his bones in Liberia, a kind of sacred pledge that the God of all flesh has a purpose of mercy, soon to be accomplished towards this extended region of darkness.

There also lie the bones of Prince Abdulrahman, whose history is as remarkable as that of Deacon Gardner. No doubt a gracious God is about soon to bless Africa, and only waits for the believing prayers of his people. Considering the short time which has elapsed since the discovery of America, and its distance from Africa, it is a remarkable fact that there are now resident on this continent and the West India islands four or five millions of the African race, none of whom came to this country by their own consent. It is an extraordinary instance of the inconsistency of the most benevolent men—if the account is true—that the slave-trade was suggested and recommended by one of the most distinguished philanthropists of the sixteenth century. We refer to the amiable Las Casas, who devoted his life and all his energies to promote the welfare of the aborigines of America. The common testimony of historians is, that to preserve his beloved Indians from slavery and oppression by the Spaniards, he proposed that Africans should be imported to perform the more laborious works of agriculture. The fact, however, has of late been called in question, and even positively denied; but as we are not informed on what authority the denial rests, we shall follow the common current of history; at the same time, expressing our sincere wish, that it may be discovered, that the character of this philanthropist has been unjustly loaded with this obloquy. The short account of Las Casas, which we shall now give is abridged from the article, *Las Casas*, in the *American Encyclopædia*.

This friend of the Indian race was born at Senilla, in the year 1474. When only nineteen years of age he went to America with his father, who was one of the companions of Columbus, in his first voyage. After a residence of five years in America, he returned to Spain and entered into holy orders, and then accompanied Columbus in his second voyage to America. After the conquest of Cuba he took up his residence in that island, where he distinguished himself by his humane conduct to the natives, of whom he became, in a manner, the patron. When upon a division of the conquered country, a certain number of the Indians fell under his power, he gave them all their liberty; and so much was he interested in their behalf, that he took another voyage to Spain, to plead their cause at the court of king Ferdinand;

but the death of that prince having occurred before his arrival, he was disappointed in his design.

Cardinal Ximenes the regent, however, appointed a commission to examine into circumstances on the spot, and to determine in the case accordingly, Las Casas was directed to accompany them, and received from the regent, the honourable title of Protector of the Indians. The commissioners, upon their arrival in Cuba, found it impossible to obtain the liberation of the natives: they therefore, directed their attention to the means of securing to them more humane treatment. Las Casas, however, continued to remonstrate earnestly against enslaving these unoffending people, and the planters became so incensed against him, that for personal safety he was obliged to take refuge in a convent. Upon the accession of Charles V. he again returned to Spain, and endeavoured to obtain the liberty, and secure the privileges of his beloved Indians. And it is said that his zeal for the liberties of the aborigines of America, led him now to suggest and advise the transportation of Africans, to bear the heat and burden of agricultural labour in that warm region.

Another plan which he adopted for the improvement of the natives was to plant a colony of select persons in the midst of them, by whose example and instructions they might be civilized and evangelized. That is, he undertook to do for the Indians what the Colonization Society are endeavouring to do for the Africans. This scheme he not only advised, but carried into effect; for when he returned to America, he took with him about two hundred colonists, whom he settled in the midst of the native population. His benevolent purpose was, however, soon frustrated; for he and his Spaniards had scarcely arrived before a body of invaders appeared, who ravaged the tract of country selected by him, and carried off the natives to be slaves in Hispaniola; and while he, accompanied by some others, was gone thither to seek redress and obtain a reinforcement to his colony, the natives rose up against the colonists, and so completely destroyed them, that there was not a Spaniard left in all that region. Las Casas was so much discouraged by the total failure of this favourite project, that he took up his residence in a Dominican convent, and assumed the dress of the order. Being sent by them on an embassy to Spain in 1542, he again undertook to plead the cause of the natives, about which time he published a work containing a narrative of the cruel oppression exercised towards the Indians, by which

the race was in danger of extirpation. The title of this work was *A Brief Relation of the Destruction of the Indians*. His efforts were not altogether fruitless, for he obtained a new set of regulations for the treatment and government of the Indians. He was now made bishop of Chiapa, and in 1544 returned to America. But he did not continue long there, for in 1551 he returned again to Spain, where he spent the remainder of his life. He died at Madrid in 1556, in the 92d year of his age. This brief account deserves to be inserted here, because Las Casas was in his day connected both with slavery and colonization.

We have said nothing respecting Judge Wilkeson's History. It is doubtless drawn from the most authentic sources, and contains information greatly needed by many of the friends of Colonization, who have remained ignorant of the origin, progress, and present condition of this interesting enterprise. The only fault which we have to find with this work is, that it enters too little into detail, and is more like a table of contents than a history. It seems to have been suddenly produced to meet the urgent demand for information, which is heard from all quarters. But a "History of African Colonization" is still a desideratum; and from our knowledge of the facts, we are persuaded that there are materials for filling an octavo volume, and that the incidents are of such a character as could not but create a deep and lively interest in every philanthropic bosom. But until this is done, Judge Wilkeson's performance will serve an excellent purpose, by furnishing immediate information.

Las Casas

ART. III.—*Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche.* Von Dr. August Neander. Vierter Band. Achter Theil des ganzen Werks, Hamburg, bei Friedrich Perthes. 1836. 8vo. pp. 506.

THIS is what would be called in England or America the *eighth* volume of Neander's great work, though, from the peculiar manner in which they manage these things in Germany, it is numbered only as the fourth. The period to which it is devoted falls between the death of Charlemagne and Pope Gregory the Seventh, or from 814 to 1073. We

are constrained to say that this is a tract of ecclesiastical story which less awakens our sympathies, and less displays the genius of the author, than any which he has yet treated. Instead, therefore, of seeking to characterize the volume, we shall single out a particular portion of it, relating to a subject never without its interest in the Presbyterian Church, and which it is useful to have brought before us by one as little favourable to the Calvinistic tenets as Neander; we refer to the controversy respecting predestination, which took place during the ninth century. Without confining ourselves to the language of the author, which is often awkward and circumlocutory in no common degree, we shall endeavour to be scrupulous reporters of his opinions; premising that in many respects they are very different from our own.

The almost constant battling about the true meaning of the scripture, in regard to predestination, had resulted in a triumph of the Augustinian doctrine of grace over Semipelagianism; yet the question of predestination was still unsettled. For though the recognition of Augustine, as an orthodox teacher, was almost universal, and though his theory of all-working grace was commonly received, there were some who stumbled at the naked and fearful avowal of unmitigated predestination. Not, indeed, that such avowed dissent from the doctrine of this father, or gave that place to free will, in relation to divine grace, with which we are familiar in later days. Such was the influence of Augustine on the mind and thinking of the age, and such the universal sympathy of Christian experience with the doctrine of grace, that it would have been regarded as putting these in peril to attribute any thing conditional to the free will of the creature. The truth is, however, they viewed the Augustinian system more on its practical than its speculative side, and were more concerned with the doctrine of grace than with that of predestination and reprobation; and the tenet was set forth in that mild form which appears in the work *de Vocatione Gentium*.* Both schemes, the rigorous and the mild, were handed down together. The age, if Neander errs not, was unused to the unfolding of subtile webs of thought, unpractised in acute and distinguishing thought, and given to a flow of rhetorical verbosity; hence it was easy for them to be misled by resemblances, and to mistake verbal for real distinctions. For the same reason, one who had derived all

* Neander's Hist. vol. ii. p. 897.

his theological prepossessions from the school of Augustine might readily see in milder forms of expressing the doctrines of grace, a departure from them towards Pelagianism; and could scarcely escape giving offence to many by the uncompromising roughness of his expressions. Such a man, says Neander, was the monk Gottschalk, or Gotteschalculus, with whom began the predestinarian controversy in the ninth century.

Gotteschalculus was descended from a Saxon family, and was placed by his parents, at an early age, in the monastery of Fulda, as an *oblatus*, or one set apart to the monastic life. Here he pursued the ordinary course of study, and formed a close alliance with the afterwards celebrated Walafrid Strabo. But he sighed to be released from these bonds, and, in 829, received from the council at Mayence a dispensation from his ties to the monastery. In seeking this dispensation, he was zealously, though ineffectually opposed by the abbot of Fulda, Rabanus Maurus. It is not unlikely that this had some connexion with their subsequent conflicts.

Gotteschalculus, upon leaving this monastery, went to another called Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons, in France. Here he studied, with great zeal, the works of Augustine, and other theologians of the same school. The doctrine of absolute predestination became inwrought into his Christian life, and in his mind was inseparably connected with the idea of God, and the unchangeableness of the divine will. He employed himself chiefly with dogmatic and speculative questions. In connexion with these, he received from his friend, the abbot Servatus Lupus, some very wholesome advice. "Let us expatiate," said he, in one of his letters, "in the open field of scripture, and devote ourselves wholly to meditation upon them, seeking the face of God, humbly, piously, and forever. The clemency of God, in condescension to our weakness, while we attempt not things which are too high for us, will raise us to higher and nobler views, and reveal himself to our purged faculties."

In the system of Gotteschalculus the idea of predestination regards not merely the elect, but the reprobate. He recognised a *predestinatio duplex*, agreeably to which the former are predestined to everlasting life, and the latter foreordained to everlasting death. He held this doctrine to be important for vindicating the unchangeableness and independency of the divine decrees, which, but for this, would seem to depend on events occurring in time. In regard to the works

of God, to foresee and to foreordain are one, as God's knowledge, like his will, is creative.* And here, according to Neander, Gottschalcus departed from the mode of expression which was usual in the school of Augustine, where it was common to distinguish between the *praesciti*, or reprobate, and the *praedestinati*, or elect; no doubt with the intention of removing from God all causality in regard to sin. Yet Augustine did not always avail himself of this distinction, and the idea of a twofold predestination had already been presented by Fulgentius of Ruspa, and Isidore of Seville.†

There would, in the opinion of our historian, be no essential difference between the schemes of Gottschalcus and Augustine, unless the former should be understood, in his zeal for the consistency of his theory of absolute predestination, as mounting beyond the fact of the first sin, and regarding the sin of Adam as conditioned not by his own free will, but by the necessary accomplishment of an absolute purpose of God, which predetermined the whole history of our race, and this event in particular. Neander here assumes the incompatibility of free action with an absolute decree. Laying together the positions that prescience and predestination are identical—and that all foresight of God is creative—Neander concludes that Gottschalcus made no distinction between willing, creating, and permitting, on the part of God, and that his views were identical with those of the school since called Supralapsarian. Where he speaks of these points, however, he expressly limits himself to the relation of God *to his own works*, and denies that sin is one of the works of God. “Sempiterna cum praescientia voluntas tua de operibus duntaxat tuis, Deum praescisse ac praedestinasse simul et semel tam cuncta quam singula opera sua.” He nowise refers the predestination of God to evil, but only to good; his prescience to both. “Credo atque confiteor, praescisse te ante saecula quaecunque erant futura sive bona sive mala, praedestinasse tantummodo bona.” He further divides the good, which is the object of predestination, into the blessings of grace and the awards of justice, *gratiae beneficia et justitiae judicia*. Here, with Augustine, he proceeds upon the supposition, that the evil spirits fell by the lapse of their

* Apud Omnipotentiam idem praescire quod velle.

† Neander's Hist. vol. ii. p. 912; vol. iii. p. 211.

free will, and that the whole human race sinned in Adam, and partook of his guilt.*

In the year 847, as Gottschalk, in returning from a pilgrimage to Rome, tarried at a hospitium, or house of entertainment for pilgrims, founded by Count Eberhard of Friuli, he met with Notting, then newly chosen bishop of Verona, to whom he made known his doctrine of twofold predestination. Shortly after, this prelate, at the court of the emperor Louis the Debonnaire, fell in with Rabanus Maurus, who had recently become archbishop of Mayence, and acquainted him with the doctrine. It was highly offensive to the archbishop, who promised to oppose it in writing. Accordingly he composed two works, directing one to Notting of Verona, and the other to Count Eberhard. In these he manifested great warmth against Gotteschalculus, and pursued the opinions of the latter to remote and repulsive consequences, so as to justify the suspicion that he had not forgotten their former differences. It is not to be denied however that he may have been actuated by regard for true religion; and he was evidently the more hurt by the boldness of Gottschalk's positions, inasmuch as his own system forced him rather to conceal than to avoid the same odious consequences. He charged Gotteschalculus with the opinion, that the divine predestination so constrains every man, that even if he should desire to attain salvation, and seek it by true faith and good works, he would labour in vain, unless he were foreordained to eternal life. Gotteschalculus, as a man alive to the interests of morality, was far from admitting any such consequence. He unquestionably treated that grace, whereby man is converted and sanctified, as the operation in which the divine purpose of predestination reveals itself in regard to men. He was also, says Neander, far from teaching, as Rabanus alleged, a predestination of men to evil as well as good.

As it regards the scheme of Rabanus himself, he considered the decree of God concerning the wicked, as conditioned by his prescience; not making this absolute like the decree of predestination. The distinction, therefore, between the *praesciti* and the *praedestinati* was in his view of great practical moment. His expression was that God had foreordained eternal punishment to those whom he foresaw as wicked, but not that he had foreordained these to eternal

* The words of Neander are remarkable: "dass das ganze Menschengeschlecht in Adam gesündigt und an seiner Schuld Theil genommen."

punishment. It was also with him a matter of practical moment to maintain, that God willed the salvation of all men, and that Christ died for the redemption of all: but he connected with this the opinion, that by the sin of Adam, in whom all sinned, all had likewise merited eternal punishment, and thus he believed that he effectually vindicated God from the causality of sin, and the corruption of those whom he left to their deserved doom. "Cui nullo modo fas est ea quae ab hominibus male aguntur, adscribi, qui in proclivitatem cadendi non ex conditione Dei, sed ex primi parentis praevaricatione venerunt. De cujus poena nemo liberatur, nisi per gratiam Domini nostri Jesu Christi, praeparatam et praedestinatam in aeterno consilio Dei ante constitutionem mundi." Out of this corrupt mass, it is true, only those attain to happiness, to whom God, agreeably to his eternal degree of predestination, communicates the grace which works true conversion. In regard to the question how the diverse relation of God to those whom he leaves to their deserved doom, and those whom he rescues from the same, can be reconciled with our belief in the holiness and justice of God;—he resorted to the hidden nature of the divine decree, and the incomprehensibility of the divine dealings; maintaining that we must hold fast to that only which is above all doubt, and not found our belief of God's holiness and justice in what is incomprehensible. "Contente," says he, "cum Paulo, immo si audes argue Paulum, qui dicit, Christo in se loquente, Rom. 9, 30."

We find Rabanus, therefore, shrinking from every thing, which, even in seeming, could make God the author of sin, or could derogate from his holiness; while it nowhere appears how he avoided these inferences. He did not venture to express dissent from the Augustinian system, and indeed usually expressed his opinions in phraseology taken from Augustine or Prosper. In this beginning of the contest, says Neander, we see in proclusion its whole subsequent course, it was a contest not between opinion, but between harsher and milder forms of expression.

When the letter of Rabanus to Notting was communicated to Gotteschalchus, it filled him with surprise to find himself treated as an errorist. Instead of admitting the justice of the charge, he thought he could succeed in pointing out Semipelagian principles in the statements of Rabanus, whom he regarded as a disciple rather of Gennadius and the Marseilles school, than of Augustine. In 848, perhaps with some view to a better understanding with Rabanus, he went

to Mayence, and without hesitation appeared in a council held under the archbishop, in the presence of the king of Germany, and the principal men both ecclesiastical and secular. He laid before them a book in defence of his opinions. He combated the opinion, that when it is said, God would have all men to be saved, the expression is to be taken simply, and applied even to the reprobate; or that when it is said that Christ suffered for all men, it is to be taken in an absolute sense. All such expressions he understood as restricted to the elect; for he held that the will and decree of God, namely in regard to redemption, must be fully accomplished, and could be applied to those only in respect to whom they are so accomplished.* In all this, Neander acknowledges, Gotteschalculus said no more than Rabanus must himself have admitted; for while the latter often repeated such expressions as that God would have all men to be saved, and that Christ died for the redemption of all, he despoiled them again of all favourable meaning, by teaching that those only were actually saved on whom God conferred the necessary grace, and that this was conferred only on the elect. "This contradiction," our historian is pleased to say, "he could attribute to none but himself, as he referred also to a secret and incomprehensible decree of God"

At this council there was little for Gotteschalculus to expect, in regard to a fair hearing. Rabanus Maurus was here in his own circle of influence: the opinions of Gotteschalculus were condemned as heretical. As he belonged however to another diocese, Rabanus sent him to Hinkmar, archbishop of Rheims, his ecclesiastical superior, with a request that this prelate would prevent the propagation of his errors. Hinkmar accordingly caused him to appear before a mixed assembly of estates, held at Chiersy, in the king's presence, in 849. As he refused to recant, and boldly defended his opinions, he was treated as contumacious towards his superiors, and as insulting to the bishops; his forsaking of the monastery

* Ap. Hincmar. c. 24. fol. 149: Omnes quos vult Deus salvos fieri sine dubitatione salvantur nec possunt salvari, nisi quos vult Deus salvos fieri nec est quisquam quem Deus salvari velit et non salvetur, quia Deus noster omnia quaecunque voluit, fecit. C. 27. f. 211: Illos omnes impios et peccatores, quos proprio fuso sanguine filius Dei redimere venit, hos omnipotens Dei bonitas ad vitam predestinatos irretactabiliter salvari tantummodo velit;—and afterwards: Illos omnes impios et peccatores, pro quibus idem Filius Dei nec corpus assumpsit, nec orationem nec dico sanguinem fudit, neque pro iis ullo modo crucifixus fuit.

was not forgotten, and the result was that he was declared to be a heretic, sentenced to be scourged, *durissimis verberibus castigari*, and to be cast into prison. The sentence took effect; he was scourged in an unmerciful manner, and under the stress of pain, *jam paene emoriens*, delivered up to the fire the paper in defence of his opinions; which however contained nothing but a collection of testimonies from the scriptures and the fathers. He was then imprisoned in Hautvilliers, a monastery in the diocese of Rheims. The voices which were raised in his behalf led the archbishop, Hinkmar, to allow some mitigation of his punishment: perhaps he hoped, by milder measures, to render him less troublesome. At the instance of Rabanus, Hinkmar soon resumed his severity against the poor monk. All attempts to make him recant were, however, unavailing. In defence of his doctrine, he used every means which was accessible to him in his prison; and in this he found a helper in Guntbert, a monk of Hautvilliers. This man secretly left the monastery, with an appeal of Gottschalk to Pope Nicholas, which he carried to Rome.

During his imprisonment, Gotteschalculus drew up, in vindication of his doctrine, two confessions of his faith, a longer and a shorter. His tenet of twofold predestination was in his mind closely connected with the essentials of Christian faith, as he regarded all who denied the predestination of the wicked to eternal wrath as making God a changeable being, and reducing him below the wisdom even of a prudent human creature. "Videant quale sit et quantum malum quod quum omnes electi tui omnia bona semper fecerint, faciant, et facturi sint cum consilio, praesumant affirmare, quod Tu qui totius es Auctor fonsque sapientiae, volueris vel valueris vel etiam debueris quicquam (quod absit) absque consilio patrare." No part of his personal sufferings gave him so much pain as the knowledge that the contempt which was cast upon himself redounded to the injury of the truth. "Maximum diu noctuque perfero moerorem, quod propter mei nominis vilitatem vilem hominibus video esse veritatem." And though he did not claim the power of working miracles, such was his conviction of the verity and high import of his doctrine, that he declared his expectation, that in default of other methods, God would attest his own truth by supernatural means. Accordingly, in the spirit of his age, he offered to undergo an ordeal, in the presence of the king, prelates, and clergy, by going into four casks filled with water, oil,

and pitch, and heated to the highest degree; and if this were not satisfactory, to complete the appeal by passing through the fire. And he appealed to God that he proposed this, not out of foolhardiness, but trusting in divine help. “*Quia prorsus ausum talia petendi, sicut ipse melius nosti, a me propria temeritate non praesumo, sed abs te potius tua benignitate sumo.*” It is remarkable, that at a time when such ordeals were accredited, the opposers of *Gotteschalculus* declined the proffered test.

The constancy of *Gotteschalculus* continued until his death, which took place in the year 868. *Hinkmar* refused to give him either the viaticum or Christian burial, except on condition of an explicit retraction: he refused, and being content to forego both, died peacefully in adherence to his belief.

The injustice and severity of these proceedings, could not fail to call forth much sympathy in his fate, and indignation towards the persecutors of *Gotteschalculus*. Pope *Nicholas*, whose attention had been drawn to the subject, not only by the above mentioned appeal of the prisoner, but by the accounts of his enemies, seems to have been dissatisfied with the course of the proceedings. He wrote in this view to King *Charles the Bald*, and gave *Hinkmar* to understand, that he stood in danger of something which he might not find agreeable.* The archbishop had, indeed, offered to have *Gotteschalculus* brought in person to Rome, or wherever the pope might command, in order to a thorough investigation: but it is evident that he was not sincere in the proposal, and that he stood in dread of such an inquisition. *Neander* expresses doubt whether, in this course, *Nicholas* was actuated by a regard for the rights of the innocent, which he sometimes was known to uphold, or by opposition to *Hinkmar* as a champion of ecclesiastical freedom. It is to be observed, that he did nothing effectual for the rescue of the persecuted man.

When *Hinkmar* discovered the strength of the current of opinion against his measures, he advised with a number of leading men as to the course which he should pursue in regard to *Gotteschalculus*. Among these, was *Prudentius*, bishop of *Troyes*. It is supposed by *Neander*, that the answer of *Prudentius* pointed towards a milder treatment of the accused, for whose opinions he was not without sympathy.

* *Ut providerem (says Hinkmar) ne pro iis tandem aliquando incurram quae non opto.* Op. ii. 290.

Against all such counsels, on the other hand, Rabanus Maurus set himself with violence, and even rebuked Hinkmar in a letter for allowing Gotteschalvus so much liberty in writing and speaking, to the injury of many others; exhorting him to deny the communion to the heretic, unless on condition of his recantation. "We must only pray for him," wrote he, "that Almighty God would work the salvation of the weak brother, and bring him back to the right faith." At a later period Prudentius himself espoused the doctrine of Gotteschalvus; as appears from a letter which he wrote to Hinkmar, and to Pardulus, bishop of Lyons. He maintained a two-fold predestination; but represented the predestination of God, in regard to the wicked, as conditioned by his prescience of the sin and guilt which passed upon all men through Adam; and explicitly rejected the belief that God had foreordained any one to sin, admitting, however, a foreordination to punishment. "He further held," says Neander, "that Christ died for the elect only; drawing the conclusion from the words, *for many* (Matt. xx. 28), *for you*, in the institution of the Lord's Supper. And he taught that God by no means wills the salvation of all, but only that of the elect; for God would not be the Almighty, if that which he willed should not come to pass: from the words of the apostle Paul, (1 Tim. ii. 4), he sought, by various forced interpretations, to release himself."

So contradictory were the opinions on this point, that king Charles the Bald was induced to consult Ratramnus, a monk in the convent of Corbie, one of the most learned theologians of the age, on the question how that controversy could be determined by the opinions of the early fathers. Ratramnus, in his work on the subject, omits all mention of Gottschalk's name, but discusses the doctrine of the two-fold predestination. He deduces the doctrine of the predestination of the wicked to eternal punishment, and also that of the righteous to eternal life, as necessary consequences from the eternity and unchangeableness of the divine decrees; but he founds the predestination of God in regard to the wicked, upon his prescience; considering it of great importance to remove from God every thing like causality in respect to evil; and in this, he adheres to the Augustinian principle.*

* His words respecting the order of the decrees are these: "Electos divini amoris flamma succendens, interiora id est spiritalia, et superna id est coelestia concupiscere semper facit et sequi, at reprobos justo quidem iudicio, mortalibus

Among all the defenders of Gotteschalculus and his system, there was none so much distinguished for classical accomplishment and gifts of communication, as his friend, the abbot Servatus Lupus, whom we have already mentioned. He opened, indeed, no new prospects in theology, but was remarkable for his clear sight and felicitous representation of the points in question, and for his exact discrimination between what was substantial and what was accidental. In his work, *De tribus Quaestionibus*, he endeavoured to answer the questions concerning two-fold predestination, free will, and the extent of the atonement.

In all that respects the need of divine grace for the recovery of human nature, he draws from the depths of his Christian experience representations which Neander justly considers striking. "When any one," says he, "endeavours to fulfil what is commanded, and is not sufficient for the task, humbled with the vain attempt, he resorts thither, where, by asking, seeking, knocking, he may receive what he desires, and glories not in himself, but in the Lord, for all his benefits." This principle of self-renunciation, this inspiring consciousness of absolute dependence on God, is set by Lupus in striking contrast with the self-sufficiency and self-confidence which reign in ancient heathen authors.* In his representations of the doctrine of grace, he does not abide, with Augustine, by the consideration of man as fallen, but deduces his doctrine from the nature of creaturely relation to God. He describes grace as the divine principle of life, which the soul stood in need of from the very beginning, in order to her perfection, and without which, even in his primeval state, man, as confined to himself, could not have been perfect in holiness. God is to the soul what the soul is to the body. Neander censures the sophistry with which he endeavoured to evade the force of such passages as 1 Tim. ii. 4.

From what Servatus Lupus says, it is easy to perceive that there were many in his day who, in seeking to smooth down the asperities of Augustine's expressions, really departed from

tamen occulto, dum desiderio supernae patriae non irradiat, atque eos invisibilis boni extorres derelinquit, non interiora, sed exteriora, non coelestia, sed terrena bona diligere sequique permittit. Non enim veritatis quisquam bonum vel amare potest vel assequi, nisi veritatis luce commonitus.

* For example, the words of Cato, in Cicero de Senectute, c. ii.: "Quibus nihil opis est in ipsis ad bene beateque vivendum," in contrast with "Omnia bona a vero Deo non a seipso petere." Again, the words of Virgil: "Spes sibi quisque," as opposed to "Cuique Deus vera spes."

his doctrine, in regard to grace and free will: for he speaks of those who founded the decree of election upon God's eternal foresight of faith and good works: "Deum propterea predestinasse quoslibet, quod praescierit eos devotos sibi futuros et in eadem devotione mansuros." By such a hypothesis Servatus thought grace was made to depend on human merit; or, in other words, was made void. He hints that the doctrine was held by some of great consideration, but Neander has found none such mingling in this controversy. And he says himself, that predestination was held by most, but that some—in *quibus et quaedam praeclara praesulum lumina*—took offence at the doctrine of predestination to wrath, and points out the particular in which this was offensive.* If these he taught, would only consider, that God *foresaw* the sin resulting from the free will of the first man, but *foreordained* that which was its consequence, there would remain no such appalling difficulty. He also notices the bad practical consequences which could be deduced from the doctrine of absolute predestination, as, for example, that many would say, "Why may I not live as I list, seeing I must be damned at last?" But he replies, that nothing of this kind can possibly proceed from Christian experience. Far from the mind of the true Christian be such a thought! For he knows that he is redeemed by Christ, dedicated to God in baptism, and that repentance unto life is ever open before him. Every such suggestion betrays a soul full of insatiable love for sin; one which, by incurable ungodliness, has plunged itself into the abyss of despair. It is worthy of notice, that, devoted as Servatus Lupus was to the system of Augustine, he was far from attributing infallibility to his declarations, or to any thing except the word of God.

At the summons of Charles the Bald, John Scotus took part in this controversy, and in 851 wrote a book upon predestination, in opposition to Gotteschalcus. He was not a man however who could judge of his opponent with the impartiality of Servatus; and he gave an odious picture of his heresy, as he called it. The doctrine, as he thought, involved a denial not only of free will but of grace, by attributing to an absolute decree both the sins which incur eternal perdition, and the virtues which lead to eternal life. By an absolute necessity, therefore, grace as a free gift of God, and also

* Ne credatur Deus libidine puniendi aliquos condidisse et injuste damnare eos, qui non valuerunt peccatum ac per hoc nec supplicium declinare.

human liberty were annulled. He indulged in violent reproaches against Gotteschalcus, whose confessions above noticed, he set himself to answer. The two-fold predestination of his opponent, comprising on the one hand the cause of sin and misery, and on the other the cause of holiness and salvation, he declared to be untenable, as militating against the simplicity of the divine essence. "Si autem divina natura summa omnium, quae sunt, causa multiplex, cum sit, simplex et una saluberrime creditur, consequenter necesse est nullam in se ipsa controversiam recipere credatur." His polemical views were regularly deduced from the fundamental principles of his peculiar theory. For according to John Scotus, all that is predicated of God, is but an anthropopathical intimation of his incomprehensible essence. Hence even contradictory declarations may be true of God. In attributing to the Most High creation, will, foresight, and foreordination, we do at bottom indicate by all these only the one divine essence. "Quicquid invenitur esse non aliud id esse nisi unam veramque essentiam, quae ubique in se ipsa tota est, et quae est illa nisi omnium naturarum praesciens praedestinatio et praescientia praedestinans." Especially no relations of time can be ascribed to God, in regard to whom there is neither past nor present. Only by anthropopathy can prescience or predestination be predicated of him. In reference to sin we cannot properly speak of divine causality, or even of divine knowledge. In regard to God, evil has no existence, still less therefore can there be prescience or predestination of evil. And as in regard to God evil has no existence, we can speak of God's punishing it, only in an improper sense. The idea conveyed by such expression, is, according to Neander's report of Scotus, no other than this: God has so constituted the universe, that moral evil punishes itself, and all rational beings find their proper place in the universe according to their different moral characters. Every sin carries with it its own punishment; this is manifest in an obscure manner even in this world, but will be more clearly so in the world to come. This opinion might be pushed so far as to lead to a punishment merely moral, a moral purgatory and moral hell; and in his work *De Divisione Naturae*, John Scotus actually avows this consequence. He taught moreover that God had formed no part of his creation with a view to punishment. Those who suffer eternal punishment, suffer then, [as the diseased eye suffers from the light: "sicut una eademque lux sanis oculis convenit, impedit dolentibus."

“All,” said he, “must submit to the eternal and divine law. And the only difference between the elect and the lost consists in this, that the former submit freely, and the latter by constraint.” The constitution of the universe has limited moral evil, so that it cannot stretch itself to infinity. In attempting to transcend this limit, it labours, and is tormented, and so is punished. “*Praedestinavit itaque Deus impios ad poenam vel interitum, hoc est circumscripsit eos legibus suis incommutabilibus, quas eorum impietas evadere non permittitur.*” Thus as God frees the will of those whom he has foreordained to grace, and so fills them with his love that they not only rejoice in abiding within the limits of eternal law, but account it their greatest glory to be neither able nor willing to transcend them, so he constrains the will of the wicked, whom he has foreordained to punishment, in such a manner, that every thing which leads in the former case to eternal happiness, leads in the latter case to misery.

John Scotus came forward as the defender of human liberty, and blamed his adversaries as denying it, and subjecting all things to a constraining necessity. But he really set out from a principle common to both sides, inasmuch as he acknowledged, that the corrupt will could be awakened to holiness only by grace which God imparts to the elect. While he ascribed ability of good to fallen man, he seemed to teach that this ability could come into action only by the influence of grace. This is evident from an illustration which he employs; as a man in the dark, is possessed of the faculty of sight, and yet sees nothing, until light is introduced from without him, so is it with the depraved will, until illuminated by the rays of divine mercy. So also in another place, he says that the human will is endowed not with false, but true freedom, though this freedom is so disturbed by the consequences of the first sin, that there is wanting all will to what is good, or even where good is willed, the power of effecting it is wanting; yet there still remains a certain natural liberty indicated by the desire of happiness which is natural to every man.

Neander concludes, that if this famous schoolman had laid aside his disposition to push the doctrines of his adversary to remote consequences, he would have approached very nearly to the same views of predestination, liberty and grace. His own positions respecting the divine nature, creation, and moral evil, forced him to admit, that every thing, both good

and evil, was a necessary development of God; which however does not appear to have presented itself to his own mind; and the unwieldiness of the then prevalent scientific method, except in the single case of Servatus Lupus, afforded every facility for self-deception in this regard. The grand difference however between Scotus and his antagonists, and even allies, is to be sought in his doctrine of punishments, and of final restoration, which however are not so prominent in this work as in those which display his system of opinion at greater length.

It was soon perceived by Hinkmar that he had summoned to his aid a dangerous ally, and he endeavoured to rid himself of the connexion. For the abettors of Gotteschalcus took advantage of the openings made by Scotus, and pointed out many heresies in his book. Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, abstracted nineteen propositions from it which he denounced as heretical. Prudentius of Troyes, and Florus, a deacon at Lyons, employed their pens against it. It was particularly offensive to Prudentius, that John Scotus should have said that the essence of God and his works are one and the same. From this the consequence might follow, that whatever manifests itself in the universe as the operation of God, is a part of his essence, which Prudentius regarded as pantheistical.* This is to be distinguished from the definition of those perfections of God which are one with his essence, as his truth, justice, and goodness; or those which are merely relative, and indicative of something extraneous, as prescience and predestination. Prudentius closes his book by saying, that he refrains from pronouncing an anathema upon John Scotus, but earnestly prays that he would return to the purity of Christian doctrine.

The deacon, Florus, enters more into a train of theological argument than had been done by Prudentius, who confined himself chiefly to testimonies from the fathers. He admitted that the wisdom of God, and also his knowledge, are the same with his essence, but considered it dangerous to say the same of his predestination and prescience.† He rejected,

* *Velut Dei essentia praedicantur occisio, in errorem inductio, morbi, fames, naufragia, insidiae, et alia complura, quae in divinis elogiis indita prudentium nullus ignorat.*

† Yet between the consistency of his system and the evil consequences which might be deduced from the doctrine, he seems to have been somewhat vacillating: *Utrum vero, sicut dicitur, Deus substantialiter dici possit praescientia, iudicet secundum rationem et regulam fidei qui potest, nobis tamen videtur, quod non ita possit dici de illo nisi vel mendaciter vel nimis inusitate, non est aliud illi esse et aliud praescire.*

with great indignation, as derogating from the divine glory, the doctrine that moral evil is a mere negation, and therefore cannot be an object of divine knowledge. Such an opinion seemed to him to be of evil tendency, as leading to low views of the evil of sin. In accordance with Augustine, he maintained that Adam, even in innocence, needed divine grace in order to perseverance in holiness.

While Florus condemned the abuse of human science, for which his opponent was remarkable, he did not allow his polemic zeal to betray him into a rejection of all such aids in theology, but admitted a sound and proper use of all intellectual resources. He demanded only that every thing of this kind should be brought to the test of scripture. But he maintained that in order to the right interpretation of the Bible, something more was necessary than the study of the letter, namely, the inward illumination of Christian experience. For no one, he held, could rightly understand and soundly interpret the word of God, unless his heart were possessed of faith in Christ: "*Nisi aut fides Christi praeceat in corde legentis, per quem veraciter intelligantur, aut ipsa fides Christi in eis fideliter quaeratur et Deo illuminante inveniatur.*"

Against such opponents, Hinkmar now found it necessary to seek new helpers. Gotteschalvus had communicated his views to Amulo, archbishop of Lyons, and requested his aid. This prelate was, however, incapable of forming a fair estimate of the doctrine, and adhered to the milder representations of the Augustinian system, or perhaps contemplated the whole subject through the medium afforded to him by Hinkmar. He, therefore, imputed to Gotteschalvus all the odious consequences which were deduced from his tenets by his enemies. At the same time, he was distinguished by a gentleness of manner in his treatment of those whom he regarded as in error. In the composition which he put forth against Gotteschalvus, in order to reclaim him, he addressed him as a beloved brother, for whose welfare he was not less concerned than for his own. He sent a copy of this letter to Hinkmar, and publicly expressed his desire of a reconciliation between the archbishop and Gotteschalvus; assuming, however, the very improbable occurrence of a recantation on the part of the latter. In consequence of this, Hinkmar was led to regard Amulo as an auxiliary in the contest with his new opponents. In connexion with one of his diocese, who shared in his sentiments, Pardulus, bishop of Laon, he ad-

dressed to Amulo and the church of Lyons, two letters respecting the doctrines of Gotteschalcus; annexing the letter which had been written by Rabanus Maurus to Notting, of Verona. But the archbishop Amulo died about this time, (A. D. 853) and his successor Remigius made it known that he was opposed to the course of Hinkmar. In the reply which Remigius made, in the name of the church of Lyons, he was very decided in condemning the unjust and rigorous manner in which Gotteschalcus had been treated. He calls upon them to judge for themselves whether they had evinced that moderation and Christian love which became a spiritual tribunal, and a company of priests and monks. He declared that their conduct was an object of general abhorrence. "Omnes non solum dolent, sed etiam horrent." All heretics had heretofore been overcome and convicted by reason. "Cum omnes retro haeretici verbis et disputationibus victi atque convicti sunt." The condemnation of Gottschalk's tenets, he added, was really a condemnation of catholic doctrine. "In hac re dolemus non illum miserabilem, sed ecclesiasticam veritatem esse damnatam." The true course would have been to subject his declarations of opinion to a thorough investigation. If indeed Gotteschalcus had reviled the bishops, this was an insolence which should be punished; though it were better that this should proceed from any than the bishops themselves. And he urged it as a duty, to mitigate the punishment which the poor monk had for many years endured in prison, in order to win by kindness the brother for whom Christ died, rather than to abandon him to be 'swallowed up of overmuch sorrow.'

In regard to two questions, first, whether the expression that God wills the salvation of all men, is to be taken without limitation, or with such restriction as is demanded by the doctrine of predestination; and, secondly, whether Christ died for all men, or only for the elect;—Remigius avowed his attachment to the particularistic tenet, but claimed, as Servatus Lupus had done before him, that in regard to this each party should enjoy freedom of judgment, as the church had not pronounced definitively upon these points, and as there was a diversity of opinion among the fathers.

When Hinkmar perceived the array of his opponents to be increasing, he resolved to avail himself of ecclesiastical authority, and procured a second council to be held at Chiersy, in which four propositions were established against Gotteschalcus. These proceeded upon the principles of August-

tine. Liberty of will, sufficient for continuance in original righteousness, was ascribed to Adam. By the abuse of this liberty, he fell, and thereby the whole human race became a *massa perditionis*. Out of this mass, God, according to his foreknowledge, elected those whom through his grace he foreordained to eternal life, and to whom eternal life was foreordained:* as to those on the contrary, whom by his righteous decree he left in the mass of corruption, while he foreknew their perdition, he did in no way predestinate them to it. Nevertheless, in his justice he foreordained eternal punishment to such. In this way, divine predestination is made one, referring itself either to the gift of grace, or the reward of righteousness—and this *phraseology*, says Neander, is in a two-fold manner opposed to the doctrine of the *duplex praedestinatio*. A second important difference consists in the principles, that God wills the salvation of all men, and that Christ died for all men; declarations which receive their limitation, as our author observes, from their connexion with the former position, and which, in the system of Hinkmar, as in that of Rabanus Maurus, are to be understood only with this limitation.

In opposition to these determinations, the second council at Valence, in the year 855, agreed upon six *capitula*. They established the two-fold predestination, in the sense above explained, but at the same time declared in the most express terms, that human sin is founded only in the will of the first man and his posterity, and is an object of divine prescience only. “*Nec ipsas malas ideo perire, quia boni esse non poterunt, sed quia boni esse noluerunt, suoque vitio in massa damnationis vel merito originali vel etiam actuali permanerunt.*” This council further condemned the doctrine that Christ died for the unbelieving. Yet such was their regard for the objective efficacy of sacraments, that in the fifth canon, this determination is appended: “That the whole body of believers, who are born of water and of the Holy Ghost, and who are thereby truly embosomed in the church, according to the teaching of the apostle, are baptized into the death of Christ, and hence are cleansed from their sins by his blood; for their regeneration would not be true, unless their redemption were also true. It is necessary to hold this, unless

* Aus dieser Masse habe der gute und gerechte Gott nach seiner Praescienz Diejenigen erwählt, welche er durch die Gnade zum ewigen Leben, und denen er das ewige Leben vorherbestimmt.

we would distrust the reality of the sacrament. Yet out of the mass of the believers and redeemed persons, some attain to eternal happiness, because by the grace of God they faithfully persevere in their redeemed state, while others by no means attain to the enjoyment of eternal happiness, because they do not choose to persevere in the saving condition of faith which they received at the beginning, but have again made void the grace of redemption by bad doctrine or a bad life."

In regard to grace, it was determined, that without it no *rational creature* could possibly maintain a life of true happiness. Hence the necessity of grace was deduced, not from the entrance of sin, but from the natural and necessary relations of the creature to the Creator. The errors of Scotus likewise were condemned as frivolous and absurd.* A council was proposed to be held at Savonnières (apud Saponiarias) near Toul, for the purpose of meeting upon some common ground, but the plan was never carried into effect. "There was now," says Neander, "no difference between the parties as to the substantial articles of belief; so that if another and deeper cause had not prevented, they must have been brought to a settlement by a comparison of ideas; for both parties agreed in setting out with the Augustinian principles, and their necessary consequences. But as each party clung to its own formulas as the only correct ones, and would on no account depart from these, any mutual understanding, by means of an analysis of the ideas in debate, was impossible. Again, each party had its own interest in adhering to its favourite terms: the one being concerned for dogmatic consistency in the system of absolute predestination, and the other being no less zealous for universal grace (den christlichen Universalismus) in regard to the doctrine of divine love and redemption; doctrines which in truth could be held only in name in connexion with these views, since they are opposed by the system of predestination from first to last." The want of scientific method and logical clearness, and the plan of disputing more by the aid of sentences from the fathers than by solid arguments, conspired to prolong a controversy of phrases, without any real comparison of views upon the merits of the subject. The last event worth mentioning in this train of disputations was the publication of a book by Hinkmar, in defence of the four *capitula*

* Ineptas quaestiunculas et aniles paene fabulas Scotorumque pultes.

of Chierys. As the defects just mentioned existed, to no common degree, in the mind of this prelate, in union with a verbosity which was peculiar to him, he was eminently successful in writing much upon the questions in debate, without approaching to any resolution of the discordant formulas into corresponding conceptions; and, as might have been expected, this diversity was propagated in the following centuries.

ART. IV.—*Report on Education in Europe, to the Trustees of the Girard College for Orphans.* By Alexander Dallas Bache, LL.D. President of the College. Philadelphia. 1839. pp. 666.

WHETHER the great bequest of Mr. Girard, for the endowment of a College for orphan boys, shall prove to be a blessing or the contrary, is a question of much doubt with those who understand the will as discouraging the practical religious instruction of the beneficiaries of the institution. However this may be (and it would be premature to discuss the question before we know what interpretation the trustees of the legacy have adopted,) this report of President Bache convinces us that the organization and progress of the college will be of no small importance to the general interests of education. This document furnishes abundant proof that the critical task of laying the foundation of a system of instruction and discipline, by which thousands of youth are to be in constant training, has been committed to a sagacious, comprehensive, judicious and practical mind. The station which the president holds, with such qualifications, must give great authority and influence to his views, and every thing in the circumstances under which he enters upon his office, is favourable to a successful *début* for himself and the school. A fund of millions, years of preparation and experiment, and the opportunity of profiting through actual observation by all the experience and knowledge of Europe—are advantages which no literary establishment with us has heretofore enjoyed to such an extent. Our schools of every grade and name, and most of our colleges, have been formed and conducted on the great American principle of accomplishing in the speediest and cheapest me-

thod, a certain nominal result. Our boys must learn Greek and Latin, mathematics and natural philosophy, and have a diploma to certify their erudition. But we cannot afford much time for these rudiments. At twenty-one the lads must be ready for the bar, or to enter into copartnership with their fathers, or be otherwise 'doing for themselves.' Half a dozen years at the grammar school, and three or four at college are as much as can be spared for study, even with a learned profession in view. To meet these demands the course must be superficial and hurried; the duties of a teacher or professor become little more than mechanical operations, scarcely furnishing the necessary stimulus to self-improvement, or exciting an honourable ambition, and the whole process of learning and teaching suffers degradation. It is high time that we were doing better. We ought now to be aiming at a more thorough scholarship at least for those who are destined to the liberal professions, and this is to be effected only by a reform in the whole series of departments through which the pupil has to pass. We naturally look to Europe for our excitement, if not for our models, in such an improvement; to their seats of learning, whose date is lost in antiquity; to their literature moulded from the good old ore; to their men under the shade of whose names so many ages have been proud to lie. It is for its contribution to this object that we chiefly value Dr. Bache's tour in Europe, and though this report of his observations is not regularly *published*, we trust that the impressions of it will be so multiplied and diffused, that every part of our country will have the benefit of its communications. How wide is the scope of the contemplated college, and consequently how extensively its plans may be studied in their application to other institutions of education, may be judged of by the closing paragraph of the report.

"According to the will of Mr. Girard, orphan boys are to be educated in his College from the age of six years to fourteen, sixteen, and even eighteen years of age. The materials of their instruction must be 'things rather than words.' and the degree is to be such 'as the capacities of the several scholars may merit or warrant.' The first provision, from the early age of admission which it enjoins, enables us to train as well as to instruct; the second indicates that the tendency of our training should be towards practical life. The age of our pupils embraces the period from elementary to superior instruction, and we are expressly called upon to devel-

ope talent. Our college must, therefore, combine the primary, secondary, and special schools. The means furnished by our munificent benefactor to execute his intentions are vast, and if the benefits thence accruing are not in proportion, the responsibility must rest with those to whom they have been entrusted. The trustees of the college have appealed to the experience of Europe to furnish data necessarily wanting in a new country, and it remains for them to apply the experimental deductions thus obtained from the old world with the vigour characteristic of the new. If their spirit be proportionate to the work to be accomplished, there can be little doubt of the result. Our founder has furnished them the means of establishing a series of model schools, for moral, intellectual, and physical education, embracing the period of life from early youth almost to manhood, the importance of which to our city, and even to the country at large, can hardly be estimated."

Dr. Bache was appointed to the head of the college in anticipation of the period at which it could be opened for pupils, in order that he might have leisure to prepare a system of government and instruction to meet the various and peculiar requisitions of the founder. To assist him in this service, he was authorized, without restriction of time, to visit all the establishments of Europe which were likely to furnish any suggestions towards the plan, and to purchase such books, models, drawings, and philosophical instruments, as might be immediately required for the use of the trustees or the college. Two years were passed on this mission, in which time Dr. Bache visited two hundred and seventy-eight schools in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Italy, and the principal States and free towns of Germany. Particular descriptions are given only of such of these as are distinctive in their design or system, and they are classified as follows:—Part I. Institutions for the education of orphans and other destitute children. Part II. Institutions for education in general. The first part includes an account of the institutions in Great Britain, Germany, and Holland, for the gratuitous education and care of poor children. The second and larger division comprises the fulfilment of the following programme in the introduction:

"After brief notices of certain infant schools, elementary instruction is considered under two heads: the first, embracing the schools for general purposes; the second, those in-

tended for special training, as for the education of a rural or industrious population, and of teachers for the elementary schools. Under the former head will be given a notice of the provisions for elementary instruction in Great Britain; a notice of the primary public instruction in France; a more particular description of the primary system of Holland, and of some schools which illustrate its application; a history and general sketch of the Prussian system, with detailed descriptions and notices of several prominent schools; a notice of the system of primary instruction in Saxony, and of some of the schools, and an account of the method applied in the schools of Bayreuth, in Bavaria. The second division of primary instruction will comprehend descriptions of certain rural schools of Switzerland and Great Britain, an industrial primary school of France, and of some of the schools for primary teachers in Prussia, France, Holland, and Switzerland.

“Passing to the head of secondary instruction, the report will include descriptions and notices of schools in Great Britain, France, Prussia, and Saxony; each chapter being devoted to a separate country, and preceded by general introductory remarks. I have ventured to propose a subdivision of this head, which appears to me borne out by reason, and by the present state of facts in regard to education; the argument in reference to it will be found among the matter introductory to that division of the report.

“Under the division of superior instruction will be given descriptions of some special schools for the arts, manufactures, and commerce of France, Prussia, and Austria, and the higher agricultural school of Wirtemburgh, besides brief notices of a few other similar institutions.”

The subdivision of the head of secondary instruction referred to in this extract is: “First, secondary instruction as preparatory to the professions usually designated as learned; second, as preparing for the higher practical occupations which are rising rapidly with, or have taken their place in the same rank with the professions.”

Dr. Bache found that the elementary schools of Great Britain are in general inferior to those of the continent, and that a greater advance in this department of education has been made in Holland and Prussia, in practice as well as theory, than in any other countries of Europe.

“The system of primary instruction in Holland is particularly interesting to an American, from its organization in

an ascending series; beginning with the local school authorities, and terminating, after progressive degrees of representation, as it were, in the highest authority; instead of emanating, as in the centralized systems, from that authority. A fair trial has been given to a system of inspection which is almost entirely applicable to our country, and which has succeeded with them. They have tried an important experiment, in communicating religious without sectarian instruction; another, which has resulted in demonstrating the necessity of special schools for teachers; and another, entirely unfavourable to the system of mutual instruction."

We hope this assurance of the practicability of a course of religious instruction, without sectarianism, will meet with credence from those extreme parties in our country who hold, on the one hand, that the Bible had better not be taught at all than with the least reservation of mooted points, and on the other hand, that it cannot be used in schools without the spirit of proselytism. But how is this accomplished in Holland, and what are the results? The Report states:

"There is unbounded toleration of religious creed in Holland, and while the necessity of religious instruction in the schools has been strongly felt, it has been made to stop short of the point at which, becoming doctrinal, the subjects taught could interfere with the views of any sect. Bible stories are made the means of moral and religious teaching in the school, and the doctrinal instruction is given by the pastors of the different churches on days appointed for the purpose, and usually not in the school-room."

And, on another page:

"The results of the moral and religious instruction communicated in and out of school, are fully shown in the character of the people of Holland; and these must be deemed satisfactory. Sectarian instruction is carefully kept out of the schools, while the historical parts of the Bible, and its moral lessons are fully dwelt upon. There are various collections of Bible stories for this purpose, which are commented on by the teacher, and all the incidental instruction, so important in a school, has the same tendency. Doctrinal instruction is given, according to an arrangement made with the churches of the various denominations when the school law was promulgated; this instruction is imparted out of the school, on the half-holidays and Sundays. Sometimes, when, as at the Hague, the pupils nearly all belong to one communion, a catechist attends at the school; but even then, only

those children whose parents wish it are present at the exercises.”

But why do we continue to theorize on this point, in its relation to the public schools established by our laws, when our experience, older than the existence of the republic, shows us that the use of religious instruction is feasible, without injustice or partiality? We refer to the history of our colleges, and of a multitude of academies, in which the practice of daily prayer, and of the reading and study of the scriptures, has been coeval with their establishment. And who has found them nurseries of sectarianism? Who has discovered that religious impressions cannot be made on the mind of a youth without their assuming the stamp of a special formulary? Our colleges have not been without the blessings of revivals of religion, their officers and chaplains have been members of particular denominations, but has it ever been the subject of charge or suspicion that those denominations have secured or designed the proselytism of the converts?

It may be alleged with truth that the experience of such countries as Holland and Prussia is not so complete as is necessary to establish the theory, inasmuch as in the former the Protestant church does not exist in so many branches as it does in the United States, and in Prussia the only ecclesiastical division is into the Evangelical and the Roman Catholic bodies. But no one will be staggered by this exception, who will examine the points upon which the vast majority of Christians in our country are united, and compare them in vital importance with the points on which they dissent. And if our democratic principle is to have its legitimate influence in this, as in all other matters of legislation, we see not, unless we discard the Bible by acts of Assembly, but that the views of the majority must establish religious instruction in the public schools to the extent of their unanimity. We are speaking exclusively of the legal toleration that may be demanded for the practical use of the scriptures in the public schools of our States; how closely evangelical churches can unite in diffusing the fundamental doctrines and precepts of the Bible, has been triumphantly manifested in the publications of the American Sunday School Union, and of the American Tract Society, or we might as well also say, in the works of Baxter, Bunyan, Doddridge, Richmond and a host of others of all the sections of the Christian family, whose productions are believed and loved by all.

We have looked to Dr. Bache's Report with special interest to learn what returns it would furnish to that item of his instructions which directed him to inquire, as to "the precise extent to which moral and religious instruction is purposed to be given, and is actually given, and also by whom and in what form that instruction is conveyed." His answers on this point are incorporated with the details of each school, and are partly contained in the tables of their studies, and text-books which he furnishes. From our examination of them in this dispersed form, we gather many interesting particulars. In the large charity-schools of England, the bible is taught in common with the formularies of the national church, or we should more correctly say, (if we do not misunderstand the report), the doctrines of that church are the subjects of stated instruction, and the reading of the bible is appended. One of the excellent characteristics of Dr. Bache's volume is his scrupulous adherence to the purpose of making it a descriptive, and not a critical or argumentative performance. And we have greatly admired the modest and unpretending form in which he presents the results of his investigation, so different from the course taken by the superficial and self-important. We irresistibly attach value to the casual opinions and deductions of such an observer, and have therefore attributed great weight to the remarks which are dropped in reference to the results of this inverted method of teaching religion. In the description of the Liverpool Blue-Coat school, where three hundred and fifty children are taught and maintained, the Report speaks thus:

"One of the things which struck me most on my first visit to this school, was the extensive acquaintance with doctrinal religion which the boys of the eldest class manifested. My surprise was removed, however, on learning the method by which this result was obtained, and which consisted in devoting the morning hours of winter, and at other seasons when the weather did not invite to a walk, between rising and breakfast, to learning commentaries on the doctrines of the church of England, commencing in the fourth class with the catechism of the church of England,* the collects, prayers, &c ; continuing in the third class with the explanation of the catechism; in the second, with committing to memory the

* "There is no qualification as to the religious sect to which the parent or pupil belongs, in regard to admission ; but he is required to conform, when admitted, to the forms of the church of England."

chief doctrines of the church; in the first, with committing the references by which the doctrines are supported. I felt bound to examine faithfully the question whether this was a mere intellectual effort, or whether the Christian truths thus inculcated, made an impression upon the hearts of these children; and I regret to state that I was forced to the conclusion that, in the greater number of cases, the heart was little affected by what the tongue repeated, and the intellect assented to, and this conclusion was in accordance with the result of my inquiries. It is true that the seed thus planted may lie hid to germinate in after life, and this, no doubt, sometimes occurs; but, as a general rule, the measure is found to be unproductive as far as its immediate effects have been observed."

So must it ever be where ecclesiastical conformity is put on the same level with loyalty, and where the church and the throne are combined as joint and equal claimants of the homage of every subject. It is not to be wondered at that in the public schools of such a government, the privilege of reading the liturgy in public worship is one of the prizes of good behaviour; as in the Rugby grammar-school, according to the report, "the attendance of the elder pupils on the communion, is not made a matter of rule, but in general the sixth form, and many of the fifth, are communicants of the church. The younger pupils are not encouraged to come forward." In the great grammar-schools, however, both of Rugby and Harrow, it should be remarked that the Scriptures constitute a regular portion of the studies of each class; in the former, (according to the syllabus in the report), the several books of the Bible in course, and at Harrow the same, combined with such works as Doddridge and Paley on the Evidences, Newton on the Prophecies, Watts's Scripture History, with the Church Catechism and the thirty-nine Articles.

We believe we are influenced by no prejudice in drawing from the report a far more favourable estimate of the system of religious training in the principal schools of Scotland. In Edinburgh there are seven institutions of charity, or education-hospitals as most of them are called, and both in that city and in Glasgow, there are many schools of the highest reputation, extending in their series from the infant-school to the High-School, and University. Some of the general statements of the report respecting the legal provision for elementary education may be acceptably quoted.

“The system of parochial schools in Scotland was established a century and a half ago, by an act of the Scottish Parliament. This act provided for the existence of a school in each parish, for the manner of election of the schoolmaster, and for his compensation, no mention being made of the branches required to be taught. The masters have been, in general, selected either from among candidates for the ecclesiastical profession, or such persons as could not pursue the requisite studies far enough to reach the ministry, and from persons of the humble classes who were physically incompetent for trades, and endeavoured to secure the patronage and instruction necessary to obtain places as teachers.

“The General Assembly of the church of Scotland has the right of inspecting these schools, but not that of displacing their teachers, and hence the system is wanting in the means of improvement. It has, in fact, not kept pace with the general progress of the country, the schools being deficient both in number and quality. To remedy this, efforts have been made by the General Assembly and by benevolent individuals, by the erection of new schools, and of model schools, by endeavouring to improve the condition of the teachers, and by furnishing those who aspire to this profession the means of proper training in their art. The sessional school* of Edinburgh has opened its doors to persons wishing to procure practical knowledge in teaching, and more lately the Normal Seminary of Glasgow for training Teachers has been established and taken under the patronage of the Education Committee of the General Assembly.†

“The instruction in the parochial schools is generally confined to reading, writing, and cyphering. Occasionally, in the higher schools, a little Latin is taught. The Bible and Catechism frequently constitute the text-books for reading. In some schools there are spelling-books, with selections of stories for children. The former collection of reading-lessons was absurd in the extreme as a book for children, con-

* “Schools under the charge of the ministers and elders, or church-session of a parish, are so called.”

† “The petition of the Education Committee of the General Assembly of the Scottish Church to Parliament for aid, states, that in the Highlands alone there were, in 1833, eighty-three thousand three hundred and ninety-seven persons above six years of age who could neither read nor write, and twenty-eight thousand between six and twenty years of age in this predicament. One-sixth of the population was thus without instruction, and means were wanting to provide them with schools.”

sisting of extracts for the most part above their comprehension; it has been, however, more recently replaced by a judicious selection. Most of the children who go to these schools are between the ages of six and twelve.

“Besides the parochial schools, there are, especially in the large towns, endowed schools, the state of instruction in which, at any given time, depends much upon the trustees into whose hands the endowment has fallen. The subscription and private schools have, in general, not been in advance of the others, and in many of the Highland schools, neither writing nor arithmetic are taught.

“It seems to be generally conceded that a great change is necessary in the character of popular instruction, but the nature of the change is the subject of much keen controversy, in regard to which I should be going out of my way to speak.”

The author gives a statement of his impressions of the beneficial results of the course pursued in one of the large institutions at Edinburgh, which we trust might be applied to most of the schools under similar training. In the notice of Heriot's Hospital, he says:

“The positive religious instruction is given by the study of the Bible, the evidences of Christianity, and the catechism of the Church of Scotland. Family worship also is held morning and evening. On Sunday, in addition, the pupils are occupied one hour in the morning in the study of the church catechism, or of a Bible lesson or hymn, which they recite in the evening, and they attend church twice during the day. Besides this, the discipline of the school, repressing what is amiss, and encouraging virtue, acts of course powerfully; the example of the elder boys, and the good order which prevails, tend to produce regular habits. The results of this combined moral education are to be found in the records of the character of the pupils, when they are no longer under the fostering care of the institution; and the answers to the queries before referred to, in regard to the conduct of the young men, given by the masters to whom they are apprenticed, and by those with whom they lodge, exhibit these results in a highly satisfactory point of view. Of forty-seven sets of answers, forty were entirely to the credit of the young men, on the part of the masters, and forty-six on the part of the persons with whom they lodged. Of the seven falling under censure, three had not made satisfactory progress in their business; two were, in addition, absent sometimes; one was complained of as not doing his er-

rands punctually, and only one was of the class considered decidedly vicious."

We think our own church ought before this day to have imitated the example of our Scottish parent, in providing for the gratuitous education of the children of our poor members. The excellent sessional school of Edinburgh, to which Dr. Bache attributes the greatest efficiency in improving the condition of elementary instruction in Scotland, was formed by the sessions of the churches in that city, in consequence of the evidence furnished by the applicants for admission to the Sunday-schools, of their miserable deficiency in common knowledge. Wishing to confine the Sunday-school instruction to Biblical knowledge, the sessions established a day-school, "in which a certain number of pupils sent by the different sessions, were instructed gratuitously, and a still larger number from the quarter of the town where the school was placed, at merely a nominal fee." Sheriff Wood, having made some valuable improvements in Dr. Bell's methods of teaching, introduced them with great success into this school, and made it famous for its discipline, and the intellectual advancement of its scholars. We know of no duty more imperative than that of giving every means of religious instruction to the children of the church, nor of any right more clear than that of communicating the whole of what we believe to be scriptural truth, in the course of every-day instruction. It seems to be an evident duty of our churches not only to provide alms for the support of their poor members, but to furnish the children the means of a good education, gratuitous if necessary, cheap (to them) at least. The churches of our cities by combining for this purpose, could give the means of education to all the families who need such aid, and retain within the influence and voice of the church many youth who now feel but a feeble bond of connexion with it. Such a provision seems to be especially called for in those districts of our country where the children, who are obliged to resort to the public schools for education, are excluded by law from the hearing of prayer, the singing of hymns, and scriptural exhortation.

So little encouragement is given to us to hope much for Ireland under its present political, civil, and religious enthrallment, that we are glad to find such a gleam as the following page of the Report reveals:

"The society for the promotion of the education of the poor in Ireland, established in 1811, has been of essential

service in that country. At first, they acted as a private body, but subsequently received a grant of money from the British parliament. They have a model school in Dublin, and during the continuance of the government grant, educated a considerable number of teachers, published many cheap school-books, and works for lending-libraries. With them also originated, in its application to Ireland, the admirable system of regular school inspectors. This grant was withdrawn in 1831, which has reduced very essentially the scale of their operations.

“The board of national education for Ireland was appointed in 1831, and is intended as the head of a government system of elementary instruction for the population of the whole island. This board has not only greatly increased the number of elementary schools, and supplied new text-books, but has established, on a considerable scale, a seminary where the future teacher is first instructed in the elementary branches in which he may be deficient, and then is furnished with the principles of education, and an opportunity to reduce them to practice, under superintendence, in model schools. At the time of my visit to Dublin, these schools were in the course of organization in a new building, erected specially for them. The appointment of school inspectors, a practice followed up by this board, is no doubt one of its most important measures, affording as it does, in connexion with the control of pecuniary supplies, the means of continual improvement in the individual schools.”

This country, however, furnished only one institution for particular description—an agricultural school, near Londonderry—and we refer to this for the purpose of introducing a marginal note, in which Dr. Bache says:

“I am indebted for a most favourable introduction to this school to Sir R. Ferguson, of Derry, one of its most active managers, and had the good fortune to meet there Captain Kennedy, of Lough Ash, the manager of a large estate, in a wild district, where he is pursuing plans for the elevation of the peasantry, which must produce the happiest results. The improvement of his tenants is in an increasing ratio with the time of their residence on his estate. His school, saving fund, and bazaar, where articles of use are sold at cost; his arrangements for leases, loans, agricultural instruction, and moral and religious culture, are all admirably conceived, and executed with a zeal beyond my praise. I do not know that I have been ever more impressed with a

sense of philanthropic exertion, than by a visit to Lough Ash."

In Holland, Germany, and Prussia, we find religion prominent in the tables of studies. The Bible, and Luther's Catechism, are the text books in the Protestant schools. Great use is made of the sacred narratives, biographical and historical, conveying moral lessons. The geography, antiquities, and natural history of the sacred text, are used for illustration and excitement in the study. Church history, also, is a usual topic of examination.

Dr. Bache is no friend of the mechanical mode of teaching, and he was particularly pleased with the methods pursued in the primary schools of Holland, in which the understanding is developed as well as the mind filled. From his sketch of a school at the Hague, we must take a few paragraphs, as furnishing a specimen of what Dutch children are taught from the age of six to twelve or fourteen:

"This school, I should remark, though ranking with the best of those which I saw in Holland, is not distinguished above several others of its class, and in its intellectual character seemed to me decidedly below many of the intermediate schools where the pupils are less numerous. It is, therefore, no exaggerated statement of what is obtained between the ages of six and twelve and fourteen. The subjects of instruction, including intellectual and moral, are: Exercise of the perceptive and reflective faculties. Learning to read according to Prinsen's method, including the spelling of words and the analysis of words and simple sentences. The composition of simple sentences, with printed letters. A knowledge of the different kinds of printed and written letters. Writing from dictation, for orthography. Correct reading of prose and poetry. Grammar of the Dutch language. Geography of Holland. History of Holland, including its chronology. Writing, beginning and ending with writing on the black-board. Linear drawing. Arithmetic by induction. Mental and written arithmetic, with a knowledge of the Roman numerals. Practical arithmetic, to decimal fractions inclusive. The theory of numbers. Moral and religious instruction. Vocal music.

"As natural history does not appear either in this programme or in others of primary schools, I was at the pains to ascertain if any thing was taught in relation to a branch so eminently calculated to promote early religious impressions, and found that incidentally information was given on

the habits of animals, and some of the phenomena of the physical world.

“The exercises of perception and reflection in frequent use, are those recommended by Ewald, and consist of a selection from various authors, as well as of many subjects on which the teacher is expected to be informed. The instruction is given orally, according to the following outline: The child is taught to observe and to speak correctly, by referring to objects which are about him. Knowledge of colours. Of some varieties of form, as round, square, &c. Naming of words of similar and contrary significations. Meaning of verbs in common use. Numerating by cubes. Knowledge of coins of the country, and their relative values. Division of time. To tell the time by a watch. To distinguish the true from the false. Questions on nature and art. Qualities of resemblance and distinction. Compound expressions, as ‘good day,’ ‘besides,’ &c. Witty sayings. Points of the compass. Lessons on weights and measures. On different metals. Articles of furniture in common use. Different daily occupations. The four ages of man. Different ranks of society. Proverbs and phrases. Riddles and charades. Fables. Honourable and dubious actions. Explanations of words.”

Much more attention than with us, but not more than is due, is given to natural history, singing, and drawing, in the continental institutions, but without neglecting the claims of ancient and modern languages, geography, and the usual branches of a full elementary course. It is impossible for us to mention all the peculiarities which distinguish the different countries in these respects, but the work before us is full of details, which must convince every American reader that there is much that can be introduced into our prevailing systems that is far above the visionary and empirical level of the noisy pseudo-reformers who sometimes figure among us, as “professors of common school education!”

The attention of Dr. Bache was of course strongly attracted by every thing connected with the practical operation of the famous education laws of Prussia. His impressions, particularly in regard to the primary schools, were very favourable, but we cannot enter upon this field. There is a statement, however, in reference to the honour of establishing the present system which is curious, and deserves to be circulated in this country, where it is commonly sup-

posed that education has become a subject of interest in Prussia only within a few years.

“It is a very general impression, that the present primary school system of Prussia is of comparatively recent date, or that it has been, within twenty years, recast and moulded into its present form. The fact however is, that it is a system composed of fragments of very different dates, beginning in the Mark of Brandenburg, before the kingdom of Prussia existed, and variously modified from that time to the present. It is one of the peculiar merits of the system, that its provisions have, for the most part, been tried on a small scale before they have been applied to the whole country, and that when a provision has, on trial, proved ill devised, it has been promptly modified or annulled. Prussia seems, for a series of years, to have possessed patriotic and enlightened citizens, who devoted themselves to the cause of public instruction, and monarchs who have duly estimated and encouraged their exertions in this cause.”

The contrary supposition, Dr. Bache refers to the authority attached to the assertion of M. Cousin, of France, in his celebrated report on the Prussian system, in which a “legislative project of 1819” is constantly quoted as the foundation of the system. We understand Dr Bache, in a note to the above paragraph, to deny that there is any such law, or any regulations on the subject, excepting such ordinances as have been enacted from time to time, according to exigencies, since the electorate of Joachim II. in 1540.

The Report has an interesting chapter on schools of agriculture and industry, and another on seminaries for the education of teachers for the primary schools. But we have already been detained too long by the portions of the report which relate to the primary period of education. Under the head of the institutions for secondary instruction, are classed the academies, and grammar schools, (including those of Eton, Winchester, &c.), in England; the colleges; royal and communal institutions and *pensions* (boarding schools) of France; and the gymnasia of Switzerland and the German States. In these, the pupils are prepared for the universities, and they are various in their systems of discipline, mode of teaching, and the relative proportion of different studies. In England, Dr. Bache, though furnished

with the fullest account of these particulars, found that the law of custom debarred him from the advantage of a personal inspection of the system in actual operation, and of putting its results to a test. The head master of Rugby assured him "that he had never heard of such a thing as the presence of a visitor during the recitation of an English grammar-school." One item of the description of Rugby will be a novelty to some of our readers—the custom known by the term of "fagging" at other English schools:

"The most striking peculiarity of the discipline of the institution, is to be found out of school hours, when the main body of the pupils are freed from the direct control of the masters. The whole of the pupils residing in one house are then under the charge of the boys of the sixth form, or highest class, living with them, and are subject to their control during both play and study hours. These members of the sixth form, called at Rugby *prepostors* (*praepositi viri*), are required to regulate the rising, attendance on prayers, meals, and recitations of those under them; to preserve order, and to prevent absence or visiting during study hours; to aid the younger members in their studies, and to afford them good counsel and example. To enable the prepostors to preserve their authority, they are invested with the right to punish, by setting tasks, by confining to the study room, and otherwise cutting off privileges. Besides this, they assume the right to chastise corporally, and have, by usage, many privileges not conferred by the regulations of the school, and which give them great power over the comfort and welfare of the junior pupils."*

An extract from the report, in which the author contrasts the two systems of Rugby and Harrow, discloses his views of the expediency of confining the studies of youth to classical literature, to the neglect of more practical and modern science:

"If no literature existed beyond that of Greece and Rome; if no discoveries in mathematics or physics, in art or nature; if no nations had, by the advance of civilization, come into

* "Among these usurped rights, the consequence of the law of the strongest, are the sending of their juniors upon errands, and imposing certain disagreeable duties upon them in their games. One of these latter, of which there are many, was found so injurious, that it was stopped by authority: it was obliging the lesser boys to leap the line at leap-frog, instead of the preposter. I mention it to show the character which this tyranny assumes."

greater relative importance than in the days of Rome's prosperity, the course of Harrow might be well adapted to train up British youths of the provinces in the learning of the capital. As it is, the exclusion of all, or nearly all, that characterizes modern civilization, brings discredit upon the system, and the worst foes of the legitimate use of classical culture are those who profess to be its best friends. The success which the pupils of Rugby have had in the universities, the standard by which all the public schools in England are tried, proves conclusively that it has lost nothing on the score of classical instruction by introducing some modern improvements into its course. The success, in the same field, of the Edinburgh Academy, which has also adopted, and actually gone further in these improvements, shows that an efficient arrangement may carry out the modern courses, without interrupting the progress of the ancient languages. When we come to consider the gymnasia of Germany, we shall have additional examples of the same kind, embracing a still further extension of modern branches, without injury to the classical departments. This grade of progress in England, and even in Scotland, has yet been too recent to afford the desired experience as to its results."

As a specimen of some of these practical improvements, which American schools might well consider, we quote a paragraph from the description of Mr. Voelcker's establishment, near Liverpool:

"The instruction, in regard to the articles of trade and commerce, is accompanied by a kind of practical exercise in the system of banking, in the different operations of trade, in the mode of keeping books, &c., the members of the class being converted into an imaginary community, carrying on supposed operations of this kind under the direction of the teacher. To conduct these exercises properly, requires considerable skill, as well as knowledge, but I was much pleased to see that sound instruction was actually communicated, and the details of business, with their general theory, were thus impressed in a way not easily to be forgotten."

We make another extract for the same end, from the notice of a school near London:

"A course of *private reading* is marked out for the pupils, which they are encouraged to follow. The time required for an attentive perusal of each work is estimated, and a number of marks proportionate to this time may be obtained, provided the pupil passes a satisfactory examina-

tion upon its contents. These books are duly arranged in the school library, to which the pupils have access under certain regulations. The course consists of works calculated 'gradually to impart a strong taste for private reading—to lead boy, by easy steps, from the familiar story-books of children to the standard works of science and literature—to store the mind of the pupil with the historical facts before exposing him to the risk of false impressions from the mixture of history and fiction—to connect the study of biography with that of the corresponding portions of history—and where authorities disagree in their views of important events, to place the works of the different authors as nearly as convenient in juxtaposition.' This arrangement has been attended with the best effects."

And for the sake of comparison with the examinations to which we are accustomed, of candidates for matriculation at college, we copy a passage that details the character and subjects of examination employed in determining the fitness of a pupil of a Prussian gymnasium to be transferred to the university:

"The subjects of the written examination are chosen by the royal commissary present, from a list furnished by the director of the gymnasium. These subjects must be such as have never been treated specially in the class-room, but not beyond the sphere of instruction of the pupils. All the candidates receive the same subjects for composition, which are given out at the beginning of the examination. The candidates are assembled in one of the halls of the gymnasium, and remain there during the period allotted for their exercises under the charge of one or other of the examining teachers, who relieve each other. The only books allowed them are dictionaries and mathematical tables. The written exercises consist, first, in a German prose composition, the object of which is to discern the degree of intellectual developement, and the style of composition of the candidate. Second: of a Latin extempore* and a Latin composition on some subject which has been treated in the course, the special reference in this exercise being to the correctness of the style. Third: a translation from a Greek author, which has not been read in the course, and from Latin into Greek. Fourth: a translation from the German into the French.

* "An exercise in which the master speaks in German to the pupil, who must render the German into Latin, in writing."

Fifth: the solution of two questions in geometry, and of two in analysis, taken from the courses in those subjects. Candidates who desire it, may be examined further than is required for passing.

“Those who intend to study theology or philology translate a portion of one of the historical books of the Old Testament, or a psalm, into Latin, adding a grammatical analysis. The time allowed for the several written exercises is as follows: for the German, five hours; Latin composition, five hours; Latin extempore, one hour; Greek translation, three hours; translation from Latin into Greek, two hours; French composition, four hours; mathematical exercises, five hours; Hebrew exercises, when required, two hours. Four days are allowed for the examination in these subjects, and they must not immediately follow each other. The viva voce examination is conducted by the masters who have given instruction in the first class on the subjects of examination, unless the royal commissary directs otherwise. The subjects are, first, the general grammar and prosody of the German language, the chief epochs of national history and literature, and the national classics. Second: the translation and analysis of extracts from Cicero, Sallust, Livy, Virgil, and Horace; the ability of the candidates to render the author with judgment and taste being put to the test, as well as their grammatical and archaeological acquirements; parts of the examination are conducted in the Latin language. Third: the translation and analysis of Greek prose and of portions of Homer, with questions upon Greek grammar, Grecian history, arts, and mythology. Fourth: translations from the French classics, during which an opportunity is given to the pupil to show how far he can speak the language. Fifth: questions upon the Christian doctrines, dogmas and morals, the principal epochs in the history of the Christian church, and the Bible. Sixth: arithmetic, the elements of algebra and geometry, the binomial theorem, simple and quadratic equations, logarithms and plane trigonometry. Seventh: in history and geography, on ancient history, especially that of Greece and Rome, and modern history, especially that of the country, on physical, mathematical, and political geography. Eighth: in natural history, on the general classification of its subjects. Ninth: in such portions of physics as can be treated by elementary mathematics, and on the laws of heat, light, magnetism, and electricity. Tenth: on the elements of moral philosophy, psy-

chology, and logic. The future theological student must, besides, translate and analyse a portion of one of the historical books of the Old Testament."

In his chapter on the Prussian gymnasias, Dr. Bache quotes, with entire coincidence of opinion, the following expressions from the book of Cousin:

"There is no class in the Prussian gymnasium which has not a course of religious instruction, as it has of classical or of mathematical instruction. I have before said, and now repeat, that worship, with its ceremonies, can never be sufficient for young men who reflect, and who are imbued with the spirit of the times. A true religious instruction is indispensable, and no subject is better adapted to a regular, full, and varied instruction than Christianity, with a history which goes back to the beginning of the world, and is connected with all the great events in that of the human race, with its dogmas, which breathe a sublime metaphysics, its morality, which combines severity with indulgence, with its general literary monuments, from Genesis to the universal history."*

In this respect, all the institutions of France are in painful contrast. In the programmes of many, the Bible or religious books of any kind, have no place, and where religious instruction is at all provided for, the range of inquiry, and the time allotted for it are exceedingly meager. Other points of comparison between the British, French and German institutions of the secondary period of education, are presented in a very valuable series of remarks, in the twelfth chapter of the second part of the Report, but we can only give space to a few paragraphs:

"In regard to the methods of the British and Prussian schools in general, the recitation upon a lesson which has been studied from the text-book out of the school, used in the former, tends to foster habits of self-reliance, while that of mingling much oral instruction with the recitations used in the latter, renders the instruction more interesting to the pupils. When the latter method is employed, much less artificial stimulus from hope of reward or fear of punishment is necessary, and, if I may be permitted to judge from the examples which came under my notice in both countries, there is, on the average, more exertion on the part of a class in Prussia than in Great Britain. The prizes held out at

* Cousin. *Memoire sur l'instruction secondaire dans le royaume de Prusse.* Paris, 1837, p. 143.

the English grammar schools, in the way of scholarships at the universities, to those who distinguish themselves especially, insure a great amount of exertion on the part of young men of talent, whose subsequent success is appealed to as an evidence of the soundness of the system of instruction, with which it has little or nothing to do. The students find a similar stimulus at the university; a scholarship may, if the time be duly improved, lead to a fellowship, and thus to an honourable provision for life. With such strong motives to great individual exertion, a youth of talent might succeed in educating himself even without aid, or were the school system ever so bad.

“The manner in which the same materials of instruction are combined in the programme of a French college and of a German gymnasium is so different, that it appears like attempting to compare things not homogeneous with each other, to bring them together for such a purpose. A glance at the arrangements of any one class in the two cases will show better what I mean than any description of this peculiarity. The German programme appears to have been carefully studied, the proportion of its parts to have been carefully elaborated, the arrangements as to the order of study and time of study to have been carefully considered, and the whole presents a better matured and more finished system than that of the French college. It does not appear in the recent annals of this kind of instruction in Prussia, to have been doubtful whether letters and science shall be taught simultaneously or successively, or whether natural history shall be taught in the beginning, middle, or end of the course. The entire arrangement appears to me to be more compact and better ordered.

“The government of the French colleges differs essentially from that of the boarding-gymnasias of Prussia. The question, whether it is advantageous to establish a boarding system in the midst of the residences of the parents of pupils, as in France, or to establish day-schools, as the Prussian gymnasias, is one that depends much upon national manners. My own convictions are, in the general, in favour of the Prussian system in this respect, and of encouraging the means of strengthening domestic ties, by leaving youth under parental control. The chief officer of the Prussian gymnasium, boarding as well as others, the director, or rector, is a teacher as well as a governor, while the provisor of the French college does not teach. The former arrangement

has the advantage of bringing the director into contact with the pupils more closely; the latter allows a more thorough superintendence of instruction, discipline, and police."

One accomplishment is included in the Prussian system which we must quote for curiosity's sake: "At Pforta, dancing is taught as the means of giving an easy carriage, and with gymnastics and swimming in their appropriate seasons, as a means of health. So different are the ideas which prevail in Germany from those which have the ascendancy among us, that in this institution, directed by a clergyman, and under clerical authority in its minuter regulations, occasional balls are given, in which the first class are allowed to take a part."

We trust that in the future publications which Dr. Bache may make (and we are sure that his readers will hold him pledged by his intimations to give more selections from his journals), he will furnish those descriptions of foreign universities which he has omitted, as not so intimately connected with the primary object of his inquiries. Our desire for such a detail is rather whetted than discouraged by such remarks as the following:

"The field is, however, vast; the varieties in Great Britain alone would require much space for due description, as a few words will suffice to show. The Scotch and English universities differ very much in their organization, discipline, and instruction, and even the several Scotch universities are not alike. At Glasgow, and the academical institution at Belfast, founded upon its model, the pupils enter, in general, in very early youth. The lectures are, therefore, mixed with recitations held by the professors, which, however, the large classes at Glasgow prevent from being efficacious. The students do not reside in either of these institutions. At Edinburgh, the average age of the student is greater, and the medical department assumes, relatively to that of letters, an importance which modifies the character of the school. The lesser universities of St. Andrews and Aberdeen differ more from the others in the arrangement of discipline, resulting from the residence of a part of the students in the colleges composing them, than in the character of the instruction. In the larger English universities of Cambridge and Oxford, composed of colleges and halls, in the buildings of which the students generally reside, the discipline of each college may be said to be its own, with a general conformity

to that of the university.* The same is true in regard to the instruction, with this difference, that as all the courses tend towards the preparation for university degrees and university honours, there is a general conformity in the several colleges in the subjects taught and methods of teaching. The instruction given by the tutors in the colleges is upon the same general plan, a mixture of lecture and recitation; and as the attendance upon the lectures of the university professors is not obligatory, forms the real basis of the intellectual part of the university education. The inducements held out to exertion in these schools by the rewards which the fellowships and the stations to which they may lead hold forth, and which bring into them the greater part of the best talent of England, produce results which are of the highest order, but which cannot fairly be considered as depending mainly upon the system of instruction and discipline. It must require a very accurate knowledge of facts, with an entire absence of prejudice, to reason as to the general results of the various parts of the complex system, which has grown with the growth of these institutions themselves, and is, therefore, now very deeply rooted."

From this point, the Report takes up the superior period, or final stage of education, comprising the Polytechnic School of France, with its adjuncts—the School of Mines, and the School of Roads and Bridges, the School of Arts and Manufactures, at Paris; the School of Arts, of Prussia; Institute of Arts, at Berlin; Polytechnic Institute, of Vienna; School of Mines, of Saxony; Institute of Agriculture and Forestry, in Wurtemberg; and the Naval School of Austria, at Venice. In these institutions thorough instruction and practice are given in all the arts and manufactures which have any connexion with chemistry, geometry, technology, architecture, geology, &c. This portion of the work introduces the American to a new sphere of education. Our artisans are in general mere mechanics; they make wheels, and dye, and bleach, and work mines, and fell trees, and if it is not done by steam, the manual power is directed by little more of intelligence. What would our "operatives" think of such an elevation of their pursuits as could be effected by an institution with requisitions like these:

* A very accurate account of the universities of Cambridge and Oxford is to be found in the report of the Select Committee of the University of Pennsylvania, by Philip H. Mordan, 1853, now printed in French.

“For tradesmen, the two years of the real school, and one year of the commercial school; or for a more complete education, an additional year, embracing the courses of chemistry, physics, and technology of the technical school. For dyers, printers in stuffs, bleachers, manufacturers of chemical products, of salt, of saltpetre, for miners, metallurgists, brewers, &c.—special chemistry, physics, and technology, with some of the courses of the commercial school. For machinists, hydraulic engineers, mill-wrights, foremen in manufactories, and mining engineers—a course of two years was recommended, the first to embrace mathematics, physics, and drawing, and the second, mechanics, machine-drawing, and technology. As a preparation for agriculturists and foresters—courses of mathematics, physics, practical geometry, chemistry, and book-keeping. For miners—mathematics, physics, practical geometry, mechanics, drawing, and book-keeping. For surveyors—mathematics, physics, practical geometry, drawing, and book-keeping.”

Or take another institute for the benefit of stone-cutters, carvers, brass-founders, &c.:

“The general course of studies lasts two years, and the pupils are divided into two corresponding classes. The first class is, besides, subdivided into two sections. The lower or second class is taught first; mechanical drawing, subdivided into decorative drawing, including designs for architectural ornaments, utensils, vases, patterns for weaving, &c., and linear drawing, applied to civil works, to handicrafts, and to machines. Second, modelling in clay, plaster, and wax. Third, practical arithmetic. Fourth, geometry. Fifth, natural philosophy. Sixth, chemistry. Seventh, technology, or a knowledge of the materials, processes, and products of the arts. The studies of the lower section of the first class are general, while those of the first section turn more particularly upon the applications of science to the arts. In the lower section, the drawing, modelling, natural philosophy, and chemistry, of the first year, are continued; and, in addition, descriptive geometry, trigonometry, stereometry, mixed mathematics, mineralogy, and the art of construction, are studied. In the upper or first section, perspective, stone-cutting, carpentry, and mechanics applied to the arts, are taught, and the making of plans and estimates for buildings, work-shops, manufactories, machines, &c. These courses are common to all pupils, whatever may be their future destination; but beside them, the machinists study, during the

latter part of their stay at the institution, a continuation of the course of mechanics and mathematical analysis. The examples accompanying the instruction in regard to plans and estimates are adapted to the intended pursuits of the pupils."

But we must turn to other subjects; only taking space to assure our readers that we have done feeble justice to this most interesting and valuable document, and to its indefatigable and accomplished author.

ART. V.—*A Treatise on Justification.* By George Junkin, D. D. Philadelphia. J. Whetham. 1839: pp. 328.

It is gratifying to find that some of our orthodox American theologians are disposed to become authors, and to present to the Christian public their own views of important doctrines. Dr. Junkin undoubtedly deserves to be characterized as an energetic and indefatigable man. It could scarcely have been expected, that one who was burdened with the weighty and perplexing cares of a new and rising college, should have found leisure to compose an elaborate work on doctrinal subjects; but it would seem as though it was ordered in providence, that a man's capabilities should increase with his exertions.

Our first remark on this treatise, relates to the title. It is entitled, "A Treatise on Justification." This title does not fairly designate the character and contents of the volume. It should have been much more comprehensive; for the book treats of most of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. It is in fact a concise system of theology. It might have been called "A Treatise on the Covenants;" or, "A View of the Fall and Recovery of Man, by Jesus Christ." The title prefixed is not only inappropriate because too restricted for the contents of the volume, but because the subject of justification is not so prominent as several other subjects. Indeed, we were surprised to find how small a portion of the treatise is devoted to this cardinal doctrine. It is true, justification is a kind of central point in the system of Christian theology, from which all other doctrines radiate, and from which they take their complexion; and as some modern theologians in our

country have almost excluded this cardinal point from their system, Dr. Junkin was probably induced to place it in a conspicuous light, and to use the term as generic; since, in a sense, all other important doctrines are included in it, or depend on it.

The titles to the chapters in their consecutive order, will at once show the contents of the book, and the plan of the work. “*On the moral government of God—On the particular modifications of moral government as it was extended over man in his primitive condition; or the covenant of works—On the extent of the covenant; or the representative character of Adam—The definition of leading terms, just, righteous, righteousness, justify, justification—On the breach of the covenant, and the consequent additional requisite to Adam’s justification—On the consequences of Adam’s sin, to himself and to his posterity, physically, intellectually, and morally—On original sin—Exposition of Rom. v. 12—21—Original sin proved from the salvation of those that die in infancy—The utter inability of man in his fallen state to meet the requirements of law, and thereby restore himself to the favour of God—The gospel reveals the only remedy for the evils of the broken covenant—The covenant of grace—The fulfilment of the covenant—The extent of the atonement—Objections against a limited and real atonement—Objections founded on particular passages of Scripture against the doctrine of limited, or definite atonement—The objection against strict, limited atonement, founded on the general gospel call, stated and refuted—The Saviour’s intercession—On saving or justifying faith—Justification secures its subjects forever—Good works, their necessity and true position.*”

Dr. Junkin is careful to cut off as much as possible all occasion of logomachy, by taking pains to define, accurately, the meaning of important terms. This precaution has become absolutely necessary in controversial discussion, as nothing can be more evident than that the same theological terms are used by different writers in an entirely different sense. Unless, therefore, terms are understood in common in the same sense, those may appear widely to differ who are agreed; and on the contrary, there may seem to be an agreement, where there is a wide difference. The word *guilt* has almost changed its ancient meaning, and we have known two young theologians to carry on an almost interminable

dispute on the point, whether a sinner remained a guilty person after his justification. These ardent polemics, however, found at length, that they were perfectly agreed, when they came to understand one another; one of them having understood by the word *guilty, liableness to punishment*; the other *ill-desert or criminality*. So the word atonement is used by modern theologians in senses so different, that they may seem to be agreed, when in fact they differ from one another most essentially. The same may be said of the words, *vicarious, substitution*, and even *justification* itself. The good old orthodox sense of vicarious is, to assume the law-place of any one, to do what he was bound to do, or to suffer what he was under obligation to bear; and the same of *substitution*; but in many modern discourses, these words have an entirely different meaning. They are made to signify something done or suffered, not as fulfilling the demands of the law in another's stead, but as doing or suffering something which, though no fulfilment of the law, is intended to answer the same purpose; a meaning totally different from the old and authorized sense; and this has ever been the artifice of errorists, to retain the language of orthodoxy, to which the ears of the people had been accustomed, until they had fully introduced their new opinions. We said that this diversity of meaning applied to the word *justification*; and we would refer our readers, with pleasure, to the author's accurate definition of the terms, *just, righteous, righteousness, justify, justification*, in the sixth chapter of the work.

There is nothing new in the conclusions to which our author has arrived; but it must not be supposed that this is a mere compilation from standard authors, by whom this subject has been so largely treated, and with whose writings Dr. Junkin appears to be well acquainted. The process by which he comes to his conclusions is his own. This is an original work. As he informs us, in his preface, his method is "synthetic." He begins with the simple elements of truth, and ascends to the highest doctrines of the moral system. In the same place, he says, "If there is any thing peculiar in the general design of the work, distinguishing it from other treatises on justification, it will be found in the identification—or at least the attempt to identify the great principles of God's covenants with the first Adam and the second, and their use in man's justification, with the fundamental principles of moral rule, whose application in human governments will produce the highest measure of human freedom

and happiness." "Another feature of the plan is its philosophical arrangement. The design has been to connect the various parts together, in such manner as will be most easily followed up. For this reason, I have endeavoured to arrange the matter according to the laws of mind, by which the train of thought is regulated, so that every preceding vehicle shall have a certain aptitude to draw after it the one precisely adapted to it, and which will secure a similar sequence." We are of opinion, that this method, however philosophical, will not be found by experience to be popular with the largest class of readers; nor well adapted to their state of mental improvement. This, it is true, is the fault of the people, but such is the state in which we actually find them; and, authors, if they will profit them, must descend from the high ground of metaphysical science, and accommodate themselves to the apprehension and the attainments of the common mind. We are, moreover, of opinion that Dr. Junkin has entered into too many abstruse discussions and explanations respecting elementary principles. These had better, in a work intended for the common people, be assumed as true and undoubted, than attempted to be demonstrated by metaphysical reasoning. For example, the author employs three sections on the subject of moral agency; and while we assent to all his reasonings and conclusions on this subject, we are fully of opinion, that for his purposes three short sentences would have answered better than this philosophical discussion. People know themselves to be free and accountable, and yet they do not inquire what is essential to moral agency, and very little is gained by leading them through investigations of this sort. Thus also, the chapter (XI.) on "ability and inability," is entirely too abstruse for nine out of ten, who ought to read this book; and yet we believe that the views and reasonings of the author are philosophically correct.

When the author, in his first chapter, makes "the will of God" the only foundation of moral obligation, of course we understand him to mean, that the distinction between moral good and evil is not arbitrary, or might have been the very reverse of what it now is, if God had so willed it; but as maintaining, that the will of God, as his nature, is immutably inclined to good. As there is an extreme opinion on this subject of the will of God being the ultimate standard of moral rectitude, it would have been well to guard against this by an explanatory clause.

But we come now to the main thing which should claim attention in this treatise; the soundness of the doctrines inculcated. And here we have the pleasure of expressing our almost unqualified approbation. That Dr. Junkin would not fall below the standard of orthodoxy, acknowledged by the church to which he belongs, was a thing to be expected by all, as he has been conspicuous as a defender of these doctrines against those who attempted to introduce innovations, contrary to the uniformly received opinions of the Presbyterian church, in this country, and in Great Britain. In this respect, there will be no disappointment. There will be found here no compromise with Pelagian, Arminian, or Hopkinsian errors. Dr. Junkin does not hesitate to state clearly and firmly what he believes to be the truth of God, however unpalatable or unpopular it may be in the view of carnal reason. He presents the covenant made with Adam under some new aspects, and maintains, by cogent arguments, the representative character of the first man. His reasonings on the general principles of representation are ingenious, and in some respects original, while he comes to the conclusions commonly received. There was need here of some more critical inquiry respecting the true import of the original terms, in both Testaments, which our translators have rendered *covenant*. By allowing to the term that amplitude of meaning, which belongs to both the Hebrew and Greek words, and not confining himself to the strict sense of the English word *covenant*, the explication of the two covenants would be found much easier. He has, however, in this followed the common track of orthodox theologians. As, however, the adversaries of the Calvinistic system have utterly denied the existence of any covenant between God and Adam, proof that this transaction was properly called a covenant, should have been introduced. And the reader would naturally have expected some explanation of the way in which the first sin can be accounted for.

Dr. Junkin gives that view of the covenant of grace which is now most commonly adopted by Calvinistic writers, namely, an agreement between God the Father and the Son, in behalf of his chosen people. If we adhere to the strict meaning of the English word *covenant*, this view is undoubtedly correct; for elect sinners, until made partakers of some of the blessings of the new covenant, by which they are enabled to exercise a true faith, are incapable of entering into any stipulations, or performing any conditions. And no

other reason can be assigned why Christ should be denominated the *second Adam*, but because, in the covenant of grace, he was the great contracting party in behalf of all his chosen; as the first Adam was for all his posterity in the covenant of works.

But it is a remarkable fact, that all sound Calvinistic theologians, until about the middle of the 17th century, uniformly represented the covenant of grace to be an agreement between God and the elect sinner, through Christ the Mediator. Thus we have it in Turretine, Markius, Witsius, De Moor, Burman, Heidan, Vitringa, Wyttenbach, and a multitude of others. This diversity in the use of the phrase has introduced no small confusion into this department of theology. You can hardly find two theologians who agree precisely as to the meaning of these terms; and yet this diversity implies no real difference in doctrine. Those who hold the one or the other of these views of the precise nature of the covenant of grace, are equally firm and consistent in adhering to all the doctrines of grace. As we do not find the exact phrase in scripture, and are at liberty to affix such a sense to it as is consistent with the doctrines of the Bible, it would perhaps be best to enlarge its meaning, so as to comprehend both the covenant of redemption between the Father and the Son, and the gracious covenant which God enters into with each individual believer, when by faith he accepts the terms proposed in the gospel. And this general signification would be entirely conformable to the original terms for covenant both in the Hebrew and Greek languages; for these terms are not so restricted in their meaning as the English word covenant, but are used to designate any solemn engagement or institution accompanied with visible signs and seals, as well as a mutual compact between contracting parties. And it would seem that the Westminster Divines intended to give the phrase the latitude of meaning which has been suggested, from their account of the covenant of grace in the larger catechism (Quest. 31, 32.) "The covenant of grace was made with Christ, the second Adam, and in him with all the elect as his seed. The grace of God is manifested in the second covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation by him; and requiring faith as the condition to interest them in him, promiseth and giveth his Holy Spirit to all his elect, to work in them that faith, with all other saving graces, and to enable them

unto all holy obedience, as the evidence of the truth of the the truth of their faith, and thankfulness to God, and as the way which he hath appointed them to salvation."

The definition of the covenant of grace, however, as given in the 7th chapter of the Confession of Faith, seems to agree more with the views of the older theologians, and was undoubtedly penned by another hand. It is as follows: "Man by his fall having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace, wherein he freely offereth to sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved, and promising to give unto all them that are ordained unto life, his Holy Spirit, to make them able and willing to believe."

We fully coincide with Dr. Junkin when he says, "Due weight has never been given to the common remark, that much controversy would be saved by an accurate definition of terms." And again, "But here it is necessary to premise that although I have placed the English words at the head of the chapter (iv.), yet it is really the meaning of the original terms of the sacred writings, after which we must inquire. Our ultimate appeal is to the language of the Holy Ghost; and the true and exact sense of that must be attached to the words of our English translation, however unsuitable these may be to express that sense."

On the whole subject of the mediatorial work of Christ, which makes up a large part of the volume, we have observed nothing in which we do not concur. The author's views of the nature and extent of the atonement are in accordance with the opinions advocated in this work, in former numbers. We object, however, to the use of the phrase "*limited atonement*:" we greatly prefer "*definite atonement*," or the old terms, "*particular redemption*." The word "limited" is by many applied to that peculiar view of the nature of the atonement maintained by the author of the little work entitled "Gethsemane," according to which the atonement is limited in its intrinsic value, as well as in its designation and application. This term was invented by the opposers of the orthodox doctrine, and as it has a tendency to mislead, should be rejected by accurate writers. We believe in the infinite value and merit of the atonement, in itself considered; and we believe, that if it had been God's purpose to save the whole world, no other or greater atonement would have been requisite. Moreover,

it is our opinion, that although millions have already been pardoned through the atonement, its fulness and value is as complete now as in the beginning. Though we approve all that Dr. Junkin has written on this subject, yet we regret that he had not stated, in a single section, the true grounds of the necessity of the atonement, since very much of the stress of the controversy lies here. The distinct notice of active obedience of the Mediator at this time peculiarly seasonable, when by so many it is called in question; and especially as an attempt has been made in a certain contemporary journal to induce the belief that this was not the doctrine of the reformers and their immediate followers. Nothing but ignorance of the history of theological opinion, could ever have induced a man who had any regard for his own reputation, to venture to publish or insinuate such an opinion. We believe no single instance can be found of any theologian, belonging to the Reformed churches, or to the Lutheran churches, in their best and purest days, who denied this doctrine without incurring the censures of the church.

In the 20th chapter of this work, by far the most unsatisfactory to us of any in the treatise, where the author treats of faith, we find him making a concession, which we exceedingly regret to see. The passage to which we object is found in the 4th section, entitled, "*Difficulties and Objections:*" It relates to the responsibility of man for what he believes. There is not at this day a more important principle in dispute. That faith is an involuntary act, and hence that man cannot be held accountable for his opinions, has been inculcated by such men as lord Brougham and sir James Mackintosh; and is widely prevalent among men of philosophic minds in Great Britain, and this country. Robert Owen, by going one step further, and denying that man is accountable for his affections or feelings, subverts the whole system of morality, and makes man the mere creature of necessity, influenced necessarily by the circumstances in which he happens to be placed. There is not, at present, a more dangerous system of infidelity than this. It is not as generally known as it should be, that, at this time, this destructive system is making sad havoc in the manufacturing districts of Great Britain, under the name of **SOCIALISM**. So alarming has been its progress, that it has recently become the subject of an interesting discussion in the House of Lords, on a motion made by the Bishop of

Exeter, to present an humble address to the Queen, praying her to have inquiry made into the facts, and to cause the laws to be enforced against any who should be found transgressing the same. Numerous petitions for the suppression of Socialism were also sent to the parliament, now in session. In the course of the discussion, information was communicated of a truly alarming nature. It appeared that numerous societies had been formed, and that the greatest exertion was made by the Socialists to extend their system, and increase their numbers. In the single town of Birmingham, their number had so increased, that eight thousand signatures were obtained to a petition in their favour; and in some places they had erected capacious and elegant buildings, in which to hold their meetings. But to return from this digression. We are sure that no man abhors all such opinions, as those above-mentioned, more than Dr. Junkin; and yet he has, in our opinion, made a concession in this section, which is of dangerous tendency, and which, in our judgment, he was not in truth called upon to make. Our readers will pardon us for dwelling on this point, as we consider the subject to be important in its bearings. The following objection is introduced by the author, that the act of believing, if involuntary, can have no moral character. For it is agreed generally, that *volition* is necessary to a moral act. The act which is done without design, intention, will or choice, cannot be good or bad, in any moral sense of the words. Consequently, believing, if it necessarily follows the perception of truth, is without any moral character. This is the objection; now for the answer. "The consequence I admit; but only you will observe in reference to the *act* of believing; not with regard to the *principle* or *habit* of the mind, or to the *motive* which induced the act. The possession of capacity to perceive spiritually the truth of God's testimony, is a grace and moral excellence; and the weighing of moral motives and yielding to the stronger, is a moral virtue. We thank no man for believing that, for the truth of which there is presented to his mind, overwhelming evidence." We are persuaded that the worthy author here entangled himself in a web of his own metaphysics, from which he has been unable to extricate himself. Our first and main objection is, that faith itself, or the belief in the divine testimony, is the act required by the command of God, and we have no authority for excluding that act from the class of those which partake of a moral nature. Dr. Jun-

kin himself, in a previous section of this very chapter, insists on it, and proves, that *faith is a duty*; and if a duty, then surely a moral act; for he taught us that the will of God is the only foundation of moral obligation. Again, he admits in this very passage, that the principle of faith is moral; but if the *principle* of an action be moral, then surely the act must partake of the nature of its source. An act is the principle in exercise. The *motive* he admits to be moral, but actions receive their character from the motives which produce them. In the next paragraph he says, in further explanation, "If then it be asked, where do you connect moral responsibility with believing?—I answer, in the preparatory steps toward the art of believing; not in the act itself. To give moral character to an act, we have seen that it is requisite that it be voluntary; i. e. done in view of motives operating upon choice; and that the motives be such as to call into action the moral faculty, &c." It clearly follows from this statement, that faith itself is no duty incumbent on any man, but his whole responsibility rests upon the previous acts of mind, preparatory to the act of believing. This is a strange doctrine to emanate from such a quarter. But let us examine it a little further. In these preparatory exercises, in which man is admitted to be responsible, belief in some truth is necessary at every step. Suppose the man believes that he has evidence enough without impartially considering the whole subject: well, if he believes so, he is not responsible, and of course he can be under no obligation to make further examination. Again, if the act of belief has no moral character, and of course is no duty, then the act of unbelief has no moral character, and is no sin. Suppose two men hear the testimony of God from his own word at the same time, the one believes it cordially because he has a spiritual discernment of its excellency: the other, because of the depravity of his nature which blinds his mind, disbelieves it, is there no iniquity in this act, proceeding from such a cause?

We hope that Dr. Junkin will not persist in maintaining such a position. If this is a specimen of the benefit to be derived from introducing metaphysical subtleties into the plain doctrines of Scripture, we trust that the church will be delivered from such aid. This method of analyzing, by which an act is attempted to be separated from its motive and principle, is unphilosophical, and contrary to every sound principle of morals. By a similar process of reasoning, it may be proved that the affections are not of a moral nature, and that men are

not accountable for their love or hatred, but only for the steps preparatory to their exercise. For the affections are not voluntary in the sense of the objection under consideration. We do not love or hate in consequence of a volition, nor are our affections of the nature of a volition. And when an object appears amiable to the mind, the affection of love as certainly follows, as belief when evidence is presented. But shall we on this account declare that the affections have no moral character? Thus all morality will be cut up root and branch. And the process does not stop here, for by the same kind of metaphysical hair-splitting, we can demonstrate that no act of the will itself is of a moral nature. The volition to perform any given act is the same, whatever be the motive. Take the case of killing a man. This act may be performed from a good motive, or from a bad motive, or by an insane person; in each case the volition considered separately is the same, namely, the determination to strike a certain blow. It is evident, therefore, that volition itself, separated from the motive, has no moral character. The truth is, that to constitute a moral act, several things must be taken into view, and not the bare act separated from all its adjuncts. We are the more surprised at this inadvertence in Dr. Junkin, as he had given so full an account of what is requisite to constitute a moral agent. Now all these things are necessary to a moral act.

But what shall be done with the principle that every moral action is a voluntary action? We utterly deny it, in the sense in which it is used in the objection stated above. That is, we deny that every exercise of the mind which is moral, is the effect of a volition; although this is true in regard to external or bodily acts, because a volition must precede them if they are properly our acts. But this does not apply to the exercise of the affections in which morality or virtue principally consists. We love God, not in consequence of a volition to love him, but because we see his beauty and glory; and so of other affections of a moral nature. They precede the will, and influence it, but do not proceed from it. There is, however, a sound sense, in which it may be said that all moral acts are voluntary, that is when by the will we mean all the active powers of the man; especially the affections. We hold that the morality of actions consists primarily in the affections, and the will is only concerned in moral acts, when some external act is to be performed, or when we wish to stir up our affections by

contemplating distinctly the objects which produce them. Every moral act must have a motive, and the grand source of motives to good, is love to God and to our neighbour; when these are absent or defective, innumerable other motives operate, arising out of the active principles, passions, and propensities of human nature, now in a state of disorder, for want of the regulating principle.

But is not belief necessary, and in such case how can it be moral? In innumerable instances there is no morality in the act of believing; but it would be a false inference from this, that the act of believing in moral subjects is indifferent. The act of volition, in ten thousand cases, has no moral character, but it would not do to infer from this that volition had no moral character when a moral agent was required to obey the law of his Maker. It is true, that our belief is always in accordance with the evidence perceived, but we are of opinion, that in many cases, especially those of a moral nature, the evidence apparent to the mind will depend very much upon the moral state of that mind. And however certain the effect may be, it alters the moral character of the act no more than the certainty of the exercise of affections, agreeably to the view which the mind has of objects, takes away the moral nature of these affections.

Some months since, we perused an article in the Westminster Review, written by an insidious and sceptical writer, which, if Dr. Junkin had read, he would never have sent out to the public the views which we have been criticising. This writer starts on the principle, that, faith being an involuntary exercise of the mind, man cannot possibly be held responsible for his belief. From this he infers, that by *faith*, in Scripture, cannot be meant the believing any particular propositions, for this does not depend upon his will. What then is the thing required in the gospel? It is according to this writer a disposition to deal impartially with evidence. Here man is responsible: and whatever particular propositions he may be led to believe, provided he deals honestly with evidence, it matters not. Hence a man may have the true faith and believe very little; and on the other hand, he may believe all that the Bible contains, and have no genuine faith. And, finally, he comes to the conclusion that a man may adopt atheistical opinions and be a true believer; while the orthodox clergy are amongst the greatest unbelievers; for he says, no sect of men are so dishonest in their method of dealing with evidence.

Since the tide of infidelity seems to be running in that particular channel, let not the friends and advocates of truth give, by unnecessary concessions, any advantage to this dreadful and abominable system which threatens so much evil to the cause of religion and sound morals at this very time. We do therefore sincerely hope, that Dr. Junkin will expunge this section from his book in the next edition.

We had intended to make some remarks on the section which treats of assurance being of the essence of faith; as we had supposed it probable that the author's views differed somewhat from our own on this subject. But we are now rather inclined to believe that the difference is verbal rather than real. The distinction between the assurance of *faith* and of *sense*, used by the two great theologians, Brown of Haddington, and Dr. Mason, does not serve, in our opinion, to cast any light on this question. The true point of difference does not relate at all to the degree of assent given, or of comfort attending it, but to the precise propositions which are the primary objects of a saving faith. According to Brown's definition of the *assurance of faith*, it is, "The firm assurance of God's love to us, founded on his promise; the assurance of *sense* is the persuasion that we have already tasted his love." Now we maintain that neither of these is essential to a saving faith in its primary exercise; for we cannot be assured of the love of God to *us* personally, from any promise contained in the Bible, until we have embraced that promise. Dr. Mason uses the same distinction in the passage quoted by Dr. Junkin, but not in the same sense. As he explains the matter, it amounts to much the same as all sound Presbyterians hold. And we admit that "the assurance of faith" as used in scripture, signifies a firm belief of the truth revealed, and not any persuasion respecting our own state.

"When we speak of assurance as essential to faith," says he, "many suppose we teach that none can be real Christians who do not *feel* that they have passed from death unto life, and have not unclouded and triumphant views of their interest in Christ, so as to say, under the manifestations of his love, 'My beloved is mine, and I am his.' But God forbid that we should thus offend against the generation of his children. That many of them want such assurance may not be questioned. This, however, is the assurance, not of faith, but of sense; and vastly different they are. The object of the former is Christ revealed in the *word*; the object of the

latter Christ revealed in the *heart*. The ground of the former is the testimony of God *without us*; that of the latter, the work of the Spirit *within us, &c.*” But in our opinion this matter is placed in the true stand clearest light in our Larger Catechism, (Ques. 80, 81,) “Such as truly believe in Christ, and endeavour to walk in all good conscience before him, may, without extraordinary revelation, by faith grounded upon the truth of God’s promises, and by the Spirit enabling them to discern in themselves those graces to which the promises of life are made, and bearing witness with their spirits that they are the children of God, be infallibly assured that they are in the estate of grace, and shall persevere therein unto salvation.”

“Assurance of grace and salvation NOT BEING OF THE ESSENCE OF FAITH, true believers may wait long before they obtain it, and after the enjoyment thereof may have it weakened and intermitted through manifold distempers, sins, temptations, and desertions; yet are they never left without such a presence and support of the Spirit of God as keeps them from sinking into utter despair.”

As to the *appropriating act of faith*, which Dr. Junkin makes an essential characteristic of true faith, if it means the act of *receiving Christ and resting upon him*, which of course we do for *ourselves*, he is right; but there is no need of a new technical phrase to express it; and if it be an act different from this, by which we are assured that Christ and his benefits are *ours*, then it is not essential to a true faith. At any rate we are not convinced of the propriety or need of this phrase. And we have not found it used by the best writers on this subject. Still we have no great objection to it, if it be explained in a sound and orthodox sense. Properly speaking, the blessings of the New Covenant are appropriated to us, upon believing, by the free gift of God. As to our own apprehension or persuasion that we are interested in them, it must depend upon our evidence of having truly believed; but as to the real title, it is as firm when a true faith is weak, as when it is attended with the fullest assurance of salvation.

We have now brought our review to a close, and upon a survey of the whole work, our opinion is, that in doctrine it is sound, and that the execution furnishes evidence of a mind of strong original powers, capable of thinking out a subject without dependence upon others. But we must protest against Dr. Junkin’s fondness for metaphysical disquisitions;

especially where they are not needed, and where they rather tend to cloud than to elucidate the subject. Indeed, we are of opinion, that metaphysics is not Dr. Junkin's forte. We willingly award to him great acuteness, the power of nice discrimination, and a logical faculty; but he is too rapid and even hasty in running ahead to his conclusions, to be an accurate metaphysician. No man possesses all mental faculties in high perfection. Another thing, which we think we have observed in Dr. Junkin's investigations, is the ability to discern objects near at hand more clearly than those afar off. In regard to the former, he may be said to have a microscopic discernment; but absorbed in these, he overlooks remote consequences, though they may be essential to a correct judgment. But although we should be mistaken in this opinion, we feel great confidence that his method of abstruse reasoning is not adapted to the capacities or the tastes of the "plain reader," for whom he tells us his book was chiefly intended. Our opinion is, that nothing will so much obstruct the circulation and usefulness of this volume as these abstract disquisitions.

As we suppose that the work will go to a second edition, we would respectfully suggest that, instead of writing other books, the author employ his leisure hours in improving this. The outline given in the contents is ample enough for the energies of a life-time to fill up and perfect. Calvin continued to improve his Institutes until the year of his death: At first, we presume it was not larger than the volume under review. The great mistake of many of our best writers, has been that of publishing too much. Had Owen and Baxter and Howe confined their labours within narrow limits, they would have been able to render them much more perfect, and they would have continued to be read to the most distant times. But many of their works are falling into oblivion.

We take leave of Dr. Junkin with sincere respect for his talents and indefatigable industry, and cordially wish him success in his earnest efforts for the promotion of orthodox truth and sound literature. We have used the privilege of critics freely, but we hope not offensively; and we trust that our remarks will be perused with the same candour with which they have been written.

Lection. Alexander.

ART. VI.—*Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Tractatus Tres de Revelatione, de Ecclesia, et de Verbo Dei quos concinnavit* Revmus Dnus Franciscus Patricius Kenrick, Epus Arath, in Part. Infid. et Coadj. Ep. Philadelphiensis. Philadelphia: Typis L. Johnson, in Georgii vico. 1839.

Theologiæ Dogmaticæ, quam concinnavit Franciscus Patricius Kenrick, etc. Volumen II. Philadelphia: L. Johnson. 1840.

AN American work on systematic theology, composed in a dead language, is a thing so foreign from our every-day associations and experience, that we should feel bound to take some notice of it, if it were only as a curiosity. It needed no name upon the title page, to assure our utilitarian countrymen, that the author was connected with no protestant communion. Indeed, the Latin dress of Bishop Kenrick's work will have this curious effect, that while it seals the book to the great mass of American readers, it opens it to the educated world of Europe, and to the Romish priesthood all the world over. We can think of no class to whom it will afford so much entertainment, as to foreign papists, on account of the frequency with which the author interweaves minute accounts of the opinions and the organization of our own religious sects. If the secular part of the community have reason to dread the presence and inspection of English and French travellers, the religious world ought certainly to be aware, that there are those among them who are able and disposed to draw their likeness in imperishable colours, by the use of a language which is not only still the learned language of the world, but which is likely so to be as long as learning shall exist. One impression made upon our mind, by the inspection of these volumes, we cannot refrain from putting upon paper. We mean the impression of the striking difference between the protestant and popish method of observing men and manners. The former has, no doubt, the advantage as to candour; but the latter is, at least, as much superior in coolness and philosophical composure. One might have supposed that a secluded ecclesiastic, whom we never hear of, and who, for any general knowledge

of him here, might as well be in his titular diocese of Arath as in Philadelphia, would of course be wrapt in a bigotted ignorance of our concerns. Such a hypothesis would soon be destroyed by a cursory glance at these two volumes, in which not only sects, but individuals, are treated as objects of familiar knowledge; in which Mr. Barnes and Mr. Furness figure under the titles of Barnesius and Furnesius. If this be a specimen of the attention which our popish fellow-citizens are paying to their neighbours, and of their disposition to record what they observe, we may take to ourselves Burns's warning to his countrymen: "A chiel's amang ye takin' notes, and faith he'll prent it."

We shall not take upon us to be critics of a bishop's Latin, but shall let it pass with the remark, that it is simple and perspicuous, not more exempt from vulgar barbarisms than from the equally offensive affectation of ultra-classical idiom, which disfigures some of the recent German writers in that language. The truth is, that in style, arrangement, and appearance, the whole work bears a strong resemblance to the old fashioned theological productions of the Church of Rome. And this antique air, no less than the Latin, helps to give a very odd look to the names of our contemporaries, and the account of our religious matters, which attract the eye at every opening of the book.

It seems that the late Archbishop Marechal, of Baltimore, while a professor in St. Mary's College, formed the plan of a system of theology, which his subsequent promotion hindered him from executing. It has since become a matter of complaint, that the systematic works upon theology, imported from Europe, have no view to the state of things in this republic, and to the controversies agitated here. To supply this defect is the design of Bishop Kenrick's work, in writing which he complains that his time was too short, his books too few, and his opportunity of consultation with the learned too restricted. His first intention was to publish a compendious manual for the use of students, but he afterwards adopted a more copious method, lest from excess of brevity, he might seem rather to have betrayed than defended the truth. He carefully exonerates the mother church from all responsibility for his opinions upon doubtful points; invites the critic and opponent of the truth to turn their weapons upon him, and manfully exclaims—"Me, me, (*adsum qui feci*), in me convertite ferrum"—forgetting, in the

warmth of his disinterested zeal, that though the Church of Rome might be esteemed an object worthy of attack, the bishop of Arath might be reckoned but small game. We are not disposed, however, to quarrel with the rhetoric of Bishop Kenrick's preface, and shall, therefore, proceed to give a sketch of the contents and arrangement of the work.

The Dogmatic Theology, properly so called, begins with the second volume. The first contains the preliminary discussions as to the source of information in theology, the rule of faith, authority of the church, inspiration of the scriptures, &c. The first volume is the most interesting to the protestant reader. In both parts, the subjects are handled in the good old way of proposition, proof, objection, and reply, which we think far better than the discursive and diluted method which prevails in many systems of Protestant theology.

Bishop Kenrick is by no means a profound theologian. He would perhaps regard it not as censure, but as praise, to be told that his book contains little, if any thing, which can be called original or novel, as to the statement or defence of his opinions. There is the same superficial mode of handling controverted points, the same unavailing efforts to reconcile the semi-pelagianism of the modern papacy with the acknowledged and revered authority of St. Augustine, and the same discreet silence with respect to questions where infallible judgments have unfortunately differed, that may be observed in other publications of the same school, and with far less ability and knowledge of the subjects than are exhibited by Peter Dens and other recent writers.

In the first volume we observe, with some surprise, a rifaccimento of the old exploded slanders against Luther, Calvin, and the rest of the reformers, which we doubt not, will be swallowed by the *studiosi*, for whose sake the book was written, with as staunch a faith as that which they are taught to cherish towards the silliest legends of the Breviary. Our own readers need not to be told that the life and death of Luther and Calvin are as well authenticated matters of history, as the life and death of Washington. For the sake of working upon patriotic feeling, why not get up a story that the Father of his country was a papist, and received absolution on his death-bed?

The citations and references, with which the margins are plentifully studded, embrace, besides the usual patristic and modern theological literature of the Romish church, indica-

tions of acquaintance with some very different branches of knowledge. A few of the more recent German writers are quoted, and a great variety of English works. The author apologizes, in his preface, for having cited heretical authorities, when he had "Catholic" authorities at hand. And as this apology, with all its implied bigotry, is more than usually candid and charitable, we extract it.

"Ipsos fidei adversarios sæpius testes adduxi, quamvis non ignorarem Patres Ecclesiæ, interpretes Catholicos, vel alios scriptores, posse in eundem finem allegari, sed placuit quæ et illi bene scripserunt in Religionis vindicias laudare, licet a nobis discidio funesto heu! divulsi. Utinam qua pollent plurimi ex illis eruditionis copia, et judicii acumine totam illam doctrinam quam Apostoli cum suo sanguine Ecclesiæ profuderunt, et ipsi tueri vellent." Pref. vii.

He also claims the praise of having quoted from original authoritative documents, in all his statements, with respect to the government and doctrine of the Protestants.

The typographical execution of the volumes is correct and scholarlike, except so far as Greek and Hebrew are concerned. In the latter language some portentous novelties have been brought forward by the Bishop or his printer. See, for example, pp. 26, 27, 29, 58 of vol. I. It is but just to add, that in the second volume there is great improvement. As to the Greek, the fault is in the absence of all rule or uniformity as to the insertion or omission of the accents. The Latin, English, French, and Italian, seem to be printed with remarkable correctness.

We need scarcely say that we have no thought of reviewing Bishop Kenrick's system. We should, of course, be involved in controversy at almost every step. It could give him no surprise to be informed, that we regard his distinctive tenets as entirely false, and perhaps as little to be told, that we consider his defence of them as weak. Our object in calling the attention of our readers to the work, was merely to present a literary notice of it, as a novelty, and to amuse them with a few examples of the way in which American and Protestant affairs are discussed or represented by a Romanist in Latin. This we shall now proceed to do, with occasional reference to other topics, as they may occur.

In treating of the prophecy of Christ, contained in Gen. 49: 10, the Bishop adds the following note, which we extract, as an interesting instance of the respect which is commanded by a work of sterling merit among all who hold the funda-

mentals of religion, when no sectarian prejudice is called in question

“Hengstenberg perdocte hanc interpretationem tuetur in egregio opere: ‘Christologie des alten Testaments, und Commentar über die messianischen Weissagungen der Propheten’ Berlin, 1829, quod ante biennium in Anglicanam linguam versum Alexandria, D. C. editum est.” Vol. i. p. 66.

The following picture of the Christian world is interesting in itself, as well as on account of its American allusions.

“Ecclesia Catholica, cujus centrum Romana Petri sedes est, totam possidet Italiam, Siciliam, Hispanias et Lusitaniam, Belgium, totam fere Galliam, et Hiberniam, Bavariam, Poloniam, Bohemiam, Hungariam, et magnam ditionis Austriacæ partem, Helvetiarum plures provincias, plurimosque numerat filios in Angliâ, Scotia, Batavia, Suevia, et Norvegia, Borussia, Saxonia, Russia, et in insulis Archipelagi, aliisque Græciæ, et Turciæ Europææ partibus. In Asia minori, et tota Turcia Asiatica sunt plurimi Catholici, qui magno numero etiam reperiuntur ubique fere sparsi per Indias Orientales, et insulas plerasque Asiæ adjacentes, in Siam regno et in Sinensis imperii extremis veluti oris. Apud Sinenses ipsos 60,000 numerantur, apud Indos Orientales 460,000, et in Australia quamplurimi. In Africa non desunt Catholici in Ægypto, in Barbariæ locis maritimis, jamque erecta est sedes Episcopalis Juliæ Cæsareæ. In regno Congo, et prope promontorium quod caput Bonæ spei audit, est quoque Episcopus. Tota America meridionalis, exceptis locis aliquibus in quibus sylvestres degunt homines, Catholicam profitetur fidem, quæ et Mexicanæ reipublicæ communis est. Viget in plerisque locis Septentrionalis Americæ, quæ Britannico subjacent imperio, præsertim in provinciis Canadæ, et in plerisque insulis utriusque Americæ, vel etiam Europæ, vel Asiæ, adjacentibus, in quibus Christi nomen aliquatenus agnoscitur. In his federatis provinciis ad millionem fere pertingere censemur. Per orbem 180,000,000 numerantur.

“Græci Schismatici in Russia reperiuntur, sicut ubique fere in Turchia Europæa, et Asiatica, et in Ægypto. Russi tamen Constantinopolitanum Antistitem, qui plerisque præest, non agnoscunt. 30,000,000 a nonnullis, 41,000,000, ab aliis recensentur, quibus tamen plerumque accensent sectas alias, nempe Nestorianos, Jacobitas, Armenos, Coptos, Abyssinos, aliosque.

“Protestantes in innumeras divisi sectas, plures Europæ obtinent provincias, Angliam scilicet, Scotiam, Daniam, Sueviam, Norvegiam, Borussiam, Bataviam, pluresque Germaniæ provincias, et magnam provinciarum federatarum partem. In insulis quoque nonnullis Indiarum Occidentalium et Orientalium, et in oris maritimis Asiæ reperiuntur. Lutheranismus in Dania, et provinciis vicinis, in Saxonia, et in aliis nonnullis Germaniæ partibus præsertim viget: Calvini principia in Scotia, Borussia, Batavia, et Anglia potius obtinent. Anglicani tamen Hierarchiæ servant umbram, pluresque ritus fere Catholicos: imo plura propugnant principia, quæ specie Catholica sunt, vel parum a Catholicis dissita. Nonnulli in Europa numerant 46,000,000 ex variis Protestantium sectis, 11,500,000 in America; sed census nimis auctus videtur. In his federatis provinciis Presbyteriani, Calvini principia plerumque propugnantes, numero et studiis polleunt, sed in plurimas sectas sub-dividuntur, *veteris a novæ scholæ, uti aiunt, sectatoribus, nuperrimè novo dissidio scissis*. Baptistæ, immersionis necessitatem, ut valcat baptismus, statuentes, Methodistæ, Episcopaliani, alique omnis generis numero haud parvo reperiuntur. Exorti sunt ante paucos annos *Mormonitæ*, aureo libro, Bibliis præstantiori, uti ipsi contendunt, detecto, qui jam in provincia Missouriensi armis se tuentur. Hac tabula inspecta quisque statim percipit Ecclesiam Catholicam omnibus eminere, quam etiam divinis fulgere indicis intelligit, quum in fide semper et ubique sibi constans omnem ini

micorum superet impetum. De ea igitur cum Augustino dicimus: "Ecclesia sancta, Ecclesia una, Ecclesia vera, Ecclesia Catholica, contra omnes hæreses pugnans: pugnare potest, expugnari tamen non potest. Hæreses omnes de illa exierunt, tamquam sarmenta inutilia de vite præcisa. Ipsa autem manet in radice sua, in vite sua, in charitate sua. Portæ inferorum non vincunt eam." Vol. i. p. 116—118.

To this may be added a subsequent passage, with respect to the divisions among Protestants, in reference to the form and constitution of the Church.

"Anglicani Episcopale regimen tenent, cui fidelcs singuli sunt subjiendi, qua autem ratione Episcopi per orbem inter se conjungantur, ut in unum veluti corpus coeant, haud feliciter explicant, charitatis vinculum cum fide dogmatum fundamentalium sufficere arbitrantes: quod tamen aliquando verbis obscurioribus enuntiant. Episcoporum autem institutionem ab Apostolis repetit White: Bingham a Christi ordinatione. Methodistæ nonnulli Episcoporum regimen agnoscunt, quod tamen divinitus institutum vix possunt habere, quum Joannem Wesley, Episcopali caractere plane carentem, Thomas Coke Episcopum primum sectae ordinasse ipsi referant, et Episcopum ordinari posse a senioribus, praeconibus scilicet, saltem tribus numero, tradant, si temporum calamitate contigerit nullam in secta superesse Episcopum. Apud cætum generalem seu collationem, Anglice "*General Conference*," praecipuam constituunt potestatem: ea quippe ex senioribus, qui in annuis collationibus eliguntur, constat, quolibet quadriennio congregatur, ipsosque quos vocant episcopos suae subditos auctoritati habet. Baptistae consulunt ut data occasione inter se Ecclesiae locales societatem ineant, communibusque utantur consiliis, sed omnem auctoritatis notionem abesse jubent. Presbyteriani comitiis generalibus "*General Assembly*" ex tota America fœderata collectis, praeconibus et laicis senioribus in id electis, potestatem summam in suae sectae negotiis tribuunt. Singulas paraecias apud illos regit praeco cum duobus saltem laicis senioribus, qui tribunal constituunt "*Sessionem*" vocatum; plures sessiones tribunal *Presbyterii* efficiunt, in quo conveniunt praecones omnes qui ad eas pertinent, una cum laico seniore ex qualibet: *synodus* tria saltem presbyteria complectitur, et ex praeconibus, et laicis senioribus pari ratione constituitur: *Comitia generalia* fiunt semel in anno, praecone uno ex viginti quatuor cunjuslibet presbyterii, et seniore uno pariter coadunatis.

"In ditionibus Angliae rex, vel regina, in omnibus causis tum Ecclesiasticis, tum civilibus, praecipuam habet potestatem juxta articulos Anglicanos: sed Episcopaliani Americani profitentur civilem Magistratum nullam habere auctoritatem in rebus mere spiritualibus. Habetur caetus generalis Episcoporum: "*General Convention*;" Ministris cum laicis etiam intervenientibus. Omnibus praest Episcopus senior ordinatione, qui taman nullam in caeteros exercet auctoritatem. Anglicani Episcopum Romanum nullam habere in Angliae ditionibus jurisdictionem affirmant; sed de eo silent Americani Episcopaliani. Methodistac nullam exteram jurisdictionem agnoscunt; sed Baptistae et Presbyteriani in Episcopum Romanum tamquam Antichristum debacchantur." Vol. i. p. 140—141.

We are much amused at the frequency and readiness with which our Bishop pays the high-church prelatists in their current coin—as for example, when he says—"Anglicani autem schismatis crimen vehementer exaggerant, sui vulneris haud memores," (vol. I. p. 145.)

Whatever may be thought of the Bishop's conclusions in the following extracts, he is certainly entitled to be heard, as a witness having no connexion with the parties spoken of.

“Presbyteriani in comitiis suis generalibus agnoscunt potestatem judicariam in doctrinae controversiis, sed eam contendunt esse meré declaratoriam, adeo ut sanctae scripturae sint unica regula fidei et morum. Destruunt manifesto quod aedificant, dum errorem subesse posse hujusmodi judiciis haud gravantur fateri. Cdest igitur unitatis principium, nullum enim est tribunal quo doctrina certo dijudicari valeat.

“De Ecclesiae potestate in controversiis fidei silent Methodistae, verba articulorum Anglicanorum alioquin plerumque exscribentes.

“Baptistae supremum controversiarum judicem nullum alium agnoscunt praeter scripturam a Spiritu traditam.

“Liquet igitur apud Sectas nullum esse tribunal quo fidei unitas servari possit, quum summa judicia incerta ab ipsis agnoscantur, et erroris periculo obnoxia.” Vol. i. p. 182.

“Ex Paley audivimus quae opinionum licentia obtineat apud eos qui articulis Anglicanis subscribunt. Recentissime vero luculentum datum est argumentum confessionem Presbyterianam nullam vim apud sectam obtinere; in ipsis enim comitiis generalibus, singulis fere annis sententiae contrariae obtinuerunt, alterna fere vice *scholæ novæ*, quae a confessionis principiis longissime discedit, vel scholae *veteri* Calvinianae faventes. Quum autem commentationes in epistolam ad Romanos a Barnesio, Philadelphiae ante paucos annos edita, haereseos fuissent insimulatae, ipseque ex Synodi auctoritate a munere praedicandi suspensus, Comitia Generalia Pittsburgi anno 1836 eum absolverunt: anno verò sequenti Comitia Generalia Philadelphiae habita, omnes novae Scholae fautores et Ecclesias in quibus eae circumferebantur opiniones a consortio suo absciderunt, qua ratione sexcenti fere praecones simul abscissi dicuntur. Haec sane ostendunt confessionem nullatenus idoneam fidei unitati perpetuo servandae.” Vol. i. p. 184.

“Re quidem vera Episcopaliani nostrates in baptismi administratione omitunt singillatim interrogare de Symboli articulis, utrum scilicet credat baptizandus in Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, remissionem peccatorum, et caetera: substituta interrogatione generali: utrum teneat omnes articulos fidei Christianae prout in Symbolo Apostolico continentur. Quamvis haec mutatio parvi momenti possit cuiquam videri, ex industria facta quum sit, periculum praescfert ne sensim sine sensu a pluribus fidei dogmatibus recedendi quaeratur occasio. Quod verò ad rem magis facit, in visitatione aegrotorum olim apud Anglicanos praescriptum est ut ministri aegrotum hortaretur ad specialem peccatorum confessionem peragendam, eique confesso absolutionem auctoritate sibi a Christo commissa impertiretur: quam absolvendi potestatem Ecclesiae denegare esset, teste Pearsonio, haeresis Novatiana. Jam verò omnem mentionem confessionis, et absolutionis, Rituale Americanum prorsus omittit.

“Quum Methodistae Episcopalianos imitentur, Baptistae verò et Presbyteriani nullam fere habcant formam cultus, sed pleraque praeconum permittant arbitrio, qui orationes fundere, legere scripturas, hymnos canere, et conciones facere pro occasione debent, liquet fidei unitatem in cultu et sacramentorum administratione nullam apud sectas habere praesidium.

“Nullum est principium apud Sectas quo in regimine servari possit unitas, vel foveri sacra cum Christi fidelibus per orbem communio: nam nulla est communis auctoritas qua teneantur. Comitia Generalia in America nullo auctoritatis ligamine cum Calvinianis Scotis, Anglis, Genevensibus conjungun-

sur, sed sola imitatione regiminis, et doctrinae similitudine, plurimis capitibus, quae odium paritura forent, mutatis, se fratres exhibent. Ipsa comitia non valent unitatem in sua provincia servare, quum auctoritatem nullam sacram habere agnoscantur, et oscillatione quadam in varias ferantur partes. Episcopaliani nullo communi vinculo tenentur, Anglicani enim regem vel reginam in omnibus causis civilibus et Ecclesiasticis, intra suam ditionem, suprema auctoritate pollere fatentur, quod ex Dei ordinatione repetit rex in solemnibus sua declaratione articulis praefixa. Nostrates autem conventionem generali res suas moderantur, in singulis dioecesisibus coetu quodam statuto, quo et Episcoporum arctetur potestas. Adeo autem carent communionis sacro vinculo, ut non nisi humanitate quadam conjungi cum Anglicanis dici possint, cujus exercitium leges Anglicanae coercent, vetantes ne exterius quis episcopus in suis Ecclesiis concionetur. Anglicani porro clerici comitia, quae Convocationem vocant, nequeunt haberi absque venia regia, qualem etiam sanctionem ejus decreta exigunt ut valeant." Vol. i. p. 185—186.

The following account of Calvinistic strifes is as true as it is flattering.

"Calviniani, Dordracena Synodo habita, in sectas Gomaristarum et Arminianorum scissi sunt, illos hos etiam ad mortem nonnumquam persequentibus. Nostis etiam temporibus vidimus scissam sectam, jurgio vehementiori, et contumeliis in foliis in se invicem latis." Vol. i. p. 187.

On the subject of Presbyterian intolerance, hear the Bishop of Arath, the worthy organ of his mild and merciful Mother Church.

"Sic Calvinus in Servetum saevit: sic Beza saevendum docuit: sic foedus sanguinis inierunt Puritani, rege juramento adstricto se ex suo impetio exterminaturum omnes haereticos, et vero Dei cultui adversarios: idque muneris civili magistratui in secundi decalogi praecepti explicatione haud obscure injungunt, quam etiam Presbyteriani nostrates retinent, omnibus inculcantes se teneri vi divini illius praecepti ad sese pro sua conditione omni falso cultui opponendum, et ad monumenta idololatriae, qua ratione Catholicum cultum placuit designare, tollenda." Vol. i. p. 194.

The following reference to Dr. J. P. Wilson's work on Ruling Elders, is, we think, instructive.

"Calvinus arguitur a Wilsono, praecone ipso sectae, quod ad optatum conciliandum gratiam, laicos seniores regiminis fecerit participes, contra totius antiquitatis Christianae sensum et morem." Vol. i. p. 207.

The Bishop is of opinion that Protestant missionaries are more like travellers than preachers of the gospel, and that no nation has ever been converted by them to the Christian faith, (vol. i. p. 222.)

As the apostolical succession is a fashionable topic at the present time, we think it right to hear the Bishop of Arath on the pretensions of the Greek and English churches.

“Quod autem Graeci ordines habeant, non gravamur fateri; sed Apostolicae successioneis jura manifesto schismate amissa sunt, quum enim Christus unum voluerit esse Ecclesiam, qui unitatis ligamen dirumpit, extra Ecclesiam fit, et jurisdictionem, quae ab ipsa pendet, amittit. Quod ad Anglicanos attinet, vitium hoc merito obicitur eorum jactatae successioni, ut interim sileamus de ordinibus ipsis, quos ob novam formam sub Eduardo rege invectam, et ob litteras de Parkeri in Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem consecratione, nihil valere, magno consensu Theologi existimant.” Vol. i. p. 222.

“Inde igitur inferitur societatem omnem quae caret ministerio, qualis est *Amicorum*, vulgo *Quakers*, caetus, nullo modo esse Christi Ecclesiam: nec societatem quae ministerium habet, sed unitatis sacrum vinculum dirumpit, quod Graeci schismatici fecerunt, veram Ecclesiam esse: nec quae ordinationis validae defectu, vel schismatis crimine, Apostolicae caret successioneis juribus, quod alterutrum, vel potius utrumque, de Anglicanis affirmari tuto potest, ullatenus posse Sponsae Christi privilegia sibi vindicare. Omni autem umbra successioneis Apostolicae, vel legitimi ministerii carent, Calviniani, Methodistae, Baptistae, Unitariani, Universalistae, caeterique sectarii.” Vol. i. p. 235.

In the following paragraph the Bishop shows an accurate acquaintance, not only with the difference between our principal denominations, but with the subdivisions which exist in one of them.

“Plerique sectarii in hac regione vel Episcopale regimen prorsus rejiciunt, vel illud ad Ecclesiasticam politiam referunt, quin a Christi institutione derivetur. Presbyteriani contendunt nullam specialem auctoritatem regiminis Episcopi vocabulo designari, sed de simplicibus quovis animarum pastore illud usurpari. Iis Baptistae, ut plerumque, assentiuntur. Methodistae nonnulli Episcopalis regiminis nomen retinent, sed illud repetunt ex Wesley in hanc formam voluntate magis propensa, eum Episcopatus sui auctorem agnoscentes. Episcopaliani eo gloriantur; sed ex Apostolorum institutione illud derivat *White*, qui, moderationis laudem cupiens, animadvertit Ecclesiam Anglicam absolutam ejus necessitatem numquam affirmasse, et Bancroftum ipsum, dum ageretur de Episcopis Scotiae dandis, ab ea quaestione dirimenda consulto abstinuisse, ne omnes pene Ecclesiae reformatae ministerio carere viderentur.” Vol. i. p. 246.

The contrast between the Papists and the Quakers is exhibited in very bold relief as follows.

“*Amici*, quos *Quakeros* vocant, tenent universis prorsus hominibus lumen interius dari, quo quae ad salutem spectant noscere valeant, et salutem reapse assequi, etsi ignorent historiam Jesu. Catholica doctrina in Concilio Lateranensi III. exposita est his verbis: ‘Una vero est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur.’” Vol. i. p. 313.

The following sentence would be rather startling, if the context did not show that by *biblical system*, Bishop Kenrick means the system of the Bible Society, or the indiscriminate circulation of the scriptures:

“Callaghan, minister Protestanticus in Hibernia, egregie vitium systematicae Biblii exposuit.” Vol. i. p. 431, note.

In speaking of those who have denied the doctrine of original sin, our author brings together some who never could have dreamed of being placed in the same category:

"Hoc dogma negavit quinto saeculo ineunte *Pelagius* monachus laicus e Britannia, Coelestio Scoto assentiente; quibus praeclare restitit Augustinus, quosque concilia et Pontifices damnarunt. Albigenses in eodem haeserunt luto, sicut Zuinglius etiam, et Socinus uterque. Illud negant aperte Unitarii hodierni. Novissime Albertus Barnesius, praeco presbyterianus, illud evellere studuit, arte quadam et industria, editis in epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos commentationibus, quae magnum in secta conflaverunt incendium. Profitetur quidem se rem ipsam admittere, ex quo peccavit Adam totum humanum genus in peccatum et interitum prolapsum: sed *theoriam* nullam ab Apostolo statutam dicit, a qua igitur statuenda abstinendum est. Re tamen vera ipse suam mentem prodit, occasionem lapsus caeteris hominibus ex Adae peccato ortam, sed nullam veram peccati labem. Latet anguis in herba; de theoria enim statuenda haud agitur, sed de re ipsa: utrum scilicet peccante Adamo, universi homines constituti sint peccatores, et idcirco morti obnoxii: non adhuc quaeritur quomodo id contigerit, qua ratione reatus ille transfundatur, quave in re peccati hujus natura sit posita. Has quaestiones ad *theorias* relegari patimur libenter: sed dogma, rem, *factum* negat, qui dicit homines Adae posteris tunc primum peccatores constitui, quando suis actibus deliquerunt; Apostolus quippe docet omnes Adae peccato peccatores constitutos." Vol. ii. p. 38-39.

In the following paragraph, too, the Presbyterians and Quakers are somewhat unexpectedly brought together:

"Dordracena synodus definivit: 'Deus . . . Spiritum Sanctum etiam in tristibus lapsibus a suis non prorsus aufert, nec eo usque eos prolabi sinit, ut a gratia adoptionis, ac justificationis statu excidant.' Id tradunt aperte Presbyteriani hodierni. *Quakeri* dicunt ad tantam perfectionem perveniri posse, ut quis in *apostasiam* totalem haud amplius labi valeat." Vol. ii. p. 338.

We commend the following statement to the notice of the Baptists, Presbyterians, and Mr. Barnes:

"Barnesius, commentationibus in Pauli ad Romanos epistolam plura de Christo Deo inseruit; adjunxit tamen eum Filium designari ex tempore quo humana indutus carne apparuit, et scripturas prorsus silere de ulla ejus processione antequam homo factus sit. Liquet hac ratione distinctionem personarum tolli, et veterem haeresim sub involucris renovari. Equidem constat Arianos et Humanitarios in Presbyterianorum et Baptistarum sectis plurimos reperiri." Vol. ii. p. 79.

That nothing might appear to have escaped his notice, the bishop thus alludes to a matter which has recently attracted much attention in this country:

"In *magnetismo animali*, quo quis eorum quae procul sunt conscius fieri dicitur, spiritu illuc nescio quo pacto se transferente, et uti dicitur, *imaginatione* operante extra proprium corpus, nullam daemonicam operam interesse suspicamus, sed vel artem quandam, vel illusionem, quamvis recentissime in hac ipsa regione, plura miraque relata sint, quibus homines A catholici judicio graves adhibuerunt fidem." Vol. ii. p. 75.

With all his variety of knowledge, however, there are two omissions, which evince that he is still behind the age. Unless our very cursory perusal does the work injustice, it contains no reference either to the German Christianity, now taking root in some parts of America, or to the Oxford Christianity, already bearing fruit in others. We are, indeed, inclined to think, after all, that America, to Bishop Kenrick, means Philadelphia, and that to this circumstance may be ascribed the unenviable prominence given in his work to certain writers and preachers of that godly city.

As the bishop, more than once, rather unadvisedly admits the great diversity of sentiment existing among Romanists themselves, the question naturally arises, to which school or sect of the infallible and only-saved he happens to belong. At the end of the second volume, he replies to this inquiry, and asserts his claim to be considered a good "catholic," as follows:

"Quamvis nulli scholae necessariò nos addictos profiteamur, in haeticorum solvendis objectionibus qualibet sententia catholica uti licere existimavimus. Placet nobis celebre Augustini effatum: IN NECESSARIIS UNITAS, IN DUBIIS LIBERTAS, IN OMNIBUS CARITAS. Quod si aliquid nobis exciderit, in re adeo difficili, quod sanæ doctrinae haud consonum reperiatur, Apostolicae Sedis iudicio illud revocatum habendum erit: quae enim scripsimus, sicut et quae sumus scripturi, summo illi praesuli, qui, Petri cathedram tenens fidei ejus haeres constituitur, ex animo subjicimus, nullum majus privilegium nobis vindicantes, quam fidei ejusdem et communionis consortium." Vol. ii. p. 389.

We have suffered the bishop to speak for himself, and for the most part at our own expense. For after all, what is there more distinctive of the Papist and the Protestant than this, that while the latter dares to spread before his hearers the worst that his worst enemies can say against him, the former, not content with his expurgatory index, is afraid to trust his followers with the word of God?

QUARTERLY LIST
OF
NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

An Historical Account of the First Settlement of Salem, in West Jersey, by John Fenwick, Esq., chief proprietor of the same. With many of the important events that have occurred down to the present generation. By R. G. Johnson, Philadelphia. Published by Orrin Rogers: 1839. 12mo. pp. 173.

We hardly know how our aged men of leisure and opportunity can render a better service to the literature of the country than by preparing and publishing just such books as this. Col. Johnson has here given us a history of the county of Salem; an account of its first settlement; to a certain extent of the origin of its inhabitants; of the formation of its churches of different denominations; of legislative enactments and judicial proceedings; and its sacrifices and struggles in the revolutionary war. It is evident at once that if we could have similar authentic accounts of the several counties in our State, we should have a basis for its civil and religious history of inestimable importance. It is only in this way that the materials of history can be preserved and rendered accessible to the general historian. It is impossible for any one man to have access to the county records; to the archives of churches, to the family traditions over a whole state. The collection and publication of these materials must be left to the intelligent inhabitants of each particular district. We tender Col. Johnson, therefore, our hearty thanks for his interesting and instructive little volume, and hope that his example may be speedily followed by equally qualified writers in every part of the country.

A Sermon on the present crisis in the Missionary operations of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. By Rufus Anderson, D.D., one of the Secretaries of the Board: 1840.

It appears from this discourse that there is great danger of the income of this venerable Board falling short to an alarming extent during the current year. The deficiency for the first five months is stated at 38,000 dollars. Should the residue of the year prove equally unproductive, the receipts will not exceed two-thirds of what they were in each of the last three years. The consequences of such a deficiency would be most disastrous. It must occasion the breaking up of whole missions. The causes of this decline in the resources of the Board are no doubt various. The most obvious is the general financial embarrassment of the country. This, however, though it has to a great

extent diminished the large contributions of the rich, has not so much affected the numerous and more important contributions of the poor. Another cause is the dying out in many places of the old organizations for raising money. Formerly there were sixteen hundred associations, male and female, for this purpose; now there are but six hundred. The place of these associations is most imperfectly supplied by congregational collections. One of the remedies for the evils under which the Board now labours, is suggested by this statement. It is a return to the old and more efficient organizations. How effectual this would probably prove, may be inferred from the case of the churches of Boston. Last year they raised by congregational collections, \$4,836; this year, by even a partial return to the old plan, \$9,940. These organizations may be perfectly simple. They need only a treasurer and collectors. The thing to be done is to present the claims of missions personally to every member of the church and congregation. We are persuaded that this is the right method for that Board, and for those immediately connected with our own church. We sincerely hope that Dr. Anderson's impressive appeal may be the means of speedily relieving the Board from all its difficulties.

The Polymicrian Lexicon to the New Testament. By W. Greenfield. Philadelphia: Henry Perkins, 134 Chesnut street. Boston: Perkins & Marvin, 114 Washington Street.

We are always glad to see our press attempting to rival the English in the publication and style of standard works. This one we think decidedly superior to the English edition. The type is larger and more distinct, the page is a better size and shape, the price is much less, and the proof is more correct. This latter quality is owing to the indefatigable industry and accuracy of Mr. Joseph P. Engles, who acted as editor. This Lexicon is intended to match an edition of the Greek Testament, published a few months ago, under the same auspices. We are glad that the scholarship, industry and accuracy of Mr. Engles has been turned to account in this way, and that we have at last an opportunity to bear our testimony to qualifications, which have been so long devoted to the cause of education and religion, privately and anonymously. For the information of those not acquainted with this Lexicon, in its English dress, we would state that it is based on Wahl's Lexicon, as translated and improved by Professor Robinson. It has all the words in the New Testament and those in Griesbach's various readings, with their derivations, principal inflections, and copious definitions, supported by references to the passages where the word is so applied. When bound with the Testament it still makes a very small pocket volume, and is an invaluable apparatus for studying the New Testament. The enterprising publisher deserves the thanks of Biblical students; and, what will be as much to their interest as his, *their patronage*. The perfect convenience of this arrangement will often tempt one to look into his Greek Testament, and investigate the etymology or exact shade of meaning of a word or passage, when he would have neglected

to do so, if possessed of only the more cumbrous, though more detailed and perfect books on the subject.

The Great Concern of Salvation. By the Rev. Thomas Halyburton. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. William S. Martien, Publishing Agent: 1839.

Though this work has been published some months, it has not fallen in our way till recently. We are surely safe in presuming that our readers are well acquainted with the vigour of intellect, and the deep and scriptural piety which characterize this great man's writings. It is only necessary to say, that the abridgment of the work, (for it has been re-written and abridged for the Board of Publication, by the Rev. C. Corss,) seems to us to be admirably done. It is difficult to imagine how any one can give this work a serious and thorough perusal, without a deep and fixed conviction, that SALVATION is, indeed, THE GREAT CONCERN, and a clear view, (so far as spiritual truth can be made clear without divine influence,) of the nature of that salvation, and of the manner in which it becomes available for sinners.

The Pleasures of Religion. By Henry Forster Burder, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. W. S. Martien, Publishing Agent.

The author treats in a truly pleasing and persuasive manner, the following topics:—The Pleasures which constitute True Happiness: The Pleasures of a Good Conscience: The Pleasures of an Enlightened Intellect: The Pleasures which arise from the Exercise of the Affections in Religion: The Pleasures of Obedience to the Will of God: The Pleasures of Prayer and Praise: The Pleasures of the Sabbath: The Pleasures arising from the doctrine of Divine Providence: The Pleasures of Hope: The Pleasure of Doing Good: The Pleasures of the Heavenly State: The Pleasures of Early Piety.—This is too rich a field for such a mind to fail of gathering an ample and precious harvest. The book also possesses another quality, with which it is more difficult to clothe the discussion of such a subject;—it is decidedly *attractive* even to those who may not be much inclined to seriousness.

The Spirit of Prayer. By the Rev. Nathaniel Vincent, A.M. Philadelphia Presbyterian Board of Publication. W. S. Martien, Publishing Agent: 1840.

The language, style and manner of this little work are somewhat old fashioned: but it is, (as old fashioned books generally are,) a rich, scriptural discussion of the subject. The author treats of the spirit and occasions of prayer,—“*Pray always:*” of the parts, and different kinds of prayer,—“*With all prayer,*” the nature of right prayer,—“*Supplication in the Spirit:*” the duty and necessity of watching along with prayer,—“*Watching thereunto:*” the best manner, and the importance of, persevering in prayer,—“*With all perseverance:*” and the enlarged and liberal spirit of prayer,—“*Supplication for all saints.*” This little book is highly instructive and practical; and breathes a sweet spirit.

A Sermon delivered to the Presbyterian Congregation of Trenton, N. J., at the Dedication of their new house of worship, January 19, 1840. By John W. Yeomans. Trenton: 1840.

This sermon is distinguished by that refinement of thought and polish of diction for which Mr. Yeomans' writings are remarkable. The discourse is founded on a passage in the 66th Psalm, of which a very ingenious interpretation is given, which rests upon the hypothesis of its being a pious contemplation of the future grandeur of that temple which the warrior Psalmist was not to be allowed to see otherwise than in prophetic vision. This forms the introduction. The residue of the discourse is principally taken up in exhibiting the blessedness connected with dwelling "in the courts of the Lord;" with having a family location in a place devoted to the worship of God. A most appropriate subject for a dedication sermon. And it is treated with a felicity, good taste and pious feeling which must have rendered it peculiarly acceptable to the intelligent congregation to which it was addressed.

A History of the Rise, Progress, Genius and Character of American Presbyterianism: together with a Review of "The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. By Charles Hodge, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J." By William Hill, D.D. Washington: J. Gideon, Jr. 1840. pp. 240.

As we have just received this work, we can do little more than announce its title. This volume is the first of a series which Dr. Hill proposes to publish on the history of our church. The present number is altogether preliminary, bringing the history no further than to the formation of the first presbytery in 1705. As we hope to have the opportunity of paying our respects to Dr. Hill in our next number, we dismiss his work for the present with this slight notice.

Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah. By Albert Barnes. Three vols. 8vo.

We have not yet had an opportunity of examining this work. But as Mr. Barnes is so well known, both as a writer and commentator, our readers can be at no loss to form a probable estimate of its character.

A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life: adapted to all orders of Christians. By the Rev. William Law, A.M. Carefully revised and abridged, by Howard Malcom, A.M. Third stereotype edition. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1839. 18mo. pp. 336.

As reprints of this celebrated and extraordinary book are continually demanded, it is certainly desirable that it should be given to the public, as in the present instance, purged from those sentiments which are repugnant to the views of the great bulk of Christians. This expurgation Mr. Malcom appears to have effected in an honest and laudable manner. But the great vice of the work is one which no pruning can reach; its defect, namely, of the gospel. Admitting to the full the piety, the ascetic fascinations, and the

cogent eloquence of the work which struck the minds, not only of Johnson and Wesley, but of Gibbon, we must still protest against a Christless devotion. No doubt we should agree with the excellent editor in our opinion of the only way of entering on a life of religion, but we disagree with him in thinking that it is a sufficient apology for the absence of Christ's justifying righteousness and "the mode of conversion," that the book was addressed to *professed Christians*. For every chapter of the work shows that those to whom it is addressed, whether professed Christians or not, are such as need, first of all, to be led to Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. If the beautiful volume can be read, with a due sense of this, it may be as useful as it is popular.

