

507
12, 23

THE

CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

VOL. VI.

NEW SERIES, VOL. I.

—◆—

BOSTON.

PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
CORNER OF WASHINGTON AND SCHOOL STREETS.

LONDON, BY ROWLAND HUNTER.

LIVERPOOL, BY EDWARD WILLMER.

1829.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

NO. XXXI.

NEW SERIES—NO. I.

MARCH, 1829.

Revivalists, dissensions among the, 101, 122, 124—to be explained on philosophical principles, 104—as exhibited at New Lebanon, 109–113—not composed by that body, 113—nor by the publication of Dr Beecher and Mr Nettleton's Letters, 113—their political effects in the West, 114—their acknowledged tendency to promote 'Socinianism, Unitarianism, and Universalism,' 114—curious document published by the parties, 115

Revival of Religion in Troy, its characteristic features, 101, 120–122—in the upper counties of New York, 101

Revivals of Religion, Letters of an English Traveller on, 101—Messrs Beecher and Nettleton's Letters on the 'New Measures' in conducting, 101—considered as a means of grace, 101—their importance as exhibited in the New Lebanon Convention, 101—but recently in favor with Calvinists, 102—opposed not only by Unitarians, but by Catholics, Lutherans, High Churchmen, Quakers, and Universalists, 103—how regarded by some Presbyterians and Orthodox Congregationalists, 103

Revival System, 102—its disorders opposed by some New-England Revivalists, 105—responsible for the extravagances always attending it, 127—its obnoxious measures not mere abuses, 128—not productive of more good than evil, 129



- ART. VI.—1. *Letters of an English Traveller to his Friend in England, on the 'Revivals of Religion' in America.* Boston. Bowles and Dearborn. 1828. 18mo. pp. 142.
2. *A Sermon, preached in the Presbyterian Church at Troy, March 4, 1827.* By the REV. CHARLES G. FINNEY. Philadelphia. 1827. 8vo. pp. 16.
3. *Letters of the Rev. Dr Beecher and Rev. Mr Nettleton, on the 'New Measures' in conducting Revivals of Religion. With a Review of a Sermon, by NOVANGLUS.* New York. G. & C. Carvill. 1828. 8vo. pp. 104.
4. *A Delineation of the Characteristic Features of a Revival of Religion in Troy, in 1826 and 1827.* By J. BROCKWAY, Lay Member of the Congregational Church in Middlebury, Vt., now a Citizen of Troy. Troy. 1827. 8vo. pp. 64.
5. *A Contrast of Josephus Brockway's Testimony and Statement.* By a BRIEF REMARKER. Troy. 1827. pp. 19.
6. *Revivals of Religion, considered as Means of Grace; a Series of Plain Letters to Candidus, from his friend Honestus.* Ithaca. 1827. 8vo. pp. 39.
7. *The Importance of Revivals as Exhibited in the late Convention at New Lebanon, considered in a Brief Review of the Proceedings of that Body.* By PHILALETES. Ithaca. 1827. pp. 19.

THESE publications, with two or three other authorities which we shall cite as we proceed, will enable us to set before our readers some account of the difference which has arisen among the Revivalists, of the merits of the controversy, and of the singular pacification or truce which has been concluded between the parties. In the former series of this journal* we gave some notices of a great religious excitement, which has been agitating the upper counties of New York for the last three or four years; and it is chiefly with a view to continue the history, and bring it down to the present day, that we return to the subject.

We have no reason to suppose that anything we can say will have much effect on the leaders and principal agitators in these religious disturbances; for they are men who seem to have their full share of vanity and ambition, neither of which, they

* No. for May and June, 1827.

know, can be gratified without keeping up what is termed the Revival System. Probably there are some exceptions, but most of them must certainly be conscious, that they owe their consequence and standing much less to any real superiority of mind, than to the opportunity afforded, in an unnatural and feverish state of society, for the action and display of the only qualities for which they are at all distinguished, a coarse and impassioned eloquence, and some talents for intrigue. Still we trust, that the great body of the people, who cannot be influenced by any of these considerations, and who are generally, at such times, but little more than passive instruments in the hands of their spiritual guides, have not yet so far renounced their good sense and independence, as to be either unwilling or afraid to open their eyes on the evidence, clearer than day, that they have been misled and betrayed. In the moment of excitement, when their passions were up, and they were committed in a thousand ways, and in some sense pledged to the measure as a party measure, to have attempted to convince or persuade them would have been labor thrown away. But now that the fever has subsided, and they have had time to reflect, and look back on the mortifying issue of the revival, and the bitterness and disunion it has generated even among its original friends and supporters, it cannot be that a calm, serious, and impartial discussion of the subject will be lost on a community remarkable for intelligence and sound judgment.

The revival question ought to be treated, and we are convinced will be more and more, as a merely practical question, respecting which Christians who differ most in regard to doctrines, may be perfectly agreed. The Christians, so called, are understood to be with but few exceptions Unitarian; and yet no sect in this country has availed itself to a greater degree of revival measures in gaining influence and numbers; or conducted them, for the most part, more judiciously, or more successfully. The Methodists also are now, and always have been, decidedly and avowedly Arminian; and yet to them belongs the responsibility, not indeed of introducing revivals in the first instance, but of reducing them to a system, and the process of getting them up to a science, and almost to a distinct profession. On the other hand, it is quite a recent thing for the great body of proper Calvinists, either in this country, or in Europe, to look on these local excitements as being any better than a kind of epidemic enthusiasm, favored and pro-

moted by some of the more ignorant and fanatical sects. At this moment the opposition to revivals is far from being confined to the Unitarians of New England, but is carried on, certainly with as much earnestness, and in general, we must think, with less candor and discrimination, by the Catholics throughout the country, by most Lutherans, by the High Church party among the Episcopalians, and by the Quakers and Universalists to a man. Nay, it is believed that a majority of the judicious and well disposed among the Presbyterians and Orthodox Congregationalists, are now convinced that the experiment has been fairly tried, and that the result has proved the measure to be essentially bad, or at least so extremely dangerous, that no enlightened friend of good order and decency can wish to see it repeated. These facts show how much confidence is to be reposed in those, who still persist in maintaining, that revivals are the peculiar and spontaneous fruit of Orthodoxy, that they are never suspected and condemned but by infidels, scoffers, and Unitarians, and that opposition to them always indicates enmity to what are termed doctrines of grace, and vital godliness.

We are aware, that, to some at least, the whole subject is becoming trite and ungrateful; but we entirely accord with a writer in one of the pamphlets before us, a friend of Mr Nettleton, as to all attempts which have been made, or can be made, to hush up this controversy.

‘I think that those who are for stopping the discussion, are in a mistake respecting the true policy in the case. I think much of *Cotton Mather’s* warning: “There was a town called Amyclæ, which was ruined by silence. The rulers, because there had been some false alarms, forbade all people, under pain of death, to speak of any enemies approaching them: so, when the enemies came indeed, no man durst speak of it, and the town was lost. *Corruptions will grow upon the land, and they will gain by silence.* It will be so invidious to do it, no man will dare to speak of the corruptions; and the fate of Amyclæ will come upon the land.”’ *Letters on the ‘New Measures,’* pp. 24, 25.

Disputes on speculative points dwindle almost into insignificance, in our view, when compared with this momentous question as to the best means by which religion, considered as a practical principle, may be diffused in the community, and its tone elevated and purified. Let none fear that the controversy,

if properly conducted, will bring religion itself under suspicion, by lifting the veil from the errors and delusions, with which it has been sometimes associated. Astronomy, chemistry, and medicine did not suffer from an exposure of the follies and absurdities of astrologers and alchemists. Everybody knows, indeed, that the best things may be abused; and also that abuses of the best things are often the worst things. Besides, though the general sentiment at this moment may be against revivals, we cannot be sure it will last; nay, we have no reason to expect it will last long, if founded merely on recent mortification and disappointment, or on sudden disgusts, and not on inquiry and reflection, and a thorough understanding of the whole subject. It is said that these excitements, when managed judiciously, may be made to recur once in about three years, according to some; and once in about seven, according to others; that is, the people, after such an interval, will allow the necessary measures to be repeated, and the same or similar effects will follow. But when they are managed badly, and are attended with great and scandalous excesses, it takes, of course, a much longer time for the people to forget the impositions which have been practised on them, and the utter futility of all such attempts, so far as experience has yet gone, to improve the public morals. We wish to prevent, altogether, periodical returns of a popular delusion of this description; and to do so it is not enough to publish single outrages to which it has led, but we must also show that the system itself is unsound, and that these outrages are its natural and proper results, and not merely incidental.

This bitter and awkward schism among those who are still understood to favor what is termed the *Revival Cause*, presents moreover an interesting subject of investigation, apart from its moral bearings, and considered merely as a singular revolution in the history of parties, for which we are to account, as we easily can, on philosophical principles. We shall not volunteer our services as umpire in this quarrel, but content ourselves with proving that the more temperate, perhaps we ought to say the more politic party, have made their practice more consistent with reason and propriety, by making it less so with the revival system; and, on the other hand, that their opponents have effectually exposed and refuted the system by showing to what it must lead, if fully and honestly acted out. At the same time it is but justice to the *Revivalists* of *New England* to say,

that, whether consistently or not with the theory they still profess to hold, they have dared to raise their voice against many prevailing disorders, and ought not therefore to be accused of aiding and abetting these particular disorders, except indirectly and unintentionally. It is true, if a man from a busy and meddlesome disposition, or from a desire of influence or notoriety, begins by countenancing licentious and disorganizing principles, he is responsible for the consequences, and even for those consequences which he does not foresee, nor wish; but his responsibility is considerably lessened in regard to those consequences, which, as soon as they appear, he is among the first to condemn and disown.

In the article referred to above we noticed briefly the origin of the great Western Revival in the summer and autumn of 1825, the steps which were taken to produce it, the character of the principal agents, and some of the unhappy excesses to which it had led, prior to the dispute about the 'new measures' as they are called. For a long time the whole movement was regarded by Dr Beecher and his friends with feelings of unmingled satisfaction and triumph, as exhibiting all the marks, ever found in such cases, of a signal work of God, 'the beginning of a new era in revivals in respect to rapidity and universality.' A paragraph which appeared in the *Christian Register*, toward the close of 1826, seems to have been the first to undeceive them as to the real tendency of these proceedings; at least it was the first to alarm them as to the effect which the excesses committed in New York might have on the success of similar attempts of their own in this quarter. Soon after this Dr Beecher addressed a long letter, bearing date January, 1827, to Mr Beman of Troy, on the subject of the extravagances which this gentleman was understood to have instigated; and about the same time a long letter, of the same general tenor, was written by Mr Nettleton, of Connecticut, to Mr Aikin of Utica, another of the disorganizers. These letters were not intended, they say, for publication, but only to be shown to a few persons immediately interested, in hopes that they would cure the evil complained of, without exposing the party to the scandal of an open rupture. They are written with considerable spirit and ability, but not, we must think, in a style or temper likely to effect their object, if the declared object was the real one. To represent the 'new measures' as the machinations of the devil, or as the offspring of a crazed intellect, might do

very well for a pamphlet designed to act on the passions and prejudices of the multitude; but they were not precisely the suggestions to whisper into the ear of the authors of these measures with a view to conciliate and persuade. This remark holds true whether we suppose the authors of these measures to have been knaves, or fanatics, or both; and so it proved.

Accordingly these letters had hardly been received, when Mr Finney, the acknowledged head of the Western faction, preached at Utica, for the first time, his celebrated sermon on the text, 'Can two walk together except they be agreed?' which was afterwards preached at Troy, as the titlepage imports, and then published. This sermon is by no means very eloquent or very profound; but neither is it, assuming the principles avowed by all Revivalists, the weak and flimsy performance his Orthodox opponents would fain have it thought. The doctrine advanced is, that our walking together, that is, our union and harmony as Christians, does not depend on our being agreed in opinion or theory, but on our being agreed in temperament and tastes, and in the tone of our feelings at the moment.

'We not only feel uninterested or displeased and disgusted when a subject different from that which at present engages our affections is introduced and crowded upon us, but if anything even upon the *same subject*, that is far above or below our tone of feeling, is presented, and if our affections remain the same and refuse to be enlisted and brought to that point, we *must* feel uninterested, and, perhaps, grieved and offended. If the subject be exhibited in a light that is below our present tone of feeling, we cannot be interested until it *come up to our feelings*; if this does not take place, we *necessarily* remain uninterested; and if the subject, in this cooling, and to us, degraded point of view, is held up before our mind, and our affections struggle to maintain their height, we feel *displeased*, because our affections are not fed, but opposed. If the subject be presented in a manner that strikes far above our tone of feeling, and our affections grovel, and *refuse to rise*, it does not fall in with and feed our affections, therefore we cannot be interested; it is enthusiasm to us, we are displeased with the warmth in which our affections refuse to participate, and the farther it is above our temperature, the more we are disgusted.' *Sermon*, p. 4.

This interpretation of the text is so much better than the common one, which supposes it to require a uniformity of faith,

at least in fundamentals, that we can almost forgive the wrong still done the prophet, who meant simply to ask the question, 'Can two walk together, unless they agree beforehand to do so;' or, in other words, 'unless they meet by appointment?' Having satisfied himself, however, that the principal cause of difference among Christians is always to be found in the different tone of their feelings at the time, Mr Finney would have it inferred that the Eastern Revivalists objected to the 'new measures,' merely on account of the cold and grovelling state of their own affections. They were offended and disgusted with the 'new measures,' because, to use one of the cant phrases in this controversy, they were not 'up to them;' because they had not as yet reached that degree of fervor and spirituality with which their Western brethren had been blessed.

Mr Finney was immediately seconded in these views by the whole influence of the *Western Recorder*, a religious newspaper published at Utica, which, according to *Honestus*, has acquired the reputation of being a 'most intrepid advocate of fanaticism, and a most accomplished champion of ribaldry and vulgarity.*' All those who wrote or spoke against the prevailing abuses were denounced for their coldness and opposition, and for taking sides with the enemy; and Mr Nettleton, in particular, was roundly charged with uttering and circulating untruths, and precipitating a public discussion which might easily have been prevented by a private interview of the parties. An open rupture having now become inevitable, the following extract from a letter of Dr Beecher to the gentleman last named, which found its way into the newspapers about this time, indicates the course which the writer conceived it advisable to adopt.

'There must be immediately an extensive correspondence and concert formed; ministers must come together and consult, and churches must be instructed and prepared to resist the beginnings of evil,—the mask must be torn off from Satan coming among the sons of God, and transforming himself into an angel of light. In the mean time, no pains should be spared to save brothers Finney and Beman, both on account of the great evil they will not fail to do on lawless converts; and the great good they may do, if they are kept within their orbit.—Should all these measures fail, then we *must* publish your letter to Aikin, and mine to Beman if it be thought best. We shall

**Revivals of Religion, &c.* p. 18.

need both in New England as manifestos to stop the mouths of Socinians and others who would be glad to blast revivals by the evils arising from the West.—‘I would try silent measures first, by correspondence and forming public opinion, and putting ministers and churches on their guard, and publish only when it becomes manifest there is no hope of reformation—not however delay publishing too long, because the letters should “precede the storm.”’*

The policy here recommended was sufficiently refined and subtle, but not sound, as the event has shown; which is almost always the case when ecclesiastics turn diplomatists. The people of the West do not appear to have felt themselves much flattered by this attempt on the part of two or three unauthorised individuals to bring over a whole community to their way of thinking and acting, by *secret management*; by writing private letters, despatching emissaries, sowing dissensions in churches, and tampering with the disaffected. A more open policy, considered merely as policy, would unquestionably have been wiser and more successful, as well as more honorable; for, in the first place, it was no easy thing to overreach adepts, like Finney and Beman, in trick and manœuvre; and besides, they might have foreseen that their personal influence and reputation in that quarter, and among all parties, would be seriously impaired, and almost annihilated, by the detection and exposure of such practices. Secret and underhanded management having failed altogether, as ought to have been expected, the next step to be taken, according to the plan disclosed in Dr Beecher’s letter, was to assemble several of the clergy on both sides, to consult on the unhappy differences which had arisen, and agree, if possible, by mutual consent or compromise, on the general principles by which revivals should be conducted. Such was the origin of the far famed New Lebanon Convention, of which Dr Beecher seems entitled to the credit of having been the first projector, though the letters of invitation which were sent out, were signed by him and Mr Beman, as representatives, we suppose, of the two parties. It is but justice to Mr Nettleton to say, that he appears from the beginning to have been thoroughly convinced of the impolicy of this measure, and so expressed himself in a note declining the honor of a seat in the assembly; though he was afterwards

* Christian Register for March 24, 1827.

induced, at the earnest entreaty of his Eastern friends, to wave his objections, and attend. His objections however are so honest and sensible, and have been so completely verified by the event, that the insertion of two or three of them is necessary to throw light on this part of the narrative.

‘Those who convoke the convention are making too much noise, without any prospect of lessening the evils, and, consequently, will give the subject a new importance. I should greatly prefer a silent convention, on some public occasion like that of a commencement, where the views of brethren who differ may be privately discussed; and in case they should come to any important results, they might be published to the world; otherwise the public mind need not be disturbed.’ *Letters on the ‘New Measures.’* p. 103.

‘I fear that settled ministers at the East and South have not yet *felt* enough of the evils, to appreciate what has already been done; and that these ministers will be obliged to experience more of these evils, before they will take a decisive stand; and the sooner I withdraw, and leave the whole responsibility on them, the better.’ *Id.* p. 103.

‘Finally. To prevent misunderstanding, I am willing that my friends should attend, and do all in their power to prevent the evils feared. But I have no evidence that the principles on which these men acted are in the least altered. On the contrary, I shall be disappointed if they do not attempt to vindicate them, and justify all they have done.’ *Id.* p. 104.

The Convention met at New Lebanon, in the State of New York, July 18, 1827, and consisted in all of nineteen members; and after a busy session of eight days, in which they accomplished nothing, literally nothing, they voted to dissolve, leaving a direction that an account of such of their proceedings as they were willing to divulge, should be published in the *New York Observer*. This curious document was inserted entire in our number for July and August, 1827, of the former series, and a few brief remarks were prefixed, which make it less necessary for us here to dwell on this striking and highly characteristic passage in the history of modern Orthodoxy. We cannot refrain, however, from giving an extract from the *Letters of an English Traveller* * on this subject; a work which

* This work, as might have been expected, has caused a strong sensation among the Revivalists, and called forth several criticisms, and among the rest a long and foolish review in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*. There are but two charges brought against these *Letters* which deserve notice. It is said

we would again recommend, and it cannot be recommended in any way so effectually, as by giving a quotation.

‘After all, you will ask, what has the Convention accomplished? The answer is, Nothing. Its members might as well have stayed at home. They would have done just as much, and decided just as much, by throwing missives from a distance, as by coming to close action. For what have they done? They have framed a number of propositions so extremely general that scarcely anybody could object to them, and about which everybody knew beforehand that *they* did not differ, and then they have brought forward a number of other propositions to which the two parties alternately listened in a silence, which, if it were not politic, would fairly be construed as sullen, and which may have been both.’ *Letters of an English Traveller*, p. 98.

‘It would seem in fact, as if the Convention felt it dangerous at length to go upon disputed ground, and the first part of their report accordingly dwindles away into some of the most extraordinary moral truisms that, I imagine, ever engaged the deliberations of a grave assembly. The Convention can agree upon nothing but such propositions as these;—that,

“‘Language adapted to irritate,”—is wrong; it was high time to judge so;—that,

“‘All irreverent familiarity with God, such as men use towards their equals”—is improper;—

‘That, “‘To depreciate the value of education”—is not well;—that,

that the writer shows himself to be not only wrong in theory, but an enemy to seriousness and spirituality in religion. Those who pretend this, if they are honest men, have never read the book; for, like the Unitarian publications generally, which this controversy has drawn out, it is remarkable for not dropping a syllable, in the fearless exposure of the follies and vices of fanatics, which can have a tendency to bring religion itself into contempt, or reduce it to a system of cold and dry morality.—The other objection is, that the author’s manner is haughty and supercilious. The answer to this is, that he wrote in the character of an Englishman, and an Episcopalian; and though the question may be fairly raised whether it was judicious to adopt such a disguise, having adopted it, it was necessary to make his manner correspond. By the way, the reviewer in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* promises an article on the New Lebanon Convention. We hope he has not forgotten his pledge; and while he is about it, we trust he will enlighten the world respecting the ‘free conversations,’ and the ‘sundry documents,’ which occupied the attention of that ill starred conclave during the last two days of the session. Let him remember, that one of the resolutions, passed unanimously in that assembly, was the following;—‘No measures are to be adopted in promoting revivals of religion, which those who adopt them are unwilling to have published, or which are improper to be published to the world.’

“To state things which are not true, for the purpose of awakening sinners,” is a bad thing. Again,

“The immediate success of any measure, without regard to its scriptural character,” i. e. without regard to its rectitude, “does not justify it.”

“No measures are to be adopted for promoting revivals, which those who adopt them, are unwilling to have published.”

‘If propositions like these, need to be so solemnly laid down, what must be the inference? What must be the state of things, and what the tone of morality, when a Convention of the clergy, who have “compassed sea and land,” hill-country and champagne, four hundred miles over, sit gravely down, and solemnly vote, that dark intrigues, unconscionable expedients, angry speeches, lying, and impiety, are bad things, and wrong? What would be thought of the state of society, where a company of merchants should get together, and pass formal resolutions, declaring that fraud, cheating, and falsehood were wrong, and ought not to have countenance? This Convention for supporting and defending revivals, could not possibly have framed a severer *satire* upon revivals than they have done!’

Id. pp. 101–103.

Two resolutions were passed unanimously at this meeting, which indicate, however, that juster notions are beginning to prevail everywhere on this subject. On motion of Mr Edwards all voted, that—

‘There may be so much human infirmity, and indiscretion, and wickedness of man, in conducting a revival of religion, as to render the general evils which flow from this infirmity, indiscretion, and wickedness of man, greater than the local and temporary advantages of the revival; that is, this infirmity, indiscretion, and wickedness of man may be the means of preventing the conversion of more souls than may have been converted during the revival.’

This is well; but it seems to concede, at least in particular instances, all we have ever asserted in regard to revivals; for we never pretended that they answer no good purpose, but only that the evils which they occasion more than outweigh this good. Besides, it places the consistent Revivalist in a dilemma, from which it will not be easy for him to extricate himself; for in the case contemplated in this resolution his first endeavour must be, of course, to correct the evils complained of; but failing in this, as happened in regard to the

revival now under consideration, what is he to do? Either he must oppose the revival, and then he opposes what he at the same time acknowledges to be a work of God; or he must favor it, and then he favors what he at the same time acknowledges is likely to destroy more souls than it saves.

Another resolution moved by the same gentleman, and passed unanimously, augurs well; though we copy it not so much for anything in the proposition itself, as for the comment by Philalethes.

‘Mr Edwards introduced the following proposition :

“The existence in the churches of evangelists, in such numbers as to constitute an influence in the community separate from that of the settled pastors; and the introduction, by evangelists, of measures, without consulting the pastors, or contrary to their judgment and wishes, by an excitement of popular feelings which may seem to render acquiescence unavoidable, is to be carefully guarded against, as an evil which is calculated, or at least liable, to destroy the institution of a settled ministry, and fill the churches with confusion and disorder.

“The motion was seconded. And, after some discussion, the Convention united in a season of prayer.

“After further discussion, the question was taken, and all voted in favor of the proposition, except Mr Churchill, who was absent.”

‘The preceding proposition gives us a hint that the Presbyterian clergy, at least some of them, begin to see what will be the result of lay preaching. Gentlemen, you should have thought of this before now. The truth is, you will find your church more and more distracted, till you put a stop to the custom of allowing unauthorised men and women to lead your meetings, and to attempt expounding the word of God. Your prayer meeting leaders, whether male or female, and your itinerant students and evangelists, are every day, whether you and they believe so or not, unhinging your system. You cannot prevent it, until you fix a distinction between ministers and laymen. At present you have no distinction. For, if they may preach, exhort, expound God’s word, and lead the devotions of the worshipping assembly, why not administer the sacraments? The question does not concern me, but you will do well to take timely care of a valid ministry; and when you get it, allow of no encroachments, male or female. This will no doubt, be for a time, unpopular among you; because you have not a few in your communion, who are not a little proud of their gifts; and while a fondness for display, and the emotions of spiritual pride

have places in the human heart, those whom you have employed to help you, will not readily retire to the ranks, become private Christians, and hold their tongues. Many of them, would no doubt leave you, in order to be continued conspicuous characters in other societies. You had better let them go. Powerful as you are, and popular as you are, you are in more danger from these coadjutors, these revival leaders, these male and female conductors of prayer meetings, than from all other quarters put together. Rest assured this is the language of soberness and truth, and of perfect good nature.' *Importance of Revivals*, pp. 12, 13.

We presume that the mention, or the remotest allusion to this Convention will always be as wormwood and gall to the Eastern members, whose disappointment at the result was heightened by the consciousness of having been completely baffled and outwitted by their opponents in a measure of their own proposing. After a stormy conference in which mutual jealousy and hate were but thinly disguised under the awful name of religion and a disgusting parade of devotional services, the two parties separated more committed than ever, and of course more obstinate in those very differences, which they had come together to heal. Then came the finishing stroke of Dr Beecher's policy, which consisted in giving to the press his own and Mr Nettleton's letters, nearly a year after they were written. And what was the consequence? Mr Finney and his friends, who had spurned these letters in manuscript, now spurned them in print; with this difference only, that the war of recrimination, still more provoked, became louder and more uncompromising. We suspect that many among the Orthodox have learned at last, what we have had occasion to intimate before as one of the worst features of the revival system, that it gives an activity and ascendancy to coarse and vulgar men, which the judicious and better informed of their own party can neither prevent, calculate, nor control.

Meanwhile, everything which by the most charitable construction could be called religion in the excitement, was rapidly subsiding. A reaction had commenced, and in some places the fever heats were beginning to be succeeded by the fever chills. Yet, as usually happens in such cases, the personal jealousies and antipathies engaged in the controversy, instead of abating, were only made more bitter, as an interest in the higher objects with which these passions had been originally

connected, and by which they had been in some respects qualified and restrained, died away. The writings, published and unpublished, which poured in from New England, had some effect undoubtedly on the Western fanatics, and made some converts; but it was only to carry into every church, and almost into every family in the infected district, all the miseries of a domestic broil. Considered merely in a civil and political point of view, it was no slight evil, that the peace of neighbourhoods should be disturbed; that religious societies should be rent; that thousands, through a misguided zeal for God, should neglect their regular and necessary occupations; that sectarian prejudice and rancor should appear in their business and social intercourse, nay, enter into and corrupt their judgments of public men and public measures. The infidel and skeptic found in scenes like these a new argument for distrusting all pretences to piety, the thoughtless and dissolute new temptations to scoff, and the rational Christian a literal and entire fulfilment of his saddest forebodings. Only one good and permanent result is ever likely to grow out of these commotions, a result which is alluded to, though in terms of regret and alarm, in the following extract from one of the pamphlets under review.

‘Among the defenders of these doctrines and measures, and the advocates of revivals, it is common to hear a most unmeasured abuse of Socinianism, Unitarianism, and Universalism. Far be it from me, to attempt any apology for these sects. Would to God it were in my power to persuade them to abandon theories which I honestly believe to be fraught with evil; most gladly would I draw them to embrace a scriptural and consistent system. While I lament the course pursued by these men, I think it easy to see upon what soil they have sprung up and most vigorously flourished. What preceded the preaching of Murray in Scotland, but a powerful exhibition of Calvinistic fanaticism? The same Universalist found a similar field in Boston and its vicinity, and if you will take the trouble to examine, you will find that while Socinians or Unitarians and Universalists, are always hovering upon each others’ borders, both find aliment in those regions where the views fostered by revivals have been most prevalent. It does not require any gift of prophecy to foretel that the religious history of New England will hereafter confirm the position here taken.’ *Revivals of Religion*, p. 28.

It is a natural consequence that the intelligent and reflective among the Orthodox, on witnessing the practical evils to which their system has led, should be disposed to reexamine its evidences. Truth can never hope to make progress unless a spirit of free inquiry is awakened, and in places where this spirit can only be awakened by disorder and outrage, we may lament indeed the occasion, but we must at the same time adore that Providence which makes it the parent of good. We are aware that acting under strong impulses, a community are peculiarly liable, in flying from one extreme, to be hurried into another. In all such cases, however, when men adopt crude and loose opinions as a refuge from Calvinism, we hope and trust that experience, and common sense, and the obvious sense of scripture, will soon correct the errors, which, if they had considered them in all their bearings, they would have rejected at first. This, we must think, will be the history of the distinguishing and obnoxious principles of modern Universalism.

Alarmed at length by the cry, that Orthodoxy was in danger, the authors of this schism published the following document, with which we shall close our historical notices. We give it entire, and without comment, as it needs none.

‘The subscribers having had opportunity for free conversation on certain subjects pertaining to Revivals of Religion, concerning which we have differed, are of opinion that the general interests of Religion would not be promoted by any further publications on those subjects, or personal discussions; and we do hereby engage to cease from all publications, correspondences, conversations and conduct, designed or calculated to keep those subjects before the public mind; and that, so far as our influence may avail, we will exert it to induce our friends on either side to do the same.

(Signed,)

LYMAN BEECHER,	EBENEZER CHEEVER,
DERICK C. LANSING,	JOHN FROST,
S. C. AIKIN,	NATHAN S. S. BEMAN,
A. D. EDDY,	NOAH COE,
C. G. FINNEY,	E. W. GILBERT,
SYLVESTER HOLMES,	JOEL PARKER.

‘*Philadelphia, May 27, 1828.*’

Here we might stop; but before quitting the subject we wish to go more at length into the merits of the controversy respecting the ‘new measures,’ as they are termed. In doing this we shall give frequent and copious extracts from the writers on

both sides, not only because fairness and candor require it, but because the extracts themselves will be found to be curious and interesting, and to most of our readers entirely new. They will also serve to authenticate and confirm almost everything we have ever said against revivals, and being so many reluctant confessions wrung from friends to the system, they cannot be suspected of coloring or exaggeration.

In describing the course pursued by Finney himself, Mr Nettleton says;—

‘The account which his particular friends give of his proceedings, is, in substance, as follows;—He has got ministers to agree with him only by “crushing,” or “breaking them down.” The method by which he does it, is by creating a necessity, by getting a few individuals in a church to join him, and then all those who will not go all lengths with him are denounced as enemies to Revivals; and rather than have such a bad name, one and another falls in to defend him; and then they proclaim what ministers, elders, and men of influence have been “crushed” or “broken down.” This moral influence being increased, others are denounced, in a similar manner, as standing out, and leading sinners to hell. And to get rid of the noise, and save himself, another will “break down.” And so they wax hotter and hotter, until the church is fairly split in twain. And now, as for those elders and Christians, who have thus been converted to these measures; some of them are sending out private word to their christian friends abroad, as follows;—“I have been fairly *skinned* by the denunciations of these men, and have ceased to oppose them, to get rid of their noise. But I warn you not to introduce this spirit into your church and society.”’ *Letters on the ‘New Measures.’* p. 12.

‘They do cultivate and awaken in others, what very much resembles the passion of anger, wrath, malice, envy, and evil speaking. This is the inevitable consequence of their style of preaching. As Dr Griffin observed, “It sounds like the accredited language of profanity,” or as a pious woman of color in Troy expressed it, “I do wonder what has got into all the ministers to swear so in the pulpit.”’ *Id.* p. 13.

The same writer makes the following judicious reflections on Mr Finney’s sermon.

‘The sermon in question entirely overlooks the nature of true religion. It says not one word, by which we can distinguish between true and false zeal, true and false religion. Indeed it does not seem to hint that there can be any such thing as false

zeal and false religion. If the tone of feeling can only be raised to a certain pitch, then all is well. The self-righteous, the hypocrite, and all who are inflated with pride, will certainly be flattered and pleased with such an exhibition; especially if they be very self-righteous and very proud. False affections often rise far higher than those that are genuine; and this every preacher, in seasons of revival, has had occasion to observe and correct. And the reason of their great height is obvious. There are no salutary checks of conscience—no holy, humble exercises, to counteract them in their flight. And they court observation. “A Pharisee’s trumpet shall be heard to the town’s end, when simplicity walks through the town unseen.” If the preacher is not extremely careful to distinguish between true and false affections, the devil will certainly come in and overset and bring the work into disgrace. False zeal and overgrown spiritual pride will rise up and take the management, and condemn *meekness* and *humility*, and trample upon all the christian graces, because they are not “up to it.” *Id.* p. 30.

‘On reading the sermon in question, I was reminded of the repeated complaints which for some time past I have heard from the most judicious, experienced, and best revival ministers in the West; the substance of which is as follows;—“There are various errors in the mode of conducting Revivals in this region, which ought to be distinctly pointed out. That on the prayer of faith. This talking to God as a man talks to his neighbour, is truly shocking—telling the Lord a long story about A. or B., and apparently with no other intent than to produce a kind of stage effect upon the individual in question, or upon the audience generally. This mouthing of words; those deep and hollow tones, all indicative that the person is speaking into the ears of man, and not to God. I say nothing of the nature of the petitions often presented; but *the awful irreverence of the manner!* How strange that good men should so far forget themselves, as evidently to play tricks in the presence of the great God.”’

Id. p. 35.

Another Orthodox writer under the signature ‘Novanglus,’ in reviewing the sermon abovementioned, reprobates in the strongest terms, the irregularities to which the ‘new measures’ have led.

‘If an individual *awakes*; that is, if he adopts these new measures, and gets full of that kind of animal feeling which they promote, he must try to bring his minister into the same spirit; and if he cannot succeed, he must go about and try to raise a party to “shake him off.” I have heard of such advice

being given privately to individuals, in particular cases, but this is the first time I have ever known it to be publicly preached and printed, as serious advice in all cases. And what is the rule by which individual church members may know when it is their duty to set about this work, and try to “shake off their sleepy minister?” No rule is given in this immediate connexion; but perhaps one is found on the 12th page;—“If the *matter* of preaching is right, and the sinner is *pleased*, there is something defective in the *manner*.” If the unconverted part of the congregation are generally satisfied with the minister, it is a certain indication that he is a “sleepy minister,” and ought to be “shaken off.” Individuals, then, have only to ask whether the congregation are generally in peace, and satisfied with their minister; and if they are, it is their duty to commence measures to drive him away.’ *Id.* pp. 70, 71.

He mentions an attempt of this kind against a Mr Williston, of Durham.

‘The story is, in substance as follows;—A young convert from the West made his appearance there, saying, that he “knew all about how to conduct Revivals,” and pointing to the meetinghouse, told of the “abominations that were portrayed on those walls.” He talked insolently to the minister, and then to the people against him. And after an evening lecture which Mr W. preached, he dropped on his knees, and told the Lord a long story about Mr W., and how he had talked to him, and what he had said in his sermon that was false, and so tried to convince the people and the Lord that Mr W. was a liar, and going down to hell if he did not repent. Upon Mr W’s trying to calm the people, by putting the most charitable construction upon his conduct, that of his not being in his right mind, his brother, who was a member of the church, arose, and told the people that Mr W. was “the head Achan in the camp,” and that “his character was as black as hell,” &c., upon which some went and tried to still them, while the minister and others retired. For his conduct that evening, this member was labored with by the brethren, and justified himself on the principles of this sermon. He said he had nothing against Mr W., but he “did it to have a revival.”’ *Id.* pp. 71, 72.

No writer, however, inveighs with so much severity, or with so much power against his Western brethren, as Dr Beecher, of this city. He is speaking of the self-sufficiency and recklessness of consequences, which the ‘new measures’ induce.

‘For why should a good man stop, who knows certainly that

he is right exactly, and that all men are wrong in proportion as they differ from him? This unquestionably was the state of mind to which Davenport and his followers came. He and they, upon the subject of promoting Revivals, were undoubtedly the subjects of a religious nervous insanity. They mistook the feeling of certainty and confidence produced by nervous excitement, and perverted sensation, for absolute knowledge, if not for inspiration; and drove the whirlwind of their insane piety through the churches with a fury which could not be resisted, and with a desolating influence which in many places has made its track visible to the present day. It was this "know-certain-feeling," which emboldened Davenport to chastise aged and eminent ministers, and to pray for them, and denounce them as unconverted, and to attempt to break them down by promoting separations from all who would not conform implicitly to his views, by setting on fire around them the wood, hay, and stubble, which exist in most communities, and may easily be set on fire, at any time, by rashness and misguided zeal; and so far as my observation extends, the man who confides exclusively in himself, and is inaccessible to advice and influence from without, has passed the bounds of sound reason, and is upon the confines of destruction.' *Id.* pp. 93, 94.

He remarks in another place;—

'No mode of reasoning is so safe as matter-of-fact reasoning, if properly conducted; and none perhaps is so liable to be perverted to purposes of sophistry. The grounds of deception are two;—1. Drawing general conclusions from particular premises; inferring that because some preacher's mode of address or action has been useful in some circumstances, it is applicable to all circumstances. As if a physician, on discovering a remedy for some disease, should make it his standing and universal prescription in all cases; as if the shipmaster, who had once been driven out to sea before boisterous winds, without anchor, or compass, or chart, or rudder, and who reached by miracle his port in safety, should return to denounce henceforth these means of safety, and insist that nothing was needed to conduct auspiciously the commerce of the whole world but a direct course, and mountain waves, and all sails standing, and a hurricane for a breeze. 2. Judging from limited views and immediate effects, without regarding general and permanent results. The world, both material and intellectual, is governed by general laws, and though the violation of them may produce a temporary good, the certain result, on the great scale, will be more than a balance of general evil. Now the importance of the soul and of eternity is

such, as that good men in a revival are apt to feel no matter what is said or done, provided sinners are awakened and saved. But it ought to be remembered, that though the immediate result of some courses of conduct may be the salvation of some souls, the general and more abiding result may be the ruin of a thousand souls, destroyed by this conduct, to one saved by it; and destroyed by it as instrumentally in the direct and proper sense of the term, as any are saved by it. The sovereignty of God is not to be relied on in violation of the great laws of the moral world, but in accordance with them. When the thousands were to be sealed, the four angels were commanded to hold the winds, and keep back the judgments which they should afterwards execute, because war and distress would impede his work of mercy. Hence our Saviour introduced the gospel dispensation gradually, as the mind of man could bear it; not putting new wine into old bottles; and hence, too, Davenport, disregarding the general consequences of his conduct, and intent only on its immediate result, though he saved a few, doubtless entailed moral desolation, and darkness, and death, upon thousands of unborn generations.' *Id.* pp. 94, 95.

Again he says;—

'All your periodical Christians, who sleep from one revival to another, will be sure to blaze out now; while judicious ministers and the more judicious part of the church, will be destined to stand, like the bush, in the midst of the flames; while these periodical Christians will make up, by present zeal for their past stupidity, and chide as cold hearted formalists, those, whose even, luminous course sheds reproof on their past coldness and stupidity. The converts too will catch the same spirit; and go forth to catechise aged Christians; and wonder why old saints don't sing, and make the heavenly arches ring, as they do; and that shall come to pass, which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, as the destruction of human society and the consummation of divine wrath upon man, when children shall be princes in the church, and babes shall rule over her, and the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honorable.' *Id.* p. 97.

We find the best account of the 'prayer of faith,' and 'particularity in prayer,' on which so much stress has been laid by the friends of the 'new measures,' in Mr Brockway's *Delineation*.

'To pray the prayer of faith, was, to pray with a full conviction and a firm belief, that the petition would be heard and

answered. Nay, more, it was to believe that it would be answered without a moment's delay. All prayers that come short of this faith were not only worthless, but were mockery; and an insult offered to God. To exercise this faith was the indispensable duty of every Christian; without it, he could not pray, and without it he had no evidence of his acceptance with God. We were told by Mr Beman, in the most positive manner, that if we prayed for anything without expecting and believing that we should have it immediately, we were guilty of a most horrible attempt to mock and insult the Omniscient God. There was no such thing recognized by God as prayer, but that which asked, expected, and received the thing sought, without a moment's delay.' *Delineation*, pp. 16, 17.

The description he gives of what they meant by 'particularity in prayer,' is so thoroughly offensive and shocking, that we can hardly bring ourselves to insert it; but the truth, perhaps, had better be known.

'I will, for the benefit of those unacquainted with the practice'—'give a description of this particularity, as practised by those who had been thoroughly trained to this mode of praying. The first thing to be regarded as indispensable, is to introduce the individual by name; and in this, great care is to be taken that the name be rightly called, as a misnomer has, it is said, been the occasion of disappointment in the looked for result. The next thing in order, is to tell what God knows of the individual. If, perchance, the subject be a female, her sex must first be noticed, followed with, "O, Lord! thou seest this hardened enemy of thine;"—for it has been considered wickedness to call a sinner by a softer name than God's enemy—"Thou seest how she has raised her female hands against Thee; and how she is stretching out her puny female hands to lay hold of Thee, and pull Thee from thy throne. See, Lord, how full her hands are of sharp arrows to fight Thee. Thou seest how she is hurling her defiance at Thee. Thou knowest how black her heart is, and how her enmity to Thee rankles and burns with all the malice of a demon." And, if she be present, it must be added, "Thou seest how she has come in here with thy little ones, too proud to kneel before Thee; Thou knowest that she has come in here on purpose to mock Thee, and insult Thee to thy face." After completing this description, which, by the by, was often drawn out far beyond what I have here quoted, then might follow the petition, or imprecation—"Now, Lord God Almighty! come down upon this enemy of thine; break in upon her; break her down, O Lord, break her down;"—this

could not be too often repeated—"break in upon her. And if thou hast one thunderbolt in store, heavier than another, come, God Almighty, and break it over her head. Break her down; crush her at thy feet; slay her before Thee!"

'This is particularity in prayer. But, in case the subject or subjects, be males—for, from six to twelve names were frequently introduced in the same prayer—then the description and petition must vary with circumstances; as "O Lord! Thou knowest he is a hardened wretch; thou seest how he has raised his crest against Thee. Thou knowest, Lord, how vile his heart is; and how nothing is wanting to make him a perfect devil, but for Thee to strip the covering from his heart. Now, Lord, don't let him boast himself against Thee; but draw thy sword and come down upon him; drive it through his heart, and let him bleed at thy feet, that thine enemies may see it and be afraid."

'This is a fair, though faint specimen of the kind of praying which has been so abundant in Troy. I say a *faint* specimen, because, to render it any ways complete, it should be accompanied with loud groans, and with all that kind of action which denotes extreme distress.' *Id.* pp. 22-4.

These are weighty charges, but we must not suppose that the Western Revivalists are dumb before their accusers. They have their vindication, which, assuming the principles admitted by both parties, is at least plausible; and besides, they have their complaints of injury and wrong, in urging which they also become accusers in their turn. They contend that many of the reports which have been propagated against them by their Orthodox opponents, are unfounded and calumnious; and very likely this is true to a certain extent. We are particularly struck in this connexion with their treatment of Mr Brockway. After having proved, as they think, 'that every material part of his printed statement relative to his own testimony' before the Presbytery of Troy, in the trial of Mr Beman, 'is without foundation, and utterly untrue;' that 'his oath and his book are at war,'—they go on gravely to remark, that they have not done this 'for the purpose of casting reflections, of arraigning motives, or of impugning character,' or of affecting him in any way, as 'a member of the church in good and regular standing.'* Are we to infer from this, that in Orthodox churches a member may be convicted of perjury, or deliberate falsehood, or

* Contrast of Josephus Brockway's Testimony and Statement. pp. 17, 18.

both, without losing or endangering his good and regular standing? In these churches, if a man is seen once at the theatre, or is present at a ball, or rides a few miles on Sunday, he is immediately brought to his confessions, or cut off as a diseased member; but are we to understand that he may be guilty of perjury or deliberate falsehood, and still retain his good and regular standing? Will a bitter sarcasm about his 'short memory,' intended merely as an insult, authorise them to look on a man so convicted, in any other light than as one who has forfeited all pretensions, we do not say to religion only, but to common honesty? The truth is, that the two parties are at issue here on a very serious question, and we leave them to extricate themselves from the difficulty as they can.

Mr Finney and his friends contend, further, that much of the opposition to the 'new measures,' has grown out of a desire to conciliate the ungodly. 'Since the session of the Presbytery, Mr Beman told me in private conversation,' says Mr Brockway, 'that Dr Beecher had set up to oppose revivals for fear they were getting to be unpopular.' We suspect there is some foundation for this remark. For some years back a large portion of the Congregational and Presbyterian clergy in this country, have been gradually sliding into the same methods of gaining influence, which were first adopted by Whitefield and Wesley; and the policy, for a time at least, has been attended with something of the same success. This, of course, has gratified their lust of power; but it has been attended with the mortifying circumstance, that while they were gaining the same sort of ascendancy, it was over the same sort of people. The higher and better informed classes, though affected a little at first, soon began as a body to withdraw and stand aloof, leaving the ministers in question to find their hearers and companions in the same rank in society with the early Methodists. It has long been a favorite object with Dr Beecher, and some others, to introduce such a modification of the revival system, as will command the respect at least of educated men, and men of the world; and undoubtedly one of the reasons which have made him so active against the 'new measures,' has been the extreme disgust they were likely to excite, in persons of this description, against revivals generally.

Again, the Western party complain that the policy which the Orthodox of New England have adopted in opposing the 'new measures,' has been throughout mean, underhanded, and

disingenuous. This is well expressed in a resolution which Mr Finney's friends had the courage to bring forward in the Convention; and though understood at the time to reflect severely on the conduct of some of the members, it was carried by a majority of one.

'The writing of letters to individuals in the congregations of acknowledged ministers, or circulating letters which have been written by others, complaining of measures which may have been employed in revivals of religion; or visiting the congregations of such ministers, and conferring with opposers without conversing with the ministers of such places, and speaking against measures which have been adopted; or for ministers residing in the congregations of settled pastors to pursue the same course, thus strengthening the hands of the wicked, and weakening the hands of settled pastors, are breaches of christian charity, and ought to be carefully avoided.'

In the doings of a public body the charge is not connected, of course, with the terms of vituperation and abuse, so lavishly bestowed on other occasions. But it is painful to dwell on an altercation about motives, neither edifying nor respectable, especially when we consider the office and standing of the persons implicated, and that both parties still affect to call one another brethren.

We hasten to Mr Finney's sermon, in which, as we have intimated before, he undertakes to account philosophically for the opposition which has been made to the 'new measures,' and also for the misunderstandings, divisions, and disgusts to which they have given rise. According to his theory these new measures, as they are called, are nothing more than the common revival system carried out a little further; that is, as he thinks, more elevated, more purified, made more spiritual. But to be able to approve or sympathize in these measures it is necessary that the individual's feelings and affections should be raised to the same pitch of celestial love and harmony; and the true reason why such men as Dr Beecher and Mr Nettleton are offended and disgusted with these measures, is to be found in the cold, sluggish, and grovelling state of their hearts. We prefer, however, to let Mr Finney speak for himself.

'Again—We see why ministers and Christians visiting revivals, often, at first, raise objections to the means used, and cavil, and sometimes take sides with the wicked. The fact is, coming, as they often do, from regions where there are no reli-

gious revivals at the time, they frequently feel reproved and annoyed by the warmth and spirit which they witness. The praying, preaching, and conversation are above their present temperature. Sometimes, prejudice on account of its being amongst a different denomination from them, or prejudice against the preacher, or people, or, perhaps, pride, or jealousy, or worldliness, or something of the kind, chains down their affections that they do not enter into the spirit of the work. Now, while their *hearts remain wrong*, they will, of course, cavil; and the nearer right any thing is, the more spiritual and holy, so much the more it *must* displease them while their *affections grovel*.

‘Again—We see why ministers and private Christians differ about *prudential measures*. The man, who sees and feels the infinitely solemn things of eternity, will *necessarily* judge very differently of what is *prudent* or *imprudent*, in the use of means, from one whose spiritual eye is almost closed. The man whose heart is breaking for perishing sinners, will, of course, deem it *prudent*, and right, and necessary, to “use great plainness of speech,” and to deal with them in a very earnest and affectionate manner. He would deem a contrary course highly *imprudent*, and dangerous, and criminal. While he who feels but little for them, and sees but little of their danger, will satisfy himself with using very different means, or using them in a very different manner, and will, of course, entertain very different notions of what is prudent. Hence we see the *same person* having very different notions of *prudence*, and consequently practising very differently, at different times. Indeed, a man’s notions of what is *prudent* as to means and measures in revivals of religion, will depend, and, in a great measure, *ought* to depend, on the state of his own affections, and the state of feeling with which he is surrounded. For what would be prudent under some circumstances, would be highly imprudent in others. What would be prudent in one man, might be highly imprudent in another. What would be prudent for a man in a certain state of his affections, and under certain circumstances, would be the height of imprudence, in the *same person*, in a different state of feeling, and under other circumstances. It is, in most cases, extremely difficult to form, and often very wrong publicly to express, an opinion condemning a measure as *imprudent*, that is not condemned by the word of God, without being in a situation to enter into the feelings and circumstances of the individual and people at the time the measure was adopted. If Christians and ministers would keep these things in mind, a great many *uncharitable and censorious* speeches would be avoided, and much injury to the cause of truth and righteousness would be prevented.’ *Sermon*, p. 7, 8.

‘Again—We learn why churches are sometimes convulsed by revivals of region. In most churches, there are probably more or less hypocrites, who, when revivals are in a measure stripped of animal feeling, and become highly spiritual, are disturbed by the fire and spirit of them, and inwardly and sometimes openly oppose them. But when a part only of the real Christians in a church awake from their slumbers and become very spiritual and heavenly, and the rest *remain* carnal and earthly in their affections, the church is in danger of being torn in sunder. For as those who are awake become more engaged, more spiritual and active, the others, if they *will not awake*, will be jealous and offended, and feeling rebuked by the engagedness of others, will cavil, and find themselves the more displeased, as those that are more spiritual rise farther above them. The nearer to a right state of feeling the engaged ones arrive, the farther apart they are; and as they *ascend* on the scale of holy feeling, if *others will not ascend with them*, the almost certain consequence will be, that these will *descend*, until they really have no *community* of feeling, and can no longer walk together, because they are not agreed. This state of feeling in a church, calls for great searchings of heart in all its members, and although greatly to be dreaded and deeply to be lamented, when it exists, is easily accounted for, upon these plain principles of our nature, and is what sometimes will happen, in spite of the sagacity of men or angels to prevent it.’ *Id.* p. 9.

Before concluding we wish to offer a few reflections on the bearing which this controversy has on the great question, whether revivals, in the common acceptation of that term, ought to be favored and promoted.

We have seen that Orthodox publications, in condemning the excesses and outrages committed at the West, generally designate them as the ‘new measures.’ If by this it is intended to insinuate that similar excesses and outrages have never attended a revival before, or that they have not usually attended great revivals, it is a poor and mean artifice, which their own writings are sufficient to expose. Edwards, Dr Beecher, and Mr Nettleton admit that the same or similar extravagances disgraced the great Munster revival in Germany, the great revival among the English Independents in the time of Cromwell, and the great revival under Wesley and Whitefield. The same is equally true of other revivals less extensive and notorious; among which we may mention that in which the sect of Quakers arose, that under Mrs Hutchinson in the early days of New England,

that of the Moravians at Hernhutt, and that in Kentucky and Tennessee in 1803. Consequently, whether the measures in question are justifiable or not, and whether they properly belong to the revival system or not, it is certain that they are not new, and to call them so is a palpable misnomer.

The New England party endeavour to make it appear that the extravagances committed by their Western brethren afford no ground of objection to the revival system, but are only to be regarded as excrescences, or at most as abuses; and some ascribe them to the direct and preternatural agency of the evil one. We are aware that in the creed of the multitude there is still a remnant of the old Manichean error, which supposes a malignant being to divide with a good being the empire of the world, and that all sin is to be traced to the partial and temporary triumphs of the former. Even on this theory, however, if revivals present peculiar opportunities, of which the devil can and will take advantage to introduce the evils complained of, it is just as much an objection to the whole system, as if these evils could be shown to originate in the system itself, as their natural, and sufficient cause.

Still it may be thought that the revival system is not properly responsible for these excesses and outrages, because they are not necessary to the system, but only incidental and contingent. If by incidental and contingent in this connexion is only meant, that all the extravagances attending revivals do not, however, attend them in every instance, nobody, we presume, will dispute the position. If a man enters an infected city, it does not follow necessarily that he will be seized with the contagion; or if he associates with vicious companions, it does not follow necessarily that he will himself be corrupted. For, in both cases, the consequences of such exposure will depend, at least in some degree, on his peculiar temperament and circumstances, and other predisposing causes. For the same reason, it does not follow necessarily, that the adoption of the revival system in a particular town, or village, will hurry every individual in it, or any individual in it, into all the excesses and outrages to which that system has ever led. A multitude of causes may, and often do, exist to prevent this effect, or at least to limit and qualify it. Nevertheless it is plain, that when these excesses and outrages do in fact follow, they follow as the real consequences, and the natural consequences of the revival system. Certainly, then, it is a valid objection to the whole system, not

only if these excesses and outrages follow from it necessarily and in all cases, but if they follow from it really and naturally, when there is nothing in the existing circumstances to oppose, limit, or qualify its manifest tendencies.

Again, some will contend that the good which Revivals do is immediate, while the evil is remote ; and that the system is properly responsible only for its immediate results. But is this reasoning satisfactory ? The question is, not whether the bad consequences of a revival follow immediately or remotely ; but whether they follow really and naturally. If it be admitted that these evils do really follow from a revival, it is just as much an objection to the whole system, whether they follow to-day or to-morrow, or a thousand years from this time. Besides, we are speaking of excesses, and of course a man is not supposed to begin with excesses, let his system be ever so bad, but to be led into them gradually as the mischievous tendencies of his system are more fully developed. To say that the good which Revivals do is immediate, while the evil is remote, is only to say that the last stages of a revival are always the worst ; which is unquestionably true. But this, instead of obviating the objection we are considering, presents it, as we conceive, in the strongest possible light.

Others prefer to represent the obnoxious measures as abuses, which are not to be charged on the system, but on the ignorance and passions of bad men, by which the system has been misunderstood and perverted. Now we freely admit the impropriety of alleging a few single and occasional abuses of any system as a valid objection to the system itself ; but if we know that the system is peculiarly liable to abuse, this is a valid objection. We must take the world and human nature, as we find them ; and if we know beforehand, or have good reason to expect, that the system in question will be abused in fact, we cannot conscientiously recommend or countenance its introduction. In this case we do not reason, as some might think, from the abuse of a thing, but from its peculiar liability to abuse ; knowing, also, that the same object, so far as it is a good and reasonable one, may be attained by other means entirely unexceptionable. Besides, is it true, that the excesses and outrages, which have usually attended great revivals, are to be considered as abuses of the revival system ? They are abuses of religion, we grant ; but not of this peculiar mode of propagating it. The revival system proceeds on the dangerous and mistaken

principle, that the imaginations and passions of large bodies of men are to be excited, without taking care, at the same time, to enlighten their understandings. It also holds up the idea, and this idea is generally embraced, that the subjects of the revival are moved by an extraordinary and preternatural impulse of the Holy Spirit, which, of course, if real, should supersede and set at nought the ordinary dictates of reason and prudence. Now we think it undeniable, that the worst excesses and outrages, which ever attended a revival, flow naturally from such a state of things; and what can be shown to flow naturally from any system can hardly be counted amongst its abuses.

Driven from every other position, the Revivalist may still say, that even admitting the disorders which often attend revivals to be fairly chargeable on the system, the system is productive of more good than evil, and for this reason, if for no other, ought to be favored. To this we reply, in the first place, that we have no right to do evil, or connive at evil, that good may come, in the hope that the good will preponderate. We are also convinced that the evils directly induced by a revival on the subjects of it, are for the most part greatly underrated. To prove this, we had collected several additional testimonies, chiefly from Orthodox writers; but on turning to them again, we find they will not bear insertion in a work like this, on account of the extreme grossness and indelicacy of many of the suggestions and allusions. We are likewise to take into view the indirect influences of a revival on those who are not the subjects of it, and who are only disgusted by the scenes commonly attending such excitements, and estranged more than ever from God and virtue. We believe that the follies, and extravagances, and fanatical practices of reputed Christians, have done more to make infidels and scoffers, than all other causes put together. Then, too, as we have intimated before, there are other ways in which the same amount of good may be produced, without any of the evils and dangers incurred in revivals. Let the laws of the land be better respected and obeyed; let more attention be paid to the subject of public and general education; let more liberal and honorable principles prevail in the daily intercourse of society, and in the ordinary transactions of business; let the public and fashionable amusements, which have so much to do in determining the character of a people, be thoroughly reformed; let the licentiousness of the press be restrained by public opinion, and let the popular

literature of the day, especially works of poetry and fiction, breathe a purer spirit; in bestowing honor and applause let more regard be had to the moral and religious character, and in elections for civil office let none be raised to places of power and trust but men of approved integrity and worth; let more consistent and practical views of religion be diffused among all classes, and let the standard of preaching be elevated, and its true and proper objects be better understood; finally, let educated men, rich men, and men of standing and influence, take a greater interest in Christianity themselves, and discover more of its influence in their conduct, and do more for its spread. These are the means which God has appointed for a real and general revival of religion. Any system or policy, which pretends to supersede this process, or interferes with it in the smallest measure, or unfits society for it, or has a tendency to turn public attention to any other quarter for help, is to be disowned and rejected.

-
- ART. VII.—1. *The Franklin Primer, or Lessons in Spelling and Reading, adapted to the Understandings of Children; composed and published by a Committee, appointed for the Purpose, by the School Convention of Franklin County.* Fifth Ed. Greenfield. Phelps & Clark. 1828. 18mo. pp. 48.
2. *Secondary Lessons, or the Improved Reader; intended as a Sequel to the Franklin Primer.* By a FRIEND OF YOUTH. Second Edition. Greenfield. Phelps & Clark. 1828. 18mo. pp. 198.
3. *The General Class Book, or Interesting Lessons, in Prose and Verse, on a great Variety of Subjects; combined with an Epitome of English Orthography and Pronunciation, and intended as the Third Book in a Course of Reading, for the Use of Schools.* By the AUTHOR OF THE FRANKLIN PRIMER AND THE IMPROVED READER. Greenfield, Phelps & Clark. 1828. 18mo. pp. 312.
4. *Essays on the Philosophy of Instruction, or the Nurture of Young Minds.* Greenfield. Phelps & Clark. 1829. 18mo. pp. 36.

THESE books are the productions of one and the same author; a gentleman who has paid great attention to the subject of education, and particularly to that of childhood and early youth.