



BX7148
.C8T7

LETTERS

TO THE

REV. LEONARD BACON,

IN REPLY TO HIS ATTACK ON THE

PASTORAL UNION AND THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF CONNECTICUT.

BY REV. GEORGE A. CALHOUN,

Pastor of the Church in North Coventry, Conn.

HARTFORD.

FOR SALE BY ELIHU GEER, 26½ STATE-STREET.

MDCCCL.



CONTENTS.

	Page.
LETTER I.—Occasion of the Correspondence. Letter to the Editor of the New Haven Record. Editor's reply. The Pastoral Union arraigned for trial by Mr. Bacon. Mr. B. responsible for the discussion. Striking resemblance between him and the anonymous correspondent of the Record. Mr. Bacon's method of promoting harmony; viz. by attacking Dr. Nettleton and the Pastoral Union.	3
LETTER II.—General Association. Anonymous censure of its members justified by Mr. B. New School Assembly. Reason of Mr. B's forgetfulness of what occurred at Danbury. Unjust to make persons responsible for what they disclaim. Mr. B's charge of Jacobinism. Sneer at the name of Edwards. Mr. B's charge of prayerful calumny against the Ministers of the East Windsor Convention.	7
LETTER III.—Pastoral Union. Grew out of an attempt to subvert N. E. Calvinism. Its object important, its measures peaceable and Scriptural. Mr. B's protest against the Protest, fails of disclosing "the root and essence of existing difficulties." Difference between the New Haven divines and their opponents, not trifling. So thought Griffin, Cornelius, and others. Mr. B's awkward apology for Dr. Taylor; viz. The more he writes, the more sure he is to be misunderstood. A luminary shedding darkness! No apology for theological error, that it springs from speculative dogmas. The most destructive heresies have been defended in this way. Proof that Dr. Taylor regards the differences between new and old divinity, of great importance. He represents the sentiments of the orthodox as involving by legitimate consequence the worst of heresies. His remedy for existing evils; viz. that the orthodox give up their principles.	12
LETTER IV.—Had the Pastoral Union a right to protest? This right claimed by Mr. Bacon and Dr. Taylor. The N. H. divines, friends to free discussion on one side only. Dr. Taylor at Philadelphia. Why the Protest was not made by the Gen. Association. If the Gen. Ass. neglected their duty, no reason why the P. U. should neglect theirs. The Protest. Errors specified prevail extensively. Dr. Taylor not understood!!! Questions answered by questions. Art. 1st. of the Protest vindicated. The error condemned relates to the power of God. The real question stated. Can God so govern moral agents as to secure universal holiness? Dr. Taylor thinks the affirmative involves universalism, infidelity and atheism. Evasion exposed. Dr. Griffin's opinion of this error.	19
LETTER V.—Art. 2d. <i>Concerning the native character of man.</i> The N. H. divines hold that infants and brute animals, in regard to moral character, stand on the same ground. Their history of an infant from birth, (a long period,) to the commencement of its native depravity!! Propensities to sin, shown not to be innocent propensities. Infants with no moral character, do not need redemption or regeneration. Dr. Emmons, Dr. Hopkins, and Dr. Wood's shown not to have maintained the sentiments imputed to them by Mr. B. Art. 3d. <i>The principle and end of human actions.</i> Not strange that the language of the N. H. divines should be understood to teach that every man acts from supreme self love. Brainerd's alarm at this doctrine. Absurd ideas on this subject noticed by Edwards.	27
LETTER VI.—Art. 4th. <i>Change of heart.</i> Dr. Taylor's account of regeneration by self-love. Prof. Stuart's comment on the same. The orthodox not to be shaken by sarcasm. Art. 5th. <i>Agency of the Spirit.</i> Mr. B's impeachment of Dr. Tyler's veracity. The doctrine of direct divine efficiency. According to the N. H. divines there is no change of principle, or internal motive, in regeneration. Art. 6th. <i>Special grace.</i> A calumnious insinuation repelled. Mr. B. fails to sustain his views by an appeal to Dwight.	36
LETTER VII.—Art. 7th. <i>Election.</i> Equivocal language employed by those who adopt the new divinity. They hold that God does not make all holy and happy, because he cannot. Mr. B's disrespectful treatment of Dr. Dana. Errors subversive of the faith of the churches prior to the formation of the Pastoral Union. Reminiscences of consulta-	

tions at Andover in 1829 and 1830. Dr. Wood's questions to Dr. Taylor. Mr. B. called upon to answer them. Changes rung on the term "heretic." Pastoral Union not to be held responsible for what they disapprove. 44

LETTER VIII.—Mr. B's attack on Dr. Nettleton. His charges shown to be groundless. A brief view of Dr. N's labors from 1811 to 1822, when he was brought to the borders of the grave by typhus fever. His early dissatisfaction with the N. H. theology. His conviction of its tendency to corrupt revivals and produce spurious conversions. His expostulations with the N. H. divines. His testimony against their errors. Means used to destroy his influence. Threat to hew him down. Noted slander at Enfield examined. Dr. N's labors from 1825 to 1835. His opposition to new measures. Testimonial of Drs. Beecher, Hawes, and others. 52

LETTER IX.—Correspondence with the Editor of the Record. Theological Department of Yale College. Alleged proceedings of the Corporation. Doubtful parentage of a certain anonymous document. The Theological Institute closely allied to the churches. Members of the P. U. friends to Yale College. Questions touching the theological department of Yale College. Its party aspect. Creeds. Why a new one was adopted by the P. U. Comparison between their creed and that of the church in Y. College. Disparagement of creeds by friends of new divinity. Why was the confession of Mr. B's church altered? Their old one not conformed to new divinity. Religious periodical press in Conn. Till recently in favor of sound theology. Religious Intelligencer. Christian Spectator. Connecticut Observer. Proof that there was an organized party in the State before the P. U. was formed. 61

LETTER X.—Tract Society. Evangelical Magazine. Conference at Hartford. Convention at East Windsor. How called. Constitution of P. U. and Theol. Institute. Why membership by election. Corporation of Yale College. Reasons for establishing the Theol. Institute. The Institute connected with the churches. 71

LETTER XI.—Gen. Association at Vernon. Notice of the Theological Institute. Censure of the Middlesex Association. Proposal to reprint the Saybrook Platform. Opposition to the proposal. Gen. Association at Enfield. Reply to Mr. B's questions. P. U. not formed for the purpose of "putting down" any of their brethren. New school does not embrace a majority of pastors in the State. Alleged tendency of the P. U. to division. Extract of a letter to Dr. Sprague. Extract from Dr. Tyler's Inaugural Address. What ought to be done? 80

N. B. The letters of Mr. Bacon, to which the following are a reply, first appeared in the *New Haven Record*, but have since been published in a pamphlet. The first eight of these letters were also published in the same paper. The remainder are now for the first time given to the public. The reasons why they have not appeared in the *Record*, will be stated at the beginning of the ninth letter.

Letter I.

REV. LEONARD BACON, —

Dear Sir — In your letters addressed to me, through the medium of the Record, you have taken such an extensive range, and introduced so many and various topics to the consideration of your readers, that it seems needful we should return to the immediate occasion of this discussion. And for this purpose I introduce the following letters.

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW HAVEN RECORD.

“Dear Sir,—It appears that a correspondent of your paper, in the number issued the next after the late meeting of the General Association of Connecticut, has professed to give an account of the discussion which occurred in the Association, on the reception of delegates from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. I have read with deep regret portions of that article, which have been quoted by the New York Evangelist, and the Connecticut Observer. Will you be so good, Sir, as to send me a copy of the number of your paper containing that article? And I shall be obliged, if you will inform me whether, (if it should be desired,) a reply to that article, with the name of the writer, can be inserted in the Record, on the condition, that it shall not be answered, except with the name of the person answering it.

As you must be fully aware, Sir, your correspondent has not only brought against me and the worthy brethren who voted with me in the General Association, very serious accusations, but he has thrown out insinuations calculated to prejudice the public mind against the Theological Institute of Connecticut, I think the cause of Christ demands that the writer of that communication should be known, that there may be, (should it be judged expedient,) a private correspondence with him. Will you inform me who wrote that article? I should have written you, on this subject, at an earlier date, but did not know, till recently, that *such an account* of the discussion in the General Association had been published.

“I am yours respectfully,

“GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

“Coventry, July 26, 1839.”

“NEW HAVEN, July 30, 1839.

“REV. GEORGE A. CALHOUN, —

“Dear Sir — Yours of the 26th was duly received. With this, in reply, I shall at the same time put in the mail the No. of the Record which you requested might be sent, together with the No. for last week, which contains a reply to some remarks in the Congregationalist. I entertain the hope, that, after seeing the whole of the first article, together with the explanations in the second, you will find that it is not what you have supposed it to be. If, however, it should appear to you that there is in the account any mis-statement of facts, or any misrepresentation injurious to yourself, or those who

acted with you at the meeting of the Association, I shall most willingly publish any correction which you may think necessary. Or, if you should wish to make a statement of the views under which you acted, in pursuing the course you did, I should not object to having the Record made the medium of such explanation. Any communication confined to these objects, and within reasonable bounds as to length, will be cheerfully inserted.

"I am authorized by the writer of the article in question to say, that if a reply, with the name of the writer, should be published in the Record, he would not answer it except under his own name, if desired; and if, after reading the articles already published, you should think it best to have a private correspondence with him, his name will be given for that purpose, at your request. For myself, I shall endeavor to do whatever impartial justice may require in the case, and should certainly be very loth to be any way unnecessarily the means of aggravating the disagreement which unhappily exists among the ministers and churches of our denomination in this State.

"Respectfully yours,

"SAMUEL PORTER,

"Editor of the New Haven Record."

The restriction imposed on me, to confine my communication to the correction of "mis-statement of facts," "misrepresentation injurious," and to an explanation "of the views under which I acted" in the Association, I did not consider unreasonable, nor was it unwelcome. I suppose, that while the Editor of the Record would "endeavor to do whatever impartial justice might require in the case," he designed to prevent his paper from becoming the medium of a protracted, agitating, and painful controversy; and that he would by no means suffer it to be the instrument of attack on a large body of Pastors of Connecticut churches, or institutions dear to many of the friends of God, and on private character. The course which I thought he was marking out for himself, I highly approved.

As a member of the Pastoral Union, I should rejoice to have a knowledge of the formation of that body, and of all their subsequent acts, diffused through the land. And notwithstanding the intimations you have given to the contrary, none of their proceedings have been concealed from the public view. And though they dispute your authority, on Congregational principles, to arraign them for trial, putting "questions" to them "earnestly," and demanding "unequivocal answers"; yet, I am persuaded, they would esteem it a privilege to have their conduct more extensively and correctly understood by the Christian public. But to me the present appears to be an unfavorable time for commencing a newspaper discussion, of the character of the one now begun, which of course will be but a review and revival of the controversies of our denomination for fifteen years past, and may in the result increase, rather than diminish, existing difficulties. Aside from theological differences, the ministry and the churches are agitated with various and weighty topics of public interest; the influence of the Holy Spirit, as manifested in the conviction and conversion of sinners, is in a great measure withdrawn, and the standard of practical religion is quite depressed: could not this debate, on subjects so various and exciting, have been avoided? At least, could it not have been confined principally to "the schools," and found only on the pages of quarterly periodicals, and not have been introduced to the consideration of all the read-

ers of a religious newspaper? That there are differences existing between the Congregational ministers and churches of Connecticut, and differences which many great, good and holy men believe to be *radical*, can not be denied. In this respect the frowns of God are upon us, and we have reason to fear that evils which these differences have produced, will not be remedied for generations to come. Yet could not this discussion have been avoided? Brethren of the New Haven school, will doubtless continue to take their own course in promulgating their peculiar sentiments, and they, who do not harmonize with them in theological views, will probably continue to feel, that they must obey the dictates of their consciences. And why could we not suffer it thus to be, without the disturbance, which the present discussion must produce?

The correspondent of the Record, in giving his account of the proceedings of the General Association at Danbury, must needs anonymously attack, (and in the judgment of disinterested persons, and persons too whose theological sympathies are with him,) *severely attack*, members of that body. As one of the oldest thus assailed, in self-defence, and in defence of the worthy brethren who acted with me, I considered it my duty, with my name annexed, to correct the mistakes of that writer. And you, my brother, came forward with great promptness — even before my manuscript was published — not only to justify that attack, but to seize on the occasion which it offered, for arraigning before the public all the members of the Pastoral Union; and to secure the attention, and to interest the feelings of all the Congregational ministers of Connecticut, I understand copies of the Record, containing your letters, were forwarded to them *gratuitously*. In your first letter, you say: “The occasion seems to me favorable for commencing a discussion, which I hope will be conducted not only with mutual kindness and good temper, but with an earnest desire on both sides to remove misunderstanding, and unite the ministers of Connecticut more strongly than ever, in those ties which seem in danger of disruption.” And in the second letter you say: “I ask these questions, (respecting the Pastoral Union,) because I think it high time they were asked earnestly, and answered unequivocally. I ask these questions, because I fear that some of the founders and leaders of that organization have not sufficiently considered what they are doing.”

And now, Dear Sir, in however many particulars we may entertain different views, in this one we are surely agreed; *that you have assumed the responsibility of commencing this discussion*. And should it result in restoring to the ministry and churches even of Connecticut former agreement in sentiment, holy living, and harmonious action, you shall be recognized as an honored instrument in the hand of God. On the other hand, if it should occasion an unprofitable diversion of our brethren in the ministry from their appropriate work in winning souls to Christ; if it should agitate and distress the churches more than they have yet been agitated and distressed; if it should inflict wounds on individuals and augment existing alienations; if it should contribute to the accomplishment of that disruption of which you speak: you must not shrink from an endurance of the weighty and solemn responsibility which you have assumed. This discussion was not commenced by the “East Windsor brethren,” and if the peace of the ministry and the churches is more disturbed in consequence of it, they must not be represented as disturbers of the peace. And it will be borne in mind, that it was not commenced by myself. So far from desiring a newspaper debate of this description, it is but recently that I was constrained to feel it my duty to make any

reply to the Letters addressed to me. And allow me to state, that for the reply which I make, I am alone responsible. I am not authorized to write as the organ of the Pastoral Union, and desire that no one but myself be held accountable for what I communicate.

If it is indeed "high time that questions" respecting the Pastoral Union "were asked earnestly, and answered unequivocally;" I rejoice that we have the name of the interrogator, though his signature should give much additional influence to his communications. This is as it should be. The person, who accuses publicly should make himself known to the public, and to the public stand accountable for his accusations. And permit me to inquire, would it not have been more honorable had the correspondent of the Record published his name with his censures of his brethren? And when he was informed, that he had given offence, and that his name was requested; had he allowed it to be published without delay, would it not have been more consonant with the precepts of the Gospel and a Christian spirit, than to have authorized the Editor to say: "Should you think best to have a private correspondence with him, his name will be given for that purpose at your request." You, sir, inform me, "you shall not put yourself in the place of the correspondent of the Record." And I shall not put you there. But your very prompt, and efficient efforts to sustain him — justifying him in every particular, except the selection of one word — and the striking resemblance between him and yourself in style of writing, in remembrance of facts, in sentiments, in sympathy are such; you will pardon me, if through inadvertence, I should fail to distinguish in all cases the productions of the one from those of the other.

The hope has been expressed, that this discussion might be "conducted not only with mutual kindness and good temper, but with an earnest desire on both sides to remove misunderstanding." To me it is doubtful whether this hope will be realized. Persons conducting such discussions are strongly tempted to the exercise and expression of unkindness and ill-temper. And should it be judged, that you have been delivered from the temptation thus far, you surely would have occasion for gratitude. How I shall succeed in this particular, I cannot predict, much less promise. I am not like yourself, accustomed to the circumstances in which I am placed, as I have never appeared before the public in the character of a controversialist. And you are aware that your communications have presented an unpleasant aspect to the persons against whom they were directed, and that the author of them was not in so great danger of irritation, as the person is, who answers them. And should I err in some small degree by manifesting a wounded spirit, I beg that, among others, the following provocations may be duly considered.

1. The Rev. Asahel Nettleton is a brother with whom I have long been intimately acquainted; for whom, on account of his knowledge of the revealed will of God and the character of the human heart, I have great respect; — in whose judgment in religious concerns, prudence, conscientious regard to principle, and self-denying spirit I have great confidence; and who is highly esteemed by those who harmonize with him in their views of divine truth. That minister of Jesus Christ, that friend endeared to me by many considerations, you have held up to public view, as the great agitator of the Congregational and Presbyterian denominations, the preeminent disturber of the peace of Zion. "Whether one member suffer all the members suffer with it." Must not the friends and brethren of Mr. Nettleton feel the wound?

2. In August last, friends and patrons of the Theological Institute, to aid

that Seminary, commenced the enterprise of raising fifty thousand dollars. Success exceeded their expectations. And no sooner was the project, and the favor with which it was countenanced, announced to the public, than you was led to "think it high time these questions (relating to the Pastoral Union to whom the Institute belongs,) were asked earnestly and answered unequivocally." Is not this a singular interference? When it was resolved to raise one hundred thousand dollars for the benefit of Yale College, would the friends of that institution have been pleased with a like interference? Whenever Amherst College, or the Theological Seminary at Andover, have appealed to the public for pecuniary aid, has there been a like interference? When Williams College and Amherst College, were somewhat rival institutions, did one thus interfere with the concerns of the other? And when the friends of the Theological Department in Yale College, a few years since, were about to raise funds for the use of that department, did members of the Pastoral Union just then "think it high time," through the medium of the press, "to ask questions earnestly and demand that they be answered unequivocally"? If in this or future communications, you should discover some indication of feeling, or some expression of severity, pardon the offence, and believe me as ever,

Your friend and brother,

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, November 19, 1839.

Letter XX.

Dear Sir — It is feared that a new era in the history of the General Association of Connecticut commenced last June. Though "the Norfolk Resolutions," which were drafted by Dr. Beecher, introduced by yourself, and passed and published by the Association in 1836, were severely censured by some presses in this country and in Great Britain; never before this year, to my knowledge, were members of that body selected, and for their deliberations and actions made the objects of a partial and public animadversion. And are our brethren hereafter, when they act in the Association, to have their liberty of free discussion abridged by the presence of anonymous writers, who will color and publish for party purposes what is said? It is doubted whether a person for any purpose possesses a right, without permission, to communicate to the public the acts, much less the debates of a clerical or ecclesiastical body; especially of one, who themselves publish their proceedings. The communications of the correspondent of the Record respecting the meeting at Danbury have caused much evil. They have, without any apparent benefit, deeply wounded a large number of the ministers of this State. And though the correspondent may say, "the conduct of the East-Windsor brethren in the late General Association does not look well on paper; hence this dissatisfaction with the narrative which I thought it my duty to give;" yet the wound is not so easily healed. And, in my opinion, great injustice has been experienced by the General Association collectively in consequence of these anonymous articles; and still more, Sir, by your justification of them. On reading what has been recently published respecting the late meetings of the General Association, especially of the one in June last; what must persons unacquainted with the facts in the case, think of the Congregational ministers

of Connecticut? What must be their impressions respecting our annual meetings, and of our qualifications of heart to perform the solemn services allotted us as ministers of Jesus Christ?

Although there are, unhappily, great differences between us; although I can not, after the sober reflection of months, approve of the course pursued by the majority, or of expressions employed by some members; yet I rejoice in saying that, in no deliberative assembly engaged in animated debate, have I ever witnessed more Christian courtesy, or less in manner which was censurable. And as I have an opportunity for defending myself, and those who acted with me, from unmerited reproach; so I feel myself bound to express great respect and esteem for those brethren, who strenuously opposed what I deemed the better way; and to assert that our discussions have not diminished, but, in relation to individuals, increased that respect and esteem. The General Association of Connecticut, though painfully divided, and now perhaps in some danger of being rent asunder, has thus far exhibited a character, in most respects worthy of imitation. And since so much has been injuriously published relating to the meeting at Danbury; were I sure my "silence would not be construed into acquiescence," I would pass without notice what you have written on that subject. In replying to your First Letter, therefore, I do not expect to occupy much time or space respecting that meeting; and hence I shall omit statements which might be corrected.

In the account of the discussion in the meeting at Danbury, which you, sir, volunteered to defend, the minority of the Association were accused of "resisting to the utmost the least act of courtesy toward the body represented by Dr. Cox;" and this too when they were desirous he should sit and deliberate in the Association as a corresponding member, and had united with others in giving him the invitation. In defence of this serious and groundless accusation you say: "The invitation to Dr. Cox to sit with the Association as a corresponding member, was in my judgment at the time a frivolous thing." But in the decision of this question whose judgment is to be regarded?—Yours, or that of the Association? In their judgment it was not "a frivolous thing." They do not allow themselves to be engaged in what they consider "frivolous things." The invitation was moved by one of the majority, and it was designed to be an act of courtesy toward Dr. Cox and the body which he represented; and the Association were harmonious and cheerful in voting it.

So soon as the minority discovered in the majority symptoms of a disposition to treat in *all respects*, and in view of *all the circumstances* of the case both Assemblies alike, and conduct in a way, which it was hoped would be offensive to neither; they conceded.—In opposition to this declaration you assert: "That the fact was, those resolutions were opposed by one of the most active in the minority expressly on the ground that they *did* treat both assemblies alike." Were this the fact, it would not disprove the correctness of the declaration. The argument of an individual, during a protracted discussion, would not decide what was the action of the minority. But I am much mistaken if you have not erred in stating the fact. In 1838 the Association as "usual appointed three Delegates to the General Assembly, with *instructions* to attend its session, provided the General Assembly shall have been previously ascertained by a legal decision." Mr. Cleaveland of New-Haven to whom you doubtless refer, expressed his belief that, the General Assembly had been ascertained by a legal decision. And he also stated the opinion of an eminent jurist of this State that, "the Presbyterian case"

would not be farther prosecuted. He hence opposed the resolutions because they *did not* treat both Assemblies alike, when consistency with the course adopted in 1838, would demand a recognition of the old school as the General Assembly. It would be strange indeed, sir, if the minority could not determine as accurately their principles of action as one, who was a mere "spectator of the proceedings at Danbury."

You say: "In the third specification, the words which you have underscored are words of which I have no recollection." — "As to the [fourth] specification, the only circumstance not distinctly mentioned in the first article which appeared in the Record, is that two of the majority declared they would abandon the Association forever, if the minority were permitted to record their dissent. I do not clearly remember what you refer to." As you have, in the one case *no recollection*, and in the other not a clear remembrance; probably you was absent when the words referred to were uttered. It is doubted, therefore, whether you can so well understand their import, as can persons who heard and recollected them.

You ask me: "Were the minority oppressed? Was any one of their rights infringed? Were they denied the privilege of entering a protest? Was there any *vote* that the yeas and nays should not be taken?" — No willingness to grant the minority the privilege of entering a protest was expressed. After the adoption of the resolutions, the vote was reconsidered, "in order to make room for a proposal to take the question by yeas and nays." A long and animated debate ensued, during which two members of the majority declared distinctly, they would abandon the Association forever, if the minority were permitted to record their dissent. And the privilege was denied the minority by *a vote*, if I mistake not, of sixteen to twelve. By that vote they felt themselves oppressed, and that their rights were infringed. I did not favor a reconsideration of the vote adopting the resolutions, because I preferred to the record of the yeas and nays a protest, in which we might state the reasons of our dissent, and which, if it was not permitted to be published in the Minutes of the Association, we might dispose of according to our pleasure. It was easy to perceive, that there would be more objections, on the part of the majority to a protest, than to a record of yeas and nays.

But, sir, I have yet to learn, what are the real objections to taking the yeas and nays on important questions, when properly demanded, in the Association more than in other deliberative assemblies. And I do not fully understand why brethren who feel and act with you, are so sensitive whenever the subject is introduced. Majorities must govern; but have minorities no rights? Must they at all events be made accountable to the public for sentiments and practices which they conscientiously oppose? They have rights, and these rights are protected in well organized civil and ecclesiastical bodies. And one of the rights specified is that of recording their dissent on important questions. And does our Association alone possess the right of passing resolutions, and publishing them abroad, and making large minorities, who are in conscience opposed to such resolutions, responsible for them? Were Abolitionists to constitute a majority of the Association, and adopt resolutions denunciatory of the Colonization Society; would Colonizationists, who composed a large minority, and who opposed these resolutions, believe they had no rights infringed by being made responsible for them to the public? Were the General Association of Connecticut, at their meeting in your church next June, to adopt resolutions denouncing the Theological Department of Yale College, and the Pastor of the First Church in New-Haven, as heretical and unworthy

of confidence, and publish these resolutions, as if they were their unanimous decision, while a large minority opposed their adoption; is there not *one man* who would feel himself oppressed, and let the world know it, if he were not allowed to record his dissent? Would Rev. Leonard Bacon, as one of that minority, and in such circumstances, tell us that voting by yeas and nays was "unprovided for by the wisdom of those fathers who formed the rules of order"? — (and formed them when there was not a religious newspaper in existence, when they did not publish their proceedings, and when they transacted the business of the Association perhaps in the parlor or study of a brother.) — "that it was contrary to the genius and habits of our ecclesiastical meetings, which operate by conference and debate, rather than by vote"? — "that the reasons which exist for such a practice in legislative and representative bodies, do not exist in the General Association"? — and "that the only tendency of such a system, when introduced, must be to draw a public line of demarkation between parties, and to make each man publicly responsible to his copartizans"? Would you, Sir, in these circumstances, employ such reasoning as this against an imperious demand of justice? It is wrong, it is oppressive, to make persons responsible to the public for sentiments, and practices not their own; and much more so to make them thus responsible for sentiments and practices which they have conscientiously opposed. And men who fear God will not long silently submit to such injustice.

I regret to find in your letter the following respecting Mr. S. of the Windham Association.

"You say that this good brother, whom I have known and loved for nearly twenty years, is one of the last men who should be compared with a Jacobin legislator. True he is one of the last men of whom such a thing would have been expected. But if good men and modest men *act* like Jacobin legislators, is there any wrong in saying so?" — "When I saw that good and amiable brother stand up to read his 'instructions,' I was ashamed; and I have yet to learn that the correspondent of the Record was guilty of any misrepresentation in intimating that by that act the brother, and those who had instructed him, were sanctioning and applying to our ecclesiastical affairs, one of the most dangerous principles of political Jacobinism." — "The Windham Association did not merely express their opinion, they instructed their delegates how to vote. '*Instruct*' was the word. I felt it like a wound."

In 1838 the General Association, as "usual appointed three delegates to the General Assembly, with *instructions* to attend its sessions, &c." Who first sanctioned and applied "to our ecclesiastical affairs one of the most dangerous principles of political Jacobinism"? You, my brother, was present at Norwalk when delegates were appointed "with *instructions* to attend its sessions," &c." Was you not ashamed? And when you have read in the minutes of the General Association the word "*instructions*," have you not felt it like a wound? Yet the public have not heard of your shame and wound, which this transaction occasioned.

This public attack upon Mr. S. and those who commissioned him, has lately been brought before the Windham Association, and in a free conversation, they unitedly, and without distinction of party, condemned it as a misrepresentation of their conduct, and ill treatment of their delegate.

But what was the high offence committed? Why, the Windham Association with great unanimity, adopted a resolution expressing their deliberate judgment, that it would be for the peace of our churches to have the correspondence between the General Association and both branches of the Presby-

terian Church by interchange of delegates, suspended until the differences in the latter denomination were farther adjusted. Mr. S., their delegate, as he accorded in judgment with the brethren of his Association, advocated the suspension of the correspondence with ability and meekness. But alluding to this resolution of his Association, he happened to say, *instructed*, instead of saying, *requested*. His old friend, brother in Christ, and brother in the ministry, who had "known him and loved him for nearly twenty years," sitting as a spectator in some part of the house, "was ashamed;" and he felt the word *instruct*, "like a wound." Mr. S. by the use of that word, and his Association were "sanctioning and applying to our ecclesiastical affairs one of the most dangerous principles of political Jacobinism." And in a religious newspaper, and by a ministerial brother, who had known him and loved him so long, he is published as acting like a Jacobin legislator.

You ask me: "If good men and modest men *act* like Jacobin legislators, is there any wrong in saying so?" Had Mr. S. conducted as you represent, and had you, ashamed and wounded as you was, reprov'd him in *private*, there would have been no wrong in the case; and doubtless satisfaction would have been gained. "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault *between thee and him alone*." But after a considerable period was spent in his presence at Danbury, an article was deliberately prepared and published, in which he is compared with a Jacobin legislator. Is this right? Is this in accordance with the spirit, or precepts of the gospel? Who, according to your representation of his conduct, has committed the greater offence? Who has introduced into our ecclesiastical affairs a principle most dangerous? I am persuaded, sir, that this act of yours is not in accordance with your preaching, nor in accordance with your general conduct.

Your defence of what you are pleased to call a "playful allusion to a little piece of folly perpetrated by the Pastoral Union," while it exhibits a rare tact at self-defence, contains some things quite exceptionable. Can you believe that "the Pastoral Union *to link the name and perhaps the spirit of Edwards* forever with the institution which they were founding, sought out the old door step of the house in which Jonathan Edwards' father lived, and laid it with solemn pomp as the corner stone of their building"? This you assert without qualification; but by what way you ascertained the alleged fact, or on what authority you make the assertion, we are not informed.

I would not err in my interpretation of the following sentence.

"You can tell perhaps whether there was any thing of that devout and prayerful calumny in the convention six years ago, of which you speak so fervently." — Am I to understand you as intimating to the public that, the forty ministers, who composed the convention at East-Windsor six years ago, hypocritically engaged in devotional services for the guilty and base purpose of calumniating their brethren more effectually? Has the time come, when the earnest supplications of Congregational ministers in Connecticut are represented as a cover to calumny; not by an infidel, or a scoffer; but by a distinguished minister of Christ — the Pastor of the first Church in New-Haven? I am unwilling to put the obvious construction on that passage of your letter, and I lament that, in your haste and party zeal, such a sentence should have fallen from your pen.

You inform me, that I spoke "in the name of the minority," and that I undertook "to represent their actual sentiments towards what is called the new school Assembly." — Of this I was not acquainted till the receipt of your First letter. And did I possess all the qualifications for that service, which

you ascribe to me, I should not attempt such a representation. I said *whatever may have been their views and feelings* on these and cognate subjects relating to the controversy in the Presbyterian Church, &c. It is possible you are acquainted with writers, who sometimes put the construction which suits them best on paragraphs of their opponents, and then say: "If we misunderstand you here, we pray you to correct us."

While I have found in your Letter before me some things unpleasant and even painful; I rejoice in the opportunity of reciprocating the delight you express in its last paragraph. — Let me conclude," you observe, "by saying how much I am gratified by the closing sentence of your letter. You are in principle opposed to anonymous articles, except of a specific character. Good! How long have you been grounded on that principle?" — For a long period. Even before the earliest date to which you refer, I have "been so grounded on that principle" that, I have never written one anonymous article attacking the character or wounding the feelings of persons. During my whole life I have never written even an anonymous letter. Can you say the same, my brother? That you can scarcely express the gratification you feel, on account of this principle which I have adopted, affords me great pleasure for two reasons.

1. I had supposed myself to be very much alone in the adoption of this principle.

2. It was supposed that you was accustomed to this mode of warfare, and was quite expert in wielding its weapons. But you are now with me. And being "grounded on that principle," and acting in accordance with it, I trust your usefulness will be much increased. Hereafter there will be annexed to articles of your authorship no fictitious signatures; but Leonard Bacon, a name of which its owner need not be ashamed.

I am affectionately your brother,

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, December 6, 1839.

Letter XXX.

Dear Sir, — "What is the Pastoral Union? What is its design? What are its operations? To what results is it tending?" — The answers which you have given to these questions, as you predicted, are not satisfactory. They are far, it is believed, from making a correct impression on the minds of your readers. And had you not intimated to the contrary, I should have supposed them designed to sever for ever the clerical and ecclesiastical relations existing between the Congregational ministers and churches of this State. According to your representations, on the part of the friends of "New Haven theology" there have been no errors in doctrine or in practice. All have been as they should be, except that there has been too long delay in the publication of a treatise "on the nature of mind and of moral agency, &c." While on the other side there has been manifested, from the beginning, a contumacious spirit, which has urged on its possessors in a uniform course of unchristian and dishonorable conduct. Will such a representation "tend to unite the ministers of Connecticut more strongly than ever in those ties which seem in some danger of disreputation."

When the Pastoral Union was organized I was present, and I have taken a part in all the deliberations of that body. And to the four questions which you have made the prominent topics of your letters, I will give brief answers which, it is believed, will be approved by those who are best acquainted with the facts, and which will be sanctioned at the great day.

1. *What is the Pastoral Union?* — It is an association of ministers in Connecticut, who maintain the doctrines of the Fathers of New England, and who are dissatisfied with the recent speculations by which the peace and harmony of the churches have been disturbed.

2. *What is its design?* — Its design is to secure union and concert among the friends of New England Calvinism, and in this way to promote the cause of truth, and the interests of Christ's kingdom.

3. *What are its operations?* — By the Pastoral Union the Trustees of the Theological Institute are annually appointed. It also exercises a general supervision over the concerns of the Institute, appoints annually a committee to attend the examinations, receives their report, and also a report from the Trustees; — and deliberates on the best means of promoting the interests of the Seminary. The Pastoral Union, also, like other clerical and ecclesiastical bodies, attends to such other business, relating to the kingdom of Christ, as may from time to time be brought before it.

4. *To what results is it tending?* — The results of other organizations, and the perversion of the original design of other institutions, admonish us not to speak with too much confidence in answer to this question. We cannot look into futurity. If those who belong to the Pastoral Union, had not believed that the results would be favorable to truth and righteousness, they would not have joined it. And if they did not still believe it tended to good results, they would doubtless abandon it. But, so far as I know, there is no disposition on the part of members to forsake it. They express their belief that it has already accomplished great good; and that Providence designs it to be a blessing to the church in future ages.

And now where is the offence in organizing the Pastoral Union? For five or six years after the New Haven divines commenced the discussion in which you say "the Pastoral Union appears to have originated, I avoided expressing an opinion on the subject, and in the small circle of my influence, I did all in my power to quiet alarm and prevent division; indulging the groundless hope, that the controversy would cease before it would be allowed to agitate the churches. And it was not till it had been brought, by the preachers of the New Haven School, sustained by the Christian Spectator, into our ministers' meeting, into my pulpit, into my bible-class, and to my fire-side, and was so enforced upon me that I could not remain silent longer, that I manifested my dissatisfaction. Interest, predilection, and every extrinsic consideration, disposed me to hope and believe, that nothing dangerous was advocated in the new sentiments, and that no party organization existed, until evidence to the contrary as indisputable as it was painful, was pressed upon me. And so soon as I disclosed my dissatisfaction with the new theological views which were urged upon the Christian community in all directions, and my regret on account of the course pursued at New Haven, an extraneous influence was exerted, which was well calculated to diminish my peace and usefulness with the people of my charge, and in the vicinity where I dwell. And thus it was with many of the ministers whom you censure so severely. They were not allowed to retain their views of divine truth, and discharge their ministerial duties, as in former years, without interference from abroad. And convinced as they were

that sentiments subversive of the faith of the Fathers were inculcated with great zeal and efficiency, and *that there existed, to all intents and purposes, a powerful organization*, with many facilities for promulgating their sentiments, and revolutionizing the churches; might they not attempt to secure union and concert among the friends of New England Calvinism, and in this way endeavor to promote the cause of truth and the interests of Christ's kingdom? By thus doing, whose privileges have they invaded? Whose commands have they disobeyed? Have they not a right to think, to speak, and to act for themselves? Have Congregational ministers more than one Master? If these convictions were according to truth, on being thus convicted, were they not solemnly bound to adopt measures for defending "the faith once delivered to the saints"? And if the peace of the ministry and of the churches is disturbed, who are responsible for this consequence, they, or their opponents?

Dear Sir, allow me to say here, what I may hereafter attempt to prove, that, notwithstanding your individual, protracted, and solemn protest against the "Protest of the Pastoral Union," you have not yet come "to the root and essence of our existing difficulties." The great questions to be settled, before harmony can be restored to the ministers of this State, are: 1. *Previous to the organization of the Pastoral Union, were there not sentiments inculcated and promulgated, which were believed to be subversive of the established faith of our churches?* — 2. *Did there not, previous to that period, exist in this State, to all intents and purposes, a powerful organization with many facilities for the promulgation of those sentiments and the revolution of the churches?* As you earnestly desire that misunderstanding may be removed, you will permit me to occupy some time and space in relation to these questions.

"For half a century," you truly say, "the Congregational ministers of Connecticut had been a remarkably united and harmonious body." Soon after, you observe, "such was the state of things before the commencement of the discussion in which the Pastoral Union appears to have originated." From these declarations, may we not infer, that our existing difficulties originated in the peculiar sentiments of the New Haven school? and that the Congregational ministers of Connecticut might have remained the same "united and harmonious body," had not the instructors of that school, adopted new theological opinions, and urged them upon the religious community, to the great dissatisfaction of many ministers of the Congregational and Presbyterian denominations. Such ministers regarded the theological views of these men as differing widely from those maintained by "the orthodox," (this is the appellation which you have given us,) and they were alarmed. But you think there was no occasion for this alarm, and, in your examination of the sentiments against which the Pastoral Union protested, you represent the differences between the New Haven divines and their opponents as relating to philosophical speculations which are of no great importance. If it is so, "I ask earnestly," and I pray that I may be "answered unequivocally," why are these peculiar views inculcated and promulgated with so much zeal and efficiency, and to the hazard of such weighty and solemn interests? A full and satisfactory answer to this inquiry, would afford a grateful relief to many minds.

It is well known, that your brethren of the Pastoral Union, ministers in all the New England States, in all parts of our country, and in Europe, regard these differences as relating to matters of vital consequence: among these ministers there are not a few distinguished theologians. How were these speculations regarded by such men as Dr. Ebenezer Porter, Dr. Griffin, Dr.

Hyde, and Dr. Cornelius, while they were living? They were not permitted to die, till they had publicly and solemnly testified against them. Dr. Porter, not long before he was taken to heaven, expressed it as his deliberate opinion, that it would require *one hundred years* to repair the wastes which these speculations were bringing upon our Zion. Dr. Griffin was so deeply impressed with the importance of these differences, that he determined to write his treatise on the Doctrine of Divine Efficiency — a book which remains to this day unanswered — though it should cost him his life. How did Jeremiah Evarts — a name associated with the greatest and dearest interests of the church — feel on this subject? How are these speculations now regarded by such men as Dr. Woods, Dr. Richards, Dr. Dana, and Dr. Humphrey? not to mention the Princeton Professors, and many other eminent divines, both in the Congregational and Presbyterian denominations. If the controversy respects only minor points — “mere shades of difference” — how are we to account for the disregard manifested toward the views and feelings of such men, and the peace and prosperity of the churches?

You observe; “It is enough to say that, if I understand the case, the real differences between the parties are differences of a philosophical, rather than of a directly theological nature. Nothing is more manifest to me, through the whole, than that Dr. Taylor holds a different system of intellectual and moral philosophy from that held by his opponents.” “The original error with the controversy on both sides, that which made it impossible to arrive at any conclusion or common understanding, was, that Dr. Taylor, instead of publishing his views respecting the nature of the mind, of moral agency, of moral government, abstractly from any application of them to theological science, began with the discussion of vexed theological questions, — with the attempt to solve old difficulties and to meet old objections to the doctrines of the gospel, by reasonings, the conclusiveness and intelligibility of which depend too much on ideas and principles with which he is familiar, but which his adversaries in argument habitually overlook. The consequence is, that the more he writes on these topics of theology, the more certainly and completely is he misunderstood by a portion of his readers, who look at what he says through the colored and refractory medium of their own philosophy.” These extracts from your Second Letter I accompany with the following remarks:

1. It is not easy to perceive, how “the original error of the controversy” could be “on both sides,” since it consisted in Dr. Taylor’s not first “publishing his views respecting the nature of the mind, of moral agency, &c.” Are his opponents responsible for the manner in which he began the controversy? Did he not adopt his own method? And if this was the original error, was it not his alone? According to your reasoning, is not Dr. Taylor alone accountable to his brethren, to the churches, and to God, for all the evils of the controversy?

2. You represent this original error of Dr. Taylor as being great, and attended with most unhappy consequences; — an error, “which made it impossible to arrive to any conclusion or common understanding,” so that, “the more he writes on these topics of theology, the more certainly and completely is he misunderstood by a portion of his readers.” Why has not the error before this late period been corrected? Why is the world kept thus long in hopeless darkness? Why are the fears and distresses perpetuated, which his publications have occasioned in the hearts of thousands? If the publication of Dr. Taylor’s philosophical views of the nature of the mind, of moral agency, &c. would make every thing luminous, satisfy his brethren, and

restore peace, the book should be forthcoming. A great multitude would hail it with extacies of joy.

3. Many persons may be interested to know, by what process brother Bacon has been led to discover the facts, which he announces; — that the opponents of Dr. Taylor cannot understand him, because he has not published “his views respecting the nature of the mind, of moral agency, &c.” — and that the differences under consideration are philosophical. They are confident that they do understand him; that the differences are so far from being merely philosophical, that they relate to matters of vital interest; and that the injurious effects on the theology and experimental religion of the churches, though now seen, will hereafter be more fully discovered. If there is an insuperable barrier in the way of their arriving at the truth in this case, how did brother Bacon gain possession of it?

4. Does this reference to Dr. Taylor do him justice as a theological teacher? “The more he writes on these topics of theology, the more certainly and completely is he misunderstood by a portion of his readers.” And who are among this portion of his readers? Men distinguished for their powers of discrimination, and who have for a long period been devoted to theological science. “Our orthodox community,” wrote the late Dr. Porter of Andover, “for near a century, had been but little disturbed, till this luminary appeared, and volunteered to shed darkness on the world. He wrote, and talked, and talked and wrote; and what has been the result?” Does Dr. Porter, or yourself, sir, exhibit the person introduced in a more favorable light?

5. It yet remains to be proved, that the differences under consideration, “are differences of a philosophical, rather than of a directly theological nature.” Should it be granted, that they originate in the new and unpublished philosophy of Dr. Taylor, does he not interpret scripture, and explain the doctrines of the gospel, in accordance with his philosophy? Suppose he professes to believe the Calvinistic formulas, does he not attach to the language in which they are expressed a meaning entirely different from that which they have usually been received? And is a man’s faith determined, by the terms in which it is expressed, or, by the sense in which he uses those terms? Suppose these differences do originate in philosophy, it is no matter where they begin, we are to look at their results. The errors of Pelagius and Arminius began in philosophical speculations respecting moral agency, and the moral government of God. And where have most of the great errors, which have infested the church originated? Has it not been, in first laying down certain principles, which were supposed to be sanctioned by reason, and common sense, and then interpreting the Bible according to these principles?

The trinity in the Godhead, according to the philosophy of the Unitarians, is an absurdity. Hence passages of scripture, which teach the doctrine of the trinity must be explained away. It is inconsistent with the philosophy of the Universalists, that a just and benevolent God should punish his creatures eternally. Hence all texts of scripture, which teach the doctrine of endless punishment must be made to submit to the dictation of this philosophy. According to the philosophy of some divines, moral agents can sin in despite of all opposing influence, which God can employ to prevent it. From this was inferred the doctrine, that sin could not be entirely prevented in a moral universe. This point being settled, as supposed, all those passages of scripture, which obviously teach God’s absolute control over the moral actions of his creatures, must be explained away. According to the philosophy of some, no being can possess a moral character, till he has formed it himself by actual obe-

dience, or disobedience, to known law. Hence those texts of scripture, which teach, or seem to teach, that, God created Adam a holy being, and that, his posterity come into the world with a sinful nature, must, instead of their obvious import, receive a philosophical interpretation. According to the philosophy of some, self love is the cause of all moral action. Hence every thing in the Bible, which teaches, or seems to teach, that Christians are actuated by higher motives, must be explained in accordance with this philosophy. Are theological errors, then, to be regarded of no importance, because they originate in philosophy? I have yet to learn, how to separate philosophy from theology, when it is applied to the interpretation of the scriptures, and to an explanation of the doctrines of the gospel. Has the Bible often been misinterpreted, except in connection with a false philosophy? Has the church of Christ ever been scourged with a destructive heresy, but in connection with philosophy? And, at this period, my brother, when there are so many apologists for deviations from the long established faith, when so much is said, respecting differences being unimportant, because they are claimed to be philosophical; should we not seriously regard the voice from heaven, which says to us:— "*Beware, lest any man spoil you, through philosophy, and vain deceit; after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.*"

But, sir, you seem to think, that the differences between Dr. Taylor and his opponents cannot be of great importance, because they relate to philosophy rather than theology. Do the Association of Gentlemen, by whom the Christian Spectator was conducted, think so? Does Dr. Taylor himself think so? If this is his opinion, why then does he represent the sentiments of the orthodox, as leading, by legitimate consequence, to the "most destructive errors, and the very worst of heresies?" Let any person examine the controversy between him and Dr. Woods and Dr. Tyler, and judge whether he treats the points at issue, as "minor points," and "shades of difference." He charges Dr. Tyler with maintaining theories, which involve the positions, that "sin is a good thing"—"good in itself"—"the only real good to man"—that "to sin is the very end of man's creation, the highest end of his being, the chief end of man;"—"that God is the responsible author of sin"—that "man is doomed to sin by a natural and fatal necessity"—that "the terms of salvation and the exhibition of motives to comply with them, are a delusive mockery;"—"that man as he is constituted by his Maker is like a stone or a corpse"—that "the divine lawgiver is a deceiver"—that "God is a criminal tempter"—that "in no respect is Satan more truly criminal as a tempter than God is"—that "we ought to praise God for all the sin, which we and others have ever committed"—that "we ought to take pleasure in other men's sins, and do what we can to forward the commission of them"—that "those who are lost are doomed to sin and everlasting burnings, that the smoke of their torment may endear heaven to the saved"—that "celestial spirits, if they utter truth in their songs, praise God, not that he vindicates his law, and sustains his throne by the punishment of beings who have violated any will of his; but, for exactly fulfilling the sole purpose of their creation: they praise God for that *peculiar* delight, those *higher* and *exquisite raptures*, which they could enjoy only by means of the agonies of others in everlasting pain;"—"that "the worst kind of moral action is the best"—that "mankind are bound to believe, that they shall please and glorify God better by sin, than by obedience, and therefore to act accordingly"—and much more

to the same effect. He also charges Dr. Tyler with maintaining theories which "lead, by legitimate consequence, to Universalism, Infidelity, and to Atheism."

I need not inform you, sir, that the above extracts are taken from an article which was published in the *Christian Spectator*, September, 1832; that "immediately after its publication, Dr. Tyler wrote to the Editor, inquiring whether he might be permitted to reply to it in the *Christian Spectator*, and was informed, that no reply could be admitted, unless it was a short letter of a page or two accompanied by such remarks as the Editor might see fit to append to it;" that, though Dr. Taylor has been publicly called upon to retract or substantiate these charges; yet, to this day, he has not deigned to do either. Allow me to ask, with the expectation of receiving an explicit answer — Am I right, or am I wrong, in saying that Dr. Taylor, in writing that article "the Association of Gentlemen" in approving of its publication, and the Editor in denying to the accused an opportunity of self-defence, in the periodical which had been pledged "to advocate that system of doctrines which has generally prevailed in the Congregational and Presbyterian churches," and in which the charges were preferred; did design a solemn protest against theories of the orthodox, as tending, by legitimate consequence, to the most shocking heresies? Dr. Taylor, you know, in the same communication, says, that "the principle advocated by Dr. Tyler and others, is the very same which in the hands of Voltaire and other enemies of the gospel, has spread infidelity and atheism to such a fearful extent throughout Europe;" and that it is "inconsistency which saves those who maintain this theory, from being the *very worst of heretics*." While we remain, by public charges, associated with "Voltaire and other enemies of the gospel," as having embraced the very same principle which "has spread infidelity and atheism to such a fearful extent through Europe;" do you think that we shall be convinced that there are only "some shades of difference" between us and our accusers? If, as it is said, there is only an "inconsistency" which separates between us and "*the very worst of heretics*," is it calculated "to remove misunderstanding;" is it of any use; is it consistent; is it right in the sight of God, or in the sight of men, — to represent the differences between us and brethren of the New Haven school, as respecting "minor points?"

But will you say that Dr. Taylor did virtually retract these charges, by affirming, in a subsequent article, that he and Dr. Tyler were perfectly agreed? No, sir, Dr. Taylor did not retract these charges. He only represented Dr. Tyler as having abandoned his principles, when he had not; and I am authorized to say that *he has not to this day abandoned a principle which he maintained in the discussion*. Here allow me to add, that nothing which has been published in this unhappy controversy, has been read with more surprise, than the article to which I allude; nothing has inflicted a deeper wound. How Dr. Taylor, after having brought such charges of heresy against Dr. Tyler, without retracting any thing himself, or showing that his opponent had retracted any of his principles, could affirm conscientiously, that they were perfectly agreed, is what many persons find it difficult to see. Here is a misunderstanding, which demands attention, and by the removal of which, to the satisfaction of the aggrieved, you will perform an important service.

It is true Dr. Taylor says, that "if his representation is *wounding*, let the theory that justifies it be abandoned, and the wound will be healed." But what theory is it necessary for the orthodox to abandon? What principles are to be given up that the wound may be healed." Why, principles which

are embraced in the confession of faith to which Dr. Taylor assented when he was inducted into office as Dwight Professor of Diadactic Theology in Yale College; principles which have been embodied in every orthodox creed which has been formed since the Reformation. And does he demand such an abandonment of principle, before the wound can be healed; and, at the same time, does he consider the difference between him and his orthodox brethren as merely philosophical? Were they, in his estimation, merely philosophical, would he not, long ago, have retracted the solemn charges which he brought against Dr. Tyler, and consequently against the great body of evangelical ministers and churches?

I have now presented you some of the reasons why I can not believe that the differences under consideration, are differences of a philosophical rather than of a theological nature.

Your friend and brother,

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, December 13, 1839.

Letter II.

Dear Sir — Before noticing the contents of some of your earlier communications, I will come directly to a consideration of the Protest of the Pastoral Union, by which you appear to be greatly disturbed. An important question, in relation to which we are at issue is first to be settled. *Had the Pastoral Union a right to protest against sentiments which they deemed to be erroneous?* You seem to deny them that right; and I ask, on what do you ground the denial? Have you not occupied the public attention for nearly four months past, and about thirty columns of a religious newspaper, in protesting against the supposed errors of the Pastoral Union? I do not deny you the right of occupying, in this way, as much time and space as you think proper. But, have your brethren of the Pastoral Union no rights? Must they, as a matter of course, endorse all the opinions which you and your associates are pleased to publish? And have they committed a great offence, by expressing, in a few sentences, their views of sentiments made public? Does not every man claim the right of testifying against that which he considers wrong, in sentiment or practice? The conductors of the *Christian Spectator*, for a course of years, protested against what they regarded errors, and pointed out their supposed evil tendencies. The writer, even of a newspaper paragraph, claims the right of expressing his views of published documents. And surely this right, possessed by individuals, should not be denied to bodies of men, acting in their collective capacity. What bodies of men are there, who do not claim the right of expressing their united opinions on subjects properly brought before them? Have medical conventions assumed a right not their own, in testifying against the use of intoxicating drinks? Do political conventions dream of infringing the rights of others, when they express their opposition to political sentiments? And have not they, who are watchmen on the walls of Zion, a right to protest against what they sincerely believe to be erroneous doctrines? And are members of the Pastoral Union alone to be denied this right, and to be made responsible for opinions which they feel bound in conscience to oppose? Where, then, are our religious liberties? I claim that the Pastoral Union possess a right, not to be questioned by any man, or any

association of men, to protest against those sentiments, which they regard as erroneous.

You say, "This protest was originally designed to be a solemn contradiction to the testimony which Dr. Taylor had recently given to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Churches." And what if it was? Was not the "testimony which Dr. Taylor had recently given to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church originally designed to be a solemn contradiction" to the known opinions, and often repeated declarations of members of the Pastoral Union? And if *he* possessed a right, to state his opinions, at Philadelphia, had not *they* a right to express theirs, at East-Windsor? Dr. Taylor said, "The churches are harmonious. I suppose among ministers, there has never been less difference of theological opinion than there is to-day." This statement was read with great surprise; and I presume there was not a member of the Pastoral Union who did not believe it to be incorrect. And might they not say so? You appear, my brother, to go on the supposition, that we have not equal privileges with yourself and associates. Certainly there is no privileged order among Congregationalists.

But you ask, "Why was not this declaration made by the General Association?" — I do not know that it devolves on me any more than on yourself to answer this question; yet I will refer you to a few facts which may cast some light on the subject. Dr. Taylor did not present, as it is expected of those who have been delegates to foreign bodies, either a written or verbal report of his conduct at Philadelphia; but merely referred the Association to what was published in the newspapers, as a correct account of his procedure. Members of the Pastoral Union, who were also members of the General Association generally did not know what was published. The member, "from Tolland county," on his way to the meeting of the Association, incidentally learned the course which our delegates to the General Assembly had pursued; and, during the session, he expressed his disapprobation of Dr. Taylor's conduct, in engaging in the contentions of our Presbyterian brethren, and in pledging the sympathies of the body which he represented, exclusively to one fragment of this church. But, had Dr. Taylor informed the meeting, of which he was moderator, of what he had said, and done, as their delegate, at Philadelphia, as a rule of the Association demanded of him; and thus had prepared the way for an expression of approbation, or disapprobation of his conduct; even then, what could members of the Association, who were members of the Pastoral Union, have done in bringing him to an account? — They were given to understand, at an early period of the session, in language unequivocal, that they would not be allowed the privilege, even of recording their dissent, from any acts of that meeting. "The motion," you say, "might have been made, and when it had been rejected, those who had been voted down, might have protested, either there, or elsewhere, as the case might seem to require." That they could not have protested "*there*," you and I both know. The case did seem to require, that they should protest "*elsewhere*;" and they have done it, and where is the fault? — I admit, that it would have been proper for the General Association to have made this Protest. But there was in the meeting a large number of Dr. Taylor's students and others of like theological sympathies, sufficient to constitute a small majority, and it was not done. If they neglected their duty, is that a reason why the Pastoral Union should remain silent, and prove themselves recreant to the cause of truth and righteousness?

But, you say again, "The Protest appears to have been designed as an ex-

press contradiction of the formal testimony of the General Association of 1837." You refer to the following statement, in their report on the state of religion. "The churches in connection with the Association are generally peaceful and harmonious. And though among ministers there are shades of difference in theological views, yet they are not such as need to prevent, and we are happy to believe they will not prevent the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." This, you inform me, was the testimony of the General Association of 1837, when the old school brethren had a majority.

Here, let me remind you of some facts, in relation to this subject, which you seem to have forgotten. The report on the state of religion, from which the above is an extract, was written by the Rev. Mr. Dutton, of Guilford. It was not presented to the Association till just at the close of the session, after some of the brethren had left. There was connected with it another assertion to this effect: — that the difference of theological views among ministers, was not greater than it had been for the last fifty years. A motion was made, that the whole be stricken out, and, after much discussion, it was lost, by the casting vote of the moderator, Dr. Porter, of Farmington. There is positive proof that had all the members been present, the motion would have prevailed. As it was, a vote was passed, to strike out the assertion *relating to the last fifty years*. — As you was a witness of the transactions of that Association, and may have mingled in some out-door consultations, can you tell me, why Mr. Dutton presented the report on the state of religion at so late a period of the meeting? And, since you have seen fit to represent this testimony to be *the testimony of members of the Pastoral Union, equally with others*, you will not consider me impertinent, if I ask another question: — did not you, and some other gentlemen, who were present as spectators, know, before the report was presented to the Association, that it would embrace the testimony of which you speak, if the sanction of the body could be gained? I need not ask, whether every member of the Association, and every spectator present, did not then know, that all "the orthodox" members bore their decided testimony against each of these assertions, as false, and calculated to mislead the public mind. You have surely presented a striking case of injustice, to a minority of a body, whose records of dissent are not allowed.

But, sir, I know not, that the Pastoral Union at the time of adopting the Protest, thought of this testimony of the General Association. To my knowledge, not a word was said in relation to it. But, suppose they did call this testimony to mind? And what if it was, as you assert, their design to protest against this testimony? I know not that there was any impropriety in it. In the Association, they had borne witness against it; as, in their opinion, false, and injurious; and, when they had afterwards been made responsible for it to the public, had they not a right to protest "elsewhere?"

But, do the errors against which the Pastoral Union have protested, exist, and extensively prevail in the State? — That they exist, and have been publicly maintained, there can be no question: for they are mostly taken *verbatim*, or nearly so, from periodicals, and pamphlets, which have been printed, and extensively circulated in the State, within the last few years. You admit, that they consist mostly of extracts from published writings; but you assert, that "the errors as stated consist chiefly of *misconstrued* extracts from the writings of Dr. Taylor." *Misconstrued extracts!!* The Pastoral Union, knowing, that the New Haven brethren had reiterated the complaint, that their sentiments were misstated, and misunderstood; adopted a course which they supposed no person could censure. And do you mean to say, that the Pastoral

Union have *misconstrued* these extracts? This appears to be your meaning; for you insist upon it, that they attach to the language of these extracts a meaning, which it was not intended to convey. I must deny the odious charge; and I entertain the hope, that you will consider it your duty and privilege to retract it. Are these extracts *misconstrued*, by merely quoting them, without note or comment? The Pastoral Union have not told you, what meaning they attach to the language of these extracts; and you have no right to charge them with giving to the language any other meaning than that which it obviously expresses. The language is simple, and its import, it is believed, is easily discovered. There are in the Pastoral Union, men who have received the highest honors of Yale College, others who have been employed as instructors in that venerable institution, some who have sat for years at the feet of Dr. Taylor, as theological students, and others, still, who have ministered acceptably to the intelligent congregations of New-Haven:—are there not then men in the Pastoral Union who are capable of understanding their own mother tongue? My dear sir, *what is the matter at New Haven?* Is it true, after all the attempts which Dr. Taylor, and his learned friends, have made, for the last ten years, to give an exposition of his language, that it is even now impossible for his brethren in the ministry to understand him? Or can not members of the Pastoral Union, who were educated and honored at Yale College, understand plain English?

The following reasons may have led the Pastoral Union to conclude, that these errors extensively prevail.

1. They have been taught, and defended, in pamphlets and periodicals, which have been widely circulated, and highly commended.

2. They have been maintained, and zealously propagated, by men whose soundness in the faith has been extensively *vindicated*.

3. They have proceeded, principally, from a theological school, where many young men have been trained for the ministry, a large proportion of whom, profess to agree with their teachers.

4. Those who have maintained and defended these errors, have *themselves* claimed, that their views were extensively adopted, not only in this State, but in other parts of the country. One witness to the truth of this declaration, whose knowledge of facts in the case, and whose veracity you will not question, may be sufficient for the present. I present you with an extract of a letter from a distinguished gentleman among yourselves, addressed to one of the trustees of the Theological Institute of Connecticut, and dated about the time that seminary went into operation.

“If the East Windsor Institution is right in the contest, how large a part of the best men and institutions in the country are wrong? Two of the most popular Professors of Andover — Dr. Beecher with his overwhelming influence at the Lane Seminary and in the West — Jacksonville College in Illinois and all its officers — the Theological Seminary of Tennessee (Dr. Anderson’s) — with such men as Dr. Hawes, Dr. Porter, Mr. Dutton, Mr. McEwen, Mr. Hiccock, Mr. Andrew, and a very great number more in this State. Mr. Barnes of Philadelphia, Dr. Wisner, Mr. Winslow, and Mr. Linsley of Boston, and hundreds of others in every part of our country must all share in the same condemnation with ourselves.”

Now, Sir, I submit it to your decision, whether the reasons suggested, were not sufficient to lead the Pastoral Union to believe, that these errors do extensively prevail. If, however, it should be found, that in this respect, they have been mistaken, I assure you, none will rejoice more sincerely than themselves.

Again, you ask, "Ought such errors as these charges speak of, to be tolerated in the ministry, or within the communion of the churches? If a man holds "radical" and "dangerous errors," — if he advocates "errors subversive of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel," — if his doctrines are "at war with God's word and fraught with imminent danger to the peace and prosperity of Zion," — if he holds and advocates doctrines which can not be countenanced in our churches" without incurring "the frown of a justly offended God," — "if he boldly and perseveringly assails" those scriptural doctrines" which are "the basis of the peace and purity of our churches," — ought he not to be dealt with as an offender? Can you recognize such a man as a minister of the gospel? Can you hold communion with him as one who has "obtained like precious faith" with yourself? Is there not a regular way under our ecclesiastical system, to deal with such errorists? What is that regular way? Is it the way which the Pastoral Union have taken in this Protest?"

Churches and associations of ministers are prone to laxness in the discipline of their members. Whether the Pastoral Union, in this case, have been too lenient and forbearing, I shall not attempt to decide. However this may be, I doubt not that you will perceive that all your questions may, with great propriety, be put back to my correspondent. Call to mind, sir, the terms in which the sentiments maintained by the Pastoral Union have been characterized. Dr. Tyler, whose doctrinal views, it is well known, accord with those of the Pastoral Union generally, as they do with those of the great body of Calvinistic ministers, stands publicly charged with adopting principles which involve the positions, that "sin is a good thing" — "good in itself," — that "when men sin they do the very best thing they can do," — that "God is the responsible author of sin," — that "the Divine lawgiver is a deceiver," — that "God is a criminal tempter," — and that "in no respect is Satan more truly criminal as a tempter than God is." He has also been charged with maintaining theories which "lead by legitimate consequence to *universalism*, to *infidelity* and to *atheism*." Moreover, it has been asserted, that "the principle advanced by Dr. Tyler and others is the very same, which in the hands of Voltaire and other enemies of the gospel, has spread infidelity and atheism to such a fearful extent throughout Europe."

Now, allow me to interrogate, in your own language. "Ought such errors as these charges speak of, to be tolerated in the ministry, or within the communion of the churches?" If a man holds errors "respecting matters of (such) vital importance" — errors which are not only "subversive of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel," but which "lead by legitimate consequence to *universalism*, to *infidelity*, and to *atheism*;" — if he holds and defends principles, which involve the blasphemous sentiments, that "God is the responsible author of sin" that the divine lawgiver is a deceiver — that God is a criminal tempter, as truly so as Satan himself — if he asserts that "sin is a good thing," and perseveringly maintains what implies that "when men sin they do the very best thing they can do;" — and if a principle which he advances, "is the very same which in the hands of Voltaire and other enemies of the gospel, has spread infidelity and atheism to such a fearful extent throughout Europe;" — "ought he not to be dealt with as an offender?" Can you hold communion with him as one who has "obtained like precious faith" with yourself? Is there not a regular way, under our ecclesiastical system, to deal with such errorists? What is that regular way? Is it the way which "any of your party have taken?" Is it the way which you have adopted in commencing this correspondence?

But further, still, if the members of the Pastoral Union have been guilty of the unchristian and disorderly conduct, which you impute to them, ought they not on that account to be dealt with as offenders? If they have slandered their brethren, and adopted measures tending "to jealousies, alienation, and schism in our ecclesiastical commonwealth," ought they not to be called to an account? Why is it so, that at this late period, they have not been dealt with? "Why is it, that no pretence of an attempt has ever been made to bring one of these offenders to a trial before the proper tribunal?" Why is it, that you have not been employed in arraighing these erring brethren before their respective Associations, instead of publishing the weighty accusations against them which are contained in your Letters? "It is a serious question, my brother; *give us a manly answer.*" "In the name of those who are more immediately aimed at in the aspersions" of your Letters, "in the name of the ministers and churches of Connecticut, whom as a body," your Letters hold "up before all Christendom as" unchristian and disorderly in conduct, — "in the name of our fathers, who framed our ecclesiastical constitution, distinctly providing that every pastor accused of 'unchristian or disorderly conduct' shall be brought to account fairly and openly; — nay, in the name of our common Master, Head over all things to the church, who, if these charges are true, is 'justly offended,' and who, if they are not true, shares in the wrong done to his servants, — I entreat you, tell us frankly, why these subverters of the 'peace and order of our ecclesiastical community,' are permitted to retain their standing not only in the communion of our churches, but in the ministry."

I will now consider your remarks on the first error against which the Pastoral Union protested. It is set forth as follows:

"I. CONCERNING THE POWER OF GOD." — "That free moral agents can do wrong under every possible influence to prevent them, and that it is a groundless assumption that God could have prevented all sin, or at least the present degree of sin in a moral system."

You admit, that this error is expressed in the identical language, which has been used and defended in the recent discussions respecting the moral agency of man, and the moral government of God; but you insist, that it has not been used in the sense given to it by the Pastoral Union. Allow me to ask again, for the authority you have to make this declaration. The Pastoral Union have not explained the language. They have barely quoted it. They may have considered it so explicit as to need no exposition. That they designed to express the *very sense*, which they who had used this language intended, there is abundant proof. And how is it known, that they do not understand this language in precisely the same sense in which you understand it yourself? That they do, can you have the shadow of a doubt? But you say, they call it an error "concerning the power of God;" whereas you contend, if it is an error, it is not an error 'concerning the power of God,' but concerning moral agency, and moral government. The point at issue, then, if I understand you, is not whether the extract contains a dangerous error; but whether it is an error "concerning the power of God." But where is the inconsistency, I would ask, in supposing, that an error relating to moral agency and moral government, may relate also to the power of God? What was the question in debate, between Dr. Taylor and his opponents, to which this language refers? Did it not relate to what God *can*, and what God *can not* do, in the government of moral agents? What is the doctrine commonly received, which Dr. Taylor called in question? Was it not this, that God *can* so govern moral agents as to secure universal holiness in a moral system?

And did not Dr. Taylor contend, that to suppose God *able* to do this, is a groundless assumption? Furthermore, did he not affirm, in a very solemn manner, that to suppose God *able* to secure universal holiness in a moral system, "leads by legitimate consequence to *universalism*, to *infidelity*, and to *atheism*"? Please to notice some of Dr. Taylor's statements. — He says, "Dr. Tyler maintains, that God *can* secure the holiness and happiness of all his moral creatures. It follows therefore that God *will* secure the holiness and happiness of all his moral creatures. Of course all men will be saved." — Christian Spectator, 1838, page 432. Has the question, then, no reference to the power of God? Dr. Taylor here expressly affirms, that if God *can* secure the holiness and happiness of all his moral creatures, he certainly *will do it*. And what is this but saying, that nothing but the *want of power* on the part of God prevents him from rendering all his moral creatures holy and happy? And will you still say, that the question has no relation to the power of God? Consider also the following statement. "God not only prefers, on the whole, that his creatures should forever perform their duties rather than neglect them, but purposes, on his part, to *do all in his power* to promote this very object in his kingdom." — Christian Spectator, 1832, page 669. Why does not God secure universal obedience among his moral creatures? If this statement is correct, it is because he has not *power* to do it; for we are assured, that he purposes to *do all in his power* to secure this very object in his kingdom. And, still, has the question under consideration no relation to the *power of God*? You will permit me to advert to one or two other statements. "We know that a moral system necessarily implies the existence of free agents with the power to act in despite of *all opposing power*. — Christian Spectator, 1831, page, 67. Does not *all opposing power* include the *power of God*? "Would not a benevolent God, then, *were it possible to him* in the nature of things have secured the existence of universal holiness in his moral system?" — Dr. Taylor's Concio, page 28. Why then does not God secure the existence of universal holiness in his moral system? Because, according to this statement, *it is not possible for him to do it*. And will you, sir, yet tell me, the question has no relation to the *power of God*? Let us read the language, quoted in the Protest, in connection with the foregoing extracts. — "That free moral agents can do wrong under every possible influence to prevent them, and that it is groundless assumption that God could have prevented all sin, or at least the present degree of sin, in a moral system." Can there be any doubt as to the meaning of this passage? After all which has been published on this subject, do you really believe, that the very point in dispute is not yet understood? Does not every intelligent man, who has attended to this discussion, know what this passage means; and know too, that the Pastoral Union understands its import, and have not misconstrued it?

Like some modern preaching, with which godly persons have been afflicted, your reasoning on this subject seems to imply, that in your view, the power of God has nothing to do in governing moral agents, and preserving them in a state of holiness, any more than it has in causing a thing to be and not to be at the same time; or in preventing an equilateral triangle from being equilateral; or in doing any other thing which implies a contradiction. How then do you interpret these passages of Scripture: — "Now unto him that is *able to keep you from falling*," &c. "Who are kept by the *power of God* through faith unto salvation."

Admit the question in dispute to be as you represent it, — "Whether to

suppose God *able* so to govern moral agents as to secure universal holiness in his moral kingdom, implies a contradiction?" Still the question relates to the *power of God*. It resolves itself into another question, (*viz.*) whether thus to govern moral agents is an object of *divine power*? If it is an object of *divine power*, and does not imply a contradiction, do not those who affirm the contrary, "*err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God*"? And since the Pastoral Union do believe, that God's omnipotence implies power to exercise absolute and unlimited control over the moral universe, have they committed any offence in denominating the opinion of those who call this sublime doctrine in question, an error "*concerning the power of God*"?

Suppose a person should say to you, — It is a groundless assumption, that God *could* have created one more particle of matter than he has created. Suppose he should go farther, and say, — If God *could* have created more matter, he certainly would have done it, and to suppose *he could*, "leads by legitimate consequence to *universalism*, to *infidelity*, and to *atheism*." — You say to him, you seem to advance principles, which are inconsistent with God's omnipotence. No, he answers, — This is a slanderous accusation. "I hold and teach that the power of God is absolutely infinite, and that no addition to the power of God can by any possible stretch of the imagination be conceived of. And, on the other hand, I hold that omnipotence itself can not do a contradiction." "What I mean is, to suppose God *able* to create another particle of matter would be a contradiction, as much as to suppose him able to cause two and two to be five, or to prevent an equilateral triangle from being equiangular." Would you be satisfied, my brother, with this reasoning? After all, would you not be strongly inclined to believe, that this man was in some error "*concerning the power of God*"?

In reference to the practical importance of this error, I will give you the opinion of one, whose praise has long been in the churches, and whose memory is exceedingly precious now that his body has returned to the dust.

"If God could not prevent sin in the universe, he cannot prevent believers from fatally falling; he cannot prevent Gabriel and Paul from sinking at once into devils, and heaven from turning into hell. And were he to create new races to fill their vacant seats, they might turn to devils as fast as he created them, in spite of any thing which he could do, short of destroying their moral agency. He is liable to be defeated in his designs, and to be as miserable as he is benevolent. — This is infinitely the gloomiest idea that was ever thrown upon the world. It is gloomier than hell itself. For this involves only the destruction of a part, but that involves the wretchedness of God and his whole creation. And how awfully gloomy as it respects the prospects of individual believers. You have no security that you will stand an hour. And even if you get to heaven, you have no certainty of remaining there a day. All is doubt and sepulchral gloom. And where is the glory of God? Where the transcendent glory of raising to spiritual life a world dead in trespasses and sins? Where the glory of swaying an undivided sceptre and doing his pleasure 'in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth?'" — Griffin on Divine Efficiency, pp. 180, 181.

In conclusion, my brother, why may we not be permitted now to unite with the apostle, in saying, "Now unto him that is *able to do* exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to *the power that worketh in us*; unto him be the glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." Your friend and brother,

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, December 20, 1839.

Letter V.

Dear Sir, -- The next article in the Protest of the Pastoral Union is thus stated :

"II. CONCERNING THE NATIVE CHARACTER OF MAN." -- "That mankind come into the world with the same nature in kind as that with which Adam was created ; that men have no natural sinful propensities ; that there is a period subsequent to birth, during which they have no moral character, and are not subject to the moral government of God, and that animals and infants, previous to this supposed beginning of moral agency stand in precisely the same relation to this subject."

In commenting on this article you say, "The statement of the Protest under this second head is a statement partly of propositions which none of our ministers hold in the sense in which the Pastoral Union imputes them, and partly of propositions which, if erroneous, are still sanctioned by names which the Protesters themselves would be the last to treat with disrespect."

This assertion embraces two questions for discussion.

I. *Have these propositions been maintained by any of our ministers?* -- Compare them with the following quotations and then judge.

Dr. Taylor in his reply to Dr. Tyler in the Spirit of the Pilgrims Volume vi. page 5, says, "I did admit, as he says, that mankind come into the world with the same nature *in kind* as that with which Adam was created." In the Christian Spectator for 1832, pp. 548, 549, we have the following remarks from the pen of Dr. Taylor, "on Dr. Tyler's theory respecting human depravity." Dr. Tyler had asked, "what inconsistency is there in supposing that there is in man, a native propensity to evil, propagated from parent to child like other natural propensities?" To this the Reviewer replies -- "On this theory, then, we would offer the following remarks."

"1. It exhibits God as the responsible author of sin. We suppose Dr. Tyler believes, as others who have advanced the same theory maintain, that this propensity to sin, is itself sinful, or as another writer affirms, 'is the essence of sin.' Now who will deny, that God is the responsible author of that which he produces, whether by direct creation, or by the physical laws of propagation? -- God therefore, according to this theory, is the responsible author of that in man, in which the essence of sin consists, and actually damns the soul, for being what he makes it, or causes it to be by physical laws."

"If Dr. Tyler should say, that the propensity to sin of which he speaks, is *innocent*, still man as he comes into being, is doomed to sin by a natural and fatal necessity -- with such a propensity, man has not a natural ability to avoid sin. This is alike true, whether this propensity be supposed to be *sinful* or *innocent*."

In the Christian Spectator for 1829, we find the following statement. "Infants die. The answer has been given a thousand times ; brutes die also. -- But Mr. Harvey replies, 'animals are not subjects of the moral government of God.' Neither are infants, previous to moral agency ; for what has moral government to do with those who are not moral agents." "It has been shown that infants stand on precisely the same ground with animals as far as the present question is concerned. For neither of them are moral agents, nor subject to moral government." -- "Animals and infants previous to moral agency, do therefore stand on precisely the same ground in reference to this subject." page 373.

Again : "A child enters the world with a variety of appetites and desires,

which are generally acknowledged to be neither sinful nor holy. Committed in a state of utter helplessness to the assiduity of parental fondness, it commences existence, the object of unceasing care, watchfulness, and concession, to those around it. Under such circumstances it is, that the natural appetites are first devolved; and each advancing month brings them new objects of gratification. The obvious consequence is, that *self-indulgence* becomes the master principle in the soul of every child, long before it can understand that this self-indulgence will ever interfere with the rights, or entrench on the happiness of others. Thus by repetition is the force of constitutional propensities accumulating a bias towards self-gratification, which becomes incredibly strong before a knowledge of duty or a sense of right or wrong, can possibly have entered the mind. That moment — the commencement of moral agency, at length arrives. Does the child now come in a state of perfect *neutrality*, to the question, whether it will obey or disobey the command, which cuts it off from some favorite gratification?" pp. 366, 367.

Mark the assertion; "self-indulgence becomes the master principle in the soul of every child LONG BEFORE it can understand," &c; that is, *long before* moral agency commences.

Now, sir, compare the above extracts with the statement in the Protest. Can you indeed say, that the propositions protested against, have not been maintained by any "of our ministers?" But you affirm, that "they have not been held" in the sense in which the Pastoral Union imputes them." The sense in which the Pastoral Union imputes them! Pray, what is that sense? Can you mean to intimate, that the Pastoral Union are men of such obtuse intellects that they cannot understand the plainest propositions? Or do you mean to be understood, that the writers of these extracts intended to express what they did not believe? The Pastoral Union have published no commentary on this language; and they doubtless felt that none was required. The error against which they protested is that which is clearly expressed by the language itself understood in its obvious meaning, taking into view the connection in which it is used, and the explanations which have been given by the writers themselves. And how is it that you are led to the conclusion, that the Pastoral Union do not understand the language which they have quoted, or that they have designedly misconstrued it; when they have merely quoted it without a word of explanation? There certainly can be no doubt as to the meaning of any of the propositions in their statement, unless it be the first one, viz. "That mankind come into the world with the same nature in kind as that with which Adam was created." And the meaning of this, when we take into consideration, the connection in which it is used, the object of the writer, and the scope of his reasoning, is quite apparent, — and what is its meaning? You say; "The proposition when fairly construed, is one which you yourself believe. The nature with which Adam was created, was simply and completely human nature; the nature with which mankind come into the world, is simply and completely human nature; both are the same *in kind* with that nature which Christ assumed, and in which he died. If any man in the Pastoral Union denies this, ask him to give us the text of scripture which declares, either that Adam in Paradise was not a human soul in a human body, or that his posterity do not come into the world human souls in human bodies." This construction of the proposition, I confess, was new to me, and I think it must have been new to most of your readers. But, my dear sir, do you mean to say, that the great point at issue in the controversy between Dr. Taylor and his opponents in relation to this subject was, whether the

posterity of Adam have human souls in human bodies? Do you honestly believe, that this is *all* which Dr. Taylor meant by the declaration, that "mankind come into the world with the same nature *in kind* as that with which Adam was created?" What bearing would such a statement have upon the points under discussion? Call to mind the question in dispute. It was, as you know, whether there is in man, a natural hereditary propensity to sin. The supposition that mankind have such a natural propensity, is a sentiment which Dr. Taylor represents as leading to the most horrible and blasphemous consequences — as making God the responsible author of sin, &c., &c. It was in opposition to this sentiment that Dr. Taylor asserted, that "mankind come into the world with the same nature *in kind* as that with which Adam was created." His meaning therefore without doubt was, that mankind come into the world as free from depravity, or from any natural propensity to sin, as Adam was when he was created. If this was not his meaning, his assertion had no relevancy to the point under consideration.

You inquire whether "this proposition affirms any thing respecting the native character of man?" Allow me to ask, was it not intended to affirm that man has no "native character?" or, in other words, that he comes into the world without any moral character? Do you not know, that those who have maintained this proposition, have held that Adam was created without a moral character?

You say, "I believe that the distinction between moral *character* and physical *constitution*, is recognized by all of us — by the members of the Pastoral Union as well as by others." — The correctness of this remark depends on the meaning which you attach to the expression "*physical constitution*." "The term physical," President Day observes, "when taken by itself, is a word of very vague signification. — But when combined with another ambiguous term, it forms a compound, the meaning of which is still more multifarious" — "It is one of those pliable words, which may be made to mean one thing, or another, any thing, or nothing, as occasion may require." Your term, therefore, should have been defined. If you mean by *physical constitution*, man's bodily organization, or the substance of the soul, or the possession of intellectual powers; it is doubtless true that no one considers these things as constituting *moral character*. But if by "physical constitution," you mean all that is *natural* to man, all which he inherits from his ancestors, there are those who do not recognize your distinction. There are those who believe man has a moral nature, as well as a corporeal nature, and an intellectual nature — that he possesses a heart, or disposition, as well as an understanding. They believe that man is so *constituted*, that when objects are presented to his mind, he does not view them with indifference; but he likes or dislikes, loves or hates them. — They believe with President Edwards, that "human nature must be created with some dispositions; a disposition to relish some things as good and amiable, and to be averse to other things as odious and disagreeable. — Otherwise it must be without any such thing as inclination or will. It must be perfectly indifferent without preference, without choice or aversion towards any thing as agreeable or disagreeable. But if it had any created dispositions at all, they must be either right or wrong, either agreeable or disagreeable to the nature of things. If man had at first, the highest relish of those things that were most excellent and beautiful, a disposition to have the quickest and highest delight in those things that were worthy of it, then his dispositions were morally right, and amiable, and never can be decent and excellent in a higher sense. But if he had a disposition to love most things that were inferior

and less worthy, then his dispositions were vicious." Treatise on Original Sin, page 157.

You will observe that President Edwards says, "HUMAN NATURE must be created with some dispositions," and, "if it (i. e. HUMAN NATURE) had any concreated dispositions at all, they must be right or wrong. It was the opinion of Edwards therefore that the *nature* with which Adam was created was holy; and that mankind do not come into the world with the same nature *in kind* as that with which Adam was created. According to President Edwards, Adam was created with "dispositions morally right and amiable;" but his posterity come into the world with dispositions that are "*vicious*." — Can you, my dear sir, subscribe to these views? Are they adopted "by all of us — by members of the Pastoral Union," and "by others?" Please to give us an explicit answer to these inquiries.

You ask, "Do not these brethren of yours (brethren of the New Haven school) hold that the character which men have by nature, is corrupt, only corrupt, entirely alienated from God?" That this is the character of men so soon as they have a *moral character*, I am aware they hold. But how they can consistently maintain that this is their "native character," that they are "*sinners by nature*," I have never been able to discover. Was Adam *by nature* a sinner? Was the child Jesus by nature a sinner? But mankind, we are told, come into the world with the same nature *in kind*, — "human souls in human bodies," — as that with which Adam was created, and with which the child Jesus was born. How then are they by nature sinners? — What has their nature to do with the fact of their becoming sinners? Besides, according to this supposition; what connection is there between the sin of Adam and that of his posterity? If Adam had never sinned, would not his posterity have come into the world with the same nature *in kind*, — human souls in human bodies, — as that with which they are now supposed to be born. What influence then, has the apostacy exerted upon the human race? How is it true that, "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners;" and that "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation?"

The proposition "that men have no natural sinful propensities" you observe, "may be understood as a denial of the doctrine of physical depravity." But what do you mean by the doctrine of physical depravity? Is it the doctrine, that sin is a part of the substance of the soul? And does the unpublished philosophy of your school teach, that propensities constitute a part of the substance of the soul? If I understand you, you admit, (though in opposition to Dr. Taylor, as is evident from the above extracts,) that men have natural propensities to sin, which are innocent. Do you consider them as constituting a part of the substance of the soul? If not, why should it be thought that sinful propensities, if they exist, must constitute a part of the soul's essence? Or why should it be thought that *natural* propensities are a part of the substance of the soul, any more than acquired propensities? But you say, "The brethren here never use the word *natural* in this connection." You also say to me, "You make a distinction between that *natural* depravity which you hold, and that *physical* depravity which you reject." No sir, you are mistaken. We never use the word *physical* in this connection. It is too "vague" and "pliable" a word.

You ask, "When you *assert* the doctrine of natural, or native depravity, do you not mean that men are by nature sinners: — that in their nature as propagated from Adam there are propensities to evil, never failing in their opera-

tion on the moral character, never cured or effectually resisted but by the grace of God?" Most certainly we do. And we believe also that these propensities are not *innocent* but *sinful*. If they are not *sinful*, what *grace* would there be in curing or subduing them? Grace is favor to the guilty. What grace, then, can there be in subduing the *innocent* propensities of an *innocent* being!

You speak of an *innocent* propensity to sin. Is not this strange language? Were I to say, that a certain person is *innocently* bent on mischief — that he has an *innocent* propensity to lie, to steal, to commit adultery, and to murder, would you not think I used quite extraordinary language? If a man has a propensity to steal, do you not call it a *thievish* propensity? If he has a propensity to malice, do you not call it a *malicious* propensity? If he has a propensity to avarice, do you not call it an *avaricious* propensity? Why then should you hesitate to call a propensity to sin, a *sinful* propensity; and to regard it as such?

Allow me to inquire still farther. In what does regeneration consist, if not in changing man's propensity to sin? But does that which is innocent need to be changed? What sort of a change must that be, which only removes an innocent propensity? Is it a *moral*, or *physical* change? Is it such a change as the scriptures denominate the new birth? Is it such a change as the following language describes — "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh." — Is an innocent propensity denominated a *heart of stone*? You will not think it strange my brother, if the difference between a *sinful propensity* and a *propensity to sin*, as it has a direct bearing on the vital doctrine of regeneration, is considered by some of your brethren of no trifling importance.

But permit me to ask, with what consistency can you maintain, on your principles, that those who die in infancy must be born again, and must be redeemed by the blood of Christ, in order to be saved? If infants have no moral character, if they have no sinful propensities, — no corrupt nature, why do they need to be renewed? I might ask, how is it possible, that they should be regenerated? Do you not hold that regeneration is a moral change? And can a creature, who is not a moral being, and who sustains no other relation to the moral government of God than brute animals, be the subject of a moral change? What is the change wrought in the infant mind in regeneration? According to your principles, it cannot be a change of character; for the child has no moral character. It cannot be a change from sin to holiness; for if the child is not a moral being it is not sinful and cannot be made holy. How then, according to your principles, is it possible for the infant to be born again? And for what do those who die in infancy need regeneration? Do they need to be born again to prevent them from becoming sinners? And did Adam when he was created, need to be born again? Did the Angels need to be born again? Did the child Jesus need to be born again? And were these holy beings regenerated after they began to exist, and before they possessed a moral character?

Again, — How can you consistently maintain, that those who die in infancy are redeemed by the blood of Christ? From what are they redeemed? — Not from sin; for they have none. Not from the curse of the law; for they have not fallen under the curse of the law. From what then are they redeemed? Do you say, as a writer in the Christian Spectator has said, that it is "from the future existence and consequences of sin!" Is this redemption? Are all

those redeemed, who are prevented from becoming sinners, and from being exposed to the curse of the law? Were the angels redeemed by the blood of Christ? Was Jesus himself redeemed by his own blood? What was the object of Christ's mission? He came "to seek and to save that which *was lost*." "Christ Jesus came into the world to *save sinners*." "We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were *all dead*."

Your assertion in reference to the following propositions, introduces the second question for discussion: — "That there is a period subsequent to birth, during which men have no moral character, and are not subject to the moral government of God; and that animals and infants, previous to this supposed beginning of moral agency, stand in precisely the same relation to this subject." — You do not deny that these propositions are held by the New Haven divines; but you tell us, that, "if erroneous, they are still sanctioned by names which the Protesters themselves would be the last to treat with disrespect."

The Pastoral Union, I trust, are not disposed to treat any of their brethren with disrespect, though they feel it their duty to bear their testimony against what they consider erroneous sentiment, by whomsoever it may be maintained. You refer to Drs. Emmons, Hopkins and Woods, as divines in New England, who have sanctioned the above propositions. I have been astonished at the use which you have made of these names, (and I doubt not many others have been thus affected,) and especially at the use which you have made of the names of Hopkins and Woods. — Do you believe, Sir, and will you affirm, that these men have sanctioned the above propositions? Do you not know that a passage cannot be quoted from their writings, in which they have expressed the belief, that "there is a period subsequent to birth, during which men have no moral character, and are not subject to the moral government of God, and that animals and infants, previous to this supposed beginning of moral agency, stand in precisely the same relation to this subject"?

Have Drs. Emmons, Hopkins and Woods sanctioned these propositions?

1. Has Dr. Emmons expressed the opinion, that "there is a period subsequent to birth, during which men have no moral Character, and are not subject to the moral government of God"? I have not at command the sermon of Dr. Emmons, to which you refer, and must hence rely on the account which you give of it. You say, "Dr. Emmons, in his sermon on native depravity, asserts, as his doctrine of native depravity, 'that mankind begin to sin as soon as they become capable of sinning.' In the second division of the sermon, he attempts 'to show when men become capable of sinning.' He asserts 'that they are not capable of sinning before they become moral agents.'" You think that "his whole argument takes it for granted that men become moral agents after they begin to exist." "Accordingly in his improvement of the subject," you say, "he avows the opinion, 'that if children die before they become moral agents it is most rational to conclude that they are annihilated.'" It appears, from your account of this sermon, that in it the author has not expressed the opinion, that men become moral agents at a period subsequent to birth. You think his "whole argument takes it for granted." But in this are you not mistaken? The following is an extract from his sermon on conscience: — "For the Bible represents infants as sinful, guilty creatures, *as soon as they are born*; which plainly implies, that they are moral agents. In a word, scripture, reason, observation and experience, are all in favor of the moral agency of infants. And if we do not admit that moral agency commences in infancy, it is impossible to determine, or even to form a

probable conjecture, when it does commence." This extract is the conclusion of an argument to prove "that infants are *moral* agents as soon as they are agents." And the conclusion is, that they are moral agents *as soon as they are born*. In your representation of Dr. Emmons' opinion on this subject, have you done him justice?

2. Has Dr. Hopkins sanctioned these propositions? What is his language? — He says, "It seems proper, if not necessary, that if moral corruption be derived from Adam to his children, by a fixed law or constitution, it should take place from the *beginning of their existence*. If, by being his children, they become corrupt, they must of consequence be corrupt *as soon as they exist*, or become his children." Agreeable to this, the scripture represents all mankind as sinful *from the beginning of their existence*. The same idea is repeatedly expressed, in different forms, throughout the whole discussion of the doctrine of native depravity. But did he not say, that men begin to sin "as soon as they begin to act as moral agents? He did. But when, did he suppose, they begin to act as moral agents? At the "*beginning of their existence*." This he has most explicitly and uniformly affirmed. Has Dr. Hopkins, then, sanctioned the opinion that "there is a period subsequent to birth, during which men have no moral character, and are not subject to the moral government of God"?

3. Has Dr. Woods sanctioned these propositions? Please to read again his treatise on native depravity. Is it not the very object of that work to prove that man is morally depraved from his birth? i. e. that he has a sinful, and, of course, a moral character from his birth. But you refer to his controversy with Dr. Ware, and quote the following passage: "It seems to me as unreasonable and absurd to say, that human beings are really sinners before they are moral agents, as to say that birds and fishes are sinners." But does he express the belief that there are any human beings who are not moral agents? He says, in one place, "I make it no part of my object, in this discussion, to determine when moral agency begins." Yet it is apparent, from the whole discussion, that his belief was that men are moral beings, or moral agents, from the commencement of their existence. He certainly has nowhere expressed a contrary belief. When he says, "Dr. Ware's position is mine, that *men are sinners so soon as they become moral agents*," he attempts to show that Dr. Ware virtually admits that men are moral agents from their birth. Thus, Dr. Ware had said, "by their natural birth, men become reasonable and accountable beings." "This," says Dr. Woods, "is as much as to say, they become *moral agents*." Hence he infers that Dr. Ware has virtually admitted the orthodox doctrine, viz. that "all, by their natural birth, are moral agents, and as soon as they are moral agents, they are sinners." "To this representation of Dr. Ware," says Dr. Woods, "I fully accede." In the very paragraph, therefore, to which you have referred, Dr. Woods informs us, that the orthodox doctrine to which he accedes, is that men are moral agents and sinners from *their birth*. And has he then sanctioned the position, that "there is a period subsequent to birth, during which men have no moral character," &c.? No, Sir, I do not hesitate to say, that our venerable instructor has never given his sanction to such an opinion. You never heard the expression of such an opinion from his lips in the lecture room, nor have you seen it in his published works; and to represent him as having done it, is doing him manifest injustice.

In this place, you will allow me to ask; if the views of Dr. Woods, on

the subject of native depravity, as expressed in his controversy with Dr. Ware, accord with those of Dr. Taylor, as you seem to intimate, why did Dr. Taylor express such strong dissatisfaction with this part of the discussion? Why did he say to one brother, that on this subject Dr. Ware had the better of the argument: and to another that Dr. Woods had put back the controversy with Unitarians fifty years. You cannot be ignorant of the decided and marked disapprobation, which your New Haven brethren have often expressed of the views of Dr. Woods on this subject, as exhibited in his essay on native depravity, and in his controversy with Dr. Ware. Will you not, my dear Sir, review what you have written on this topic, and ask yourself whether it is right, or fair, or honorable, to bring forward the names of distinguished divines, to sanction sentiments which we all know they do not adopt, but repudiate?

I will now consider your remarks on the next article in the Protest, which is thus stated:

“III. CONCERNING THE PRINCIPLE AND END OF HUMAN ACTIONS.—That self-love, or the desire of happiness, is the primary cause or reason of all acts of choice which fix supremely on any object; and that of all specific voluntary action, the happiness of the agent, in some form, is the ultimate end.”

In regard to this error, you say, “I cannot but regret that the framers of the Protest, in making this particular statement, did not declare more distinctly what the error is which is here aimed at.”—I do not know how it could have been possible for them to have declared this more distinctly than they have done. They say it is an error “concerning the principle and end of human actions;” and then quote the language in which it is expressed. And is not this language definite and plain? Does it not clearly state, what in the view of the writer is “the principle and end of human actions?”—But you say, “Thousands, doubtless have been led, by this vague statement to regard your new school brethren as holding the preposterous doctrine, that every man may and must make his own happiness his only and ultimate *object* in all that he does, and that all benevolence and self-denial, all justice, truth, purity, and mercy, are merely mercenary and differ from selfishness only in name.” But how do you suppose thousands have been led to adopt this conclusion, unless the conclusion is warranted by the obvious meaning of the language? The Pastoral Union have surely made no such representation, unless it is made by the language which they have quoted *verbatim*, and without note or comment, from the Christian Spectator. If this language has produced in the minds of thousands the conviction of which you speak, do you wonder that the Pastoral Union should regard it as containing a fundamental error, and that they should publicly and solemnly protest against it? And is it not high time for you and your associates to publish a like protest?

You inquire how we “understand the words *primary cause or reason*, in the first part of the proposition, and the words *ultimate end*, in the last part.”—I answer, we understand them in their obvious meaning. And were we to attach to them that which was not their obvious meaning, would you not censure us? Turn to the Christian Spectator, and look at the connection in which the “first part of the proposition,” or rather the first proposition is used.

“The self-love or desire of happiness, is the primary cause of reason of all acts of preference or choice which fix supremely on any object. In every moral being who forms a moral character, there must be a first moral act of preference or choice. This must respect some one object, God or Mammon, as

the chief good, or as an object of supreme affection. Now whence comes such a choice or preference? Not from a previous choice or preference of the same object, for we speak of the *first* choice of the object. The answer which human consciousness gives, is, that the being, constituted with a capacity for happiness, desires to be happy; and, knowing that he is capable of deriving happiness from different objects, considers from which the greatest happiness may be derived; and as, in this respect, *he judges or estimates their relative value*, so HE CHOOSES OR PREFERS THE ONE OR THE OTHER AS HIS CHIEF GOOD." — Christian Spectator 1829, page 21.

Is there any obscurity in this language? Is it possible to misunderstand it? If the meaning of the words, primary cause or reason" is not made evident by the context, pray tell me how it can be made evident. — And so of the other proposition; "Of all specific voluntary action, the happiness of the agent, in some form, is the ultimate end." — Is there any thing vague, or ambiguous, or obscure in this language? Should I not insult my readers to intimate, that they could not understand a proposition so simple as this? It is my full belief, that you and I understand it, and that the writer understands it, exactly as it is understood by the Pastoral Union.

I agree with you, that "a voluntary agent must be influenced by motives; and that every *objective* motive, in order to be a motive, must appeal to some sensibility or desire of the mind that is to be moved by it, while the *subjective* motive is nothing else than the awakened desire moving the mind to choose." But I do not believe, that all moral beings, whether sinful or holy, are influenced by the same *subjective motives*; that is, have the same *ultimate end* in view in their moral conduct. My belief is, that the grand distinction between the saint and the sinner, lies in the *subjective* motives by which they are actuated — that while the sinner makes *his own happiness his ultimate end*; the saint makes *the glory of God his ultimate end*. It is my solemn conviction — a conviction, which in connection with what I have witnessed in years past, has occasioned me much distress — that those who are influenced by no higher motive than self-love, whatever may be their outward or visible character, are strangers to the religion of the gospel. What was it which filled the mind of the pious Brainerd with such deep distress at a period when he viewed himself near the close of life?

He says, "These things I saw with great clearness when I was thought to be dying, and God gave me great concern for his church, and interest in the world at this time. Not so much, because the late remarkable influence upon the minds of the people was abated and almost wholly gone, as because the *false religion*, the heats of imagination, and wild selfish commotions of the animal affections, which attended the work of grace, had prevailed so far. This was that which my mind dwelt upon day and night, and was to me the darkest appearance respecting religion in the land. For it was that which prejudiced the world against inward religion. This I saw was the greatest misery of all, that so few saw any measure of difference between those exercises which are spiritual and holy, and those which have SELF-LOVE FOR THEIR BEGINNING, CENTER, and END." — Brainerd's Life, page 498.

You say, "Ask any obedient and holy mind, on earth or in heaven, Why do you obey God, why do you devote yourself to his praise and service, why employ your faculties and powers in this course of benevolent action? — Must not the answer be, Because I love it, — because I delight in it, because it is my blessedness, my highest good." — You seem, my brother, to overlook

a very important distinction, which is thus happily expressed by President Edwards.

“The first objective ground of gracious affections, is the transcendently excellent and amiable nature of divine things as they are in themselves; and not any conceived relation they bear to self, or self-interest.” “Some say that all love arises from *self-love*; and that it is impossible in the nature of things, for any man to have any love to God or any other being, but that love to himself must be the foundation of it. But I humbly suppose, it is for the want of consideration they say so. They argue, that whoever loves God, and so desires his glory, or the enjoyment of him, he desires these things as his own happiness; the glory of God, and the beholding and enjoying his perfections, are considered as things agreeable to him, tending to make him happy. And so they say, it is through *self-love* or *a desire of his own happiness* that he desires God should be glorified, and desires to behold and enjoy his glorious perfections. There is no doubt but that after God’s glory and beholding his perfections are become so very agreeable to him, he will desire them as his own happiness. But how came these things to be so agreeable to him, that he esteems it his highest happiness to glorify God, &c. Is not this the fruit of love? Must not a man first love God, and have his heart united to him before he will esteem God’s good his own, and before he will desire the glorifying God as his happiness? It is not strong arguing, that because *after* a man has his heart united to God in love, and *as a fruit of this*, he desires his glory and enjoyment, as his own happiness, that therefore a desire of his own happiness must needs be the *cause and foundation* of his love; unless it be strong arguing that because a father begat a son, therefore his son certainly begat him.” — Edwards’ Works, Volume, iv. page 172.

I am, Sir, with great respect, yours, truly,

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, December 27, 1839.

Letter VI.

Dear Sir,—The fourth error set forth in the Protest relates to a change of heart. The language in which it is stated, is taken from an elaborate treatise on the means of regeneration, published in the Christian Spectator for the year 1829; in which the theory is maintained that antecedent to regeneration, the selfish principle is suspended in the sinner’s heart, that he then ceases to sin, and, prompted by self-love, begins to use the means of regeneration with motives which are neither sinful nor holy. The passage quoted in the Protest, describes the process, through which the writer supposes the sinner to go, after the suspension of the selfish principle, and while using the means of regeneration. Let it be read in connection with the context, and with other passages in the same treatise. The passage quoted by the Pastoral Union is included in brackets in the following extract.

“We have already said, that the sinner is the subject of that constitutional desire of happiness, called self-love, to which no moral quality pertains. Let the sinner then, as a being who loves happiness and desires the highest degree of it, under the influence of such a desire, take into solemn consideration the question whether the highest happiness is to be found in God or in the world;

let him pursue the inquiry, if need be, till it result in the conviction that such happiness is to be found in God only; — [and let him follow up this conviction with that intent and engrossing contemplation of the realities, which truth discloses, and with that stirring up of his sensibilities in view of them, which shall invest the world, when considered as his only portion, with an aspect of insignificance, of gloom and even of terror, and which shall chill and suspend his present active love of it; and let the contemplation be persevered in, till it shall discover a reality and an excellence in the objects of holy affection which shall put him upon direct and desperate efforts to fix his heart upon them; and let this process of thought, of effort, and of action be entered upon as one which is never to be abandoned, until the end proposed by it is accomplished, — until the only living and true God is loved and chosen, as his God forever; and we say, that in this way the work of his regeneration, through grace, may be accomplished.”] “Whence then the necessity to the sinner’s regeneration, of those acts which are dictated by the selfish principle? Is it that the acts now described are impossible?” — “Is not this indeed substantially the actual process in every instance of regeneration? Without affirming, what we shall have occasion to prove hereafter, that the transition from sin to holiness, without this mental process, is physically impossible, we say, that all the preliminary mental acts and states which are necessary to regeneration may be as rationally accounted for, by tracing them to self-love, as by tracing them to selfish principle.”—*Christian Spectator*, 1829, p. 32.

Such is the process through which this writer supposes every sinner to pass who is born again. First, the selfish principle is suspended, and self-love takes its place; all opposition to God and aversion to holiness, for the time being, ceases. The sinner becomes favorably inclined, has sincere desires after holiness, and is disposed to exert himself to the utmost to do his duty. He sees a reality and excellence in the objects of holy affection, which puts him upon direct and desperate efforts to fix his heart upon them. And all this, let it be remembered, while he is still totally depraved and dead in trespasses and sin. Some of the absurdities involved in this scheme are thus graphically described by a distinguished theologian.

“This is on the whole just such a journey as I should expect a supremely selfish man and totally depraved sinner would make in his own strength from sin to holiness. Treading selfishness under his feet with a heart caring for nothing but himself; panting with *truly sincere desires* — for acceptance with God, while blind to his ‘excellence’ and caring for nothing but to shield himself from punishment; — completely detached from the world, and just prepared to give his heart to God as soon as he can obtain clear, just and vivid views of his glories, the precise things that were never seen but by holy eyes; but upon using the means of regeneration when the act cannot possibly precede regeneration itself. If this is the road travelled by the self-determining power, surely ‘the way of transgressors is hard.’” — *Griffin on Divine Efficiency*, page 52.

You well know, Sir, that the treatise on the means of regeneration from which the above is an extract is taken, was read by many in the Christian community with great distress. It was extensively regarded, as containing principles “at war with God’s word,” and inconsistent with all genuine Christian experience. My limits will not allow me to point out all the particulars in it which are considered quite exceptionable; you will therefore permit me to refer you and the reader to *Dr. Tyler’s Strictures and Vindi-*

cation. — When the *Strictures* were published, Professor Stuart thus wrote to Dr. Ebenezer Porter, who was at that time in Charleston, S. C. — “Dr. Tyler has published his pamphlet, a noble one too — which has made an end of the matter, as to brother Taylor’s regeneration by self love, — a full end : there is no redemption. All the fog is blown away, and we have at last, a clear and sheer regeneration of the natural man by himself, stimulated by self-love, made out to be the scheme of brother Taylor ; there is no getting aside of it. Brother Taylor must sing his *παλινοδη* or go farther and plunge deeper. I hope for the *παλινοδη*, but I fear the *διατριβη*.” Dr. Porter’s *Memoirs*, page 222.

Now can you be surprised, that views of the great and cardinal doctrine of regeneration, which Professor Stuart felt himself authorized to speak of in this manner, should excite great fear and distress in the Christian Community, especially considering the source from which they emanated? My brother, the conviction is deep and solemn, that great errors have been and still are maintained and propagated among us. You may make light of this conviction, — you may regard it as the result of weakness and ignorance, — you may treat it with ridicule and sarcasm, — you may call it “prayerful calumny,” — you may look down with disdain upon those who indulge in it ; but if you expect in this way to remove it, let me assure you, you have greatly mistaken the character of the brethren with whom you have undertaken to deal.

The next article in the Protest is thus described.

“V. CONCERNING THE AGENCY OF THE SPIRIT IN REGENERATION.” — “That the Spirit, in Regeneration, does not by direct efficiency change the heart, and thus produce holy affections — that there is no other effectual hold which this divine agent can have on the sinner whom he would turn from the error of his ways, but that which consists in so bringing the truths of the Bible into contact with his understanding and moral sensibilities, that he shall voluntarily shun the threatened evil and choose the proffered good, and that there is no more difficulty in accounting for the fact that the yielding sinner supremely loves God from the impulse of a regard to his own happiness, than there is in explaining the opposite fact, of his having formerly, under the influence of the same principle, when perverted, loved his idols.”

In commenting upon the first proposition in this statement, you seem to manifest an unusual degree of excitement, and to speak with a good deal of warmth. If I do not misunderstand you, you pretty clearly intimate your belief, that the Professor of Theology at East Windsor has been guilty of a deliberate falsehood in this matter. I extremely regret this intimation, and that you have imposed on me the duty of repelling it as calumnious. In the closing paragraph of your last letter, you say ; “If I have spoken harshly, if I have judged unkindly, reprove me, and pardon me as a brother.” In this case I think you have “spoken harshly” and “judged unkindly ;” but be assured I “pardon you as a brother.” But why is it you are led to believe, that the Professor of Theology at East Windsor is guilty of this gross delinquency? Because he is a member of the Pastoral Union, and because the Pastoral Union have protested against the doctrine that “the Spirit in regeneration does not by direct efficiency change the heart and thus produce holy affections ;” and because Dr. Taylor in his controversy with Dr. Tyler said, “we have never called in question, the doctrine of an immediate or direct agency of the Spirit on the soul, in regeneration.” But my dear sir, how does this prove that Dr. Tyler has been guilty of falsehood? Have you not gone much too fast in coming to this painful conclusion? Do you know that Dr. Tyler did not object to that article of the Protest? If he objected to the insertion of this proposition in the Protest, where is the delinquency with which you

charge him? Is it not an unwarrantable assumption that Dr. Tyler is responsible for all the acts of the Pastoral Union? Without first learning how a member of Congress has acted in a given case, would you make him responsible for the action of the Legislature in that case, and on the assumption of such a responsibility charge him with the guilt of falsehood? Would not this be speaking "harshly" and judging "unkindly?"

But what has the Pastoral Union done? Have they charged Dr. Taylor with holding the doctrine which he has disclaimed? You remark, "I need not say, that this Protest is understood to describe, or that it was designed to describe the opinions of the Theological Professors at New-Haven, and particularly the opinions of Dr. Taylor." But pray tell me, how is this understood? The Pastoral Union have given no such intimation. They have protested against errors which they supposed to prevail. But they have not said or even intimated, that all the errors against which they have protested are taught at New-Haven. What if Dr. Taylor has not denied the *direct efficiency* of the Holy Spirit in regeneration:—has no one denied it? Are there not those who maintain that the Holy Spirit never operates upon the mind, except through the medium of truth or motives? Dr. Porter, in his Letters on Revivals, speaks of this as a prevalent error, and one which is maintained by "religious teachers of considerable name." Why do you not charge him with a gross delinquency?

But are you *quite sure* that this sentiment is adopted by none of the ministers of Connecticut? It will give joy to the members of the Pastoral Union to be well assured of this fact. They doubtless did suppose that this error did exist in the State; but they have not charged Dr. Taylor with maintaining it; nor do I find that Dr. Tyler has brought against him any such charge, since the disclaimer to which you refer. In his vindication, after quoting the disclaimer of Dr. Taylor, he says, "I am happy to be informed that his views on this point have been misapprehended." What ground is there then, for the insinuation that there is between Dr. Tyler and Dr. Taylor, in reference to this subject, "a plain falsehood, for which one of them must give account to the God of truth." "In the name of charity, and as sincerely desirous to put the best construction upon this matter," I entreat you not to bring before the public another such insinuation.

It is true, as it appears from his Strictures, that Dr. Tyler did understand Dr. Taylor to maintain, in his treatise on the means of regeneration, that the Divine Spirit operates not directly on the mind, but only through the medium of truth or motives. This principle he supposed to be involved in the whole tenor of his reasoning respecting the suspension of the selfish principle, and to be distinctly avowed, when he said; "If there were no other way to overcome this strong man, [the selfish principle,] but by *direct assault*, then for aught we can see, the moral transformation of the soul were hopeless, even to Omnipotence." By *direct assault*, Dr. Tyler doubtless understood Dr. Taylor to mean the *direct efficiency* of the Holy Spirit, (and what else he could mean I do not know that he or any other person has ever informed us.) But when Dr. Taylor disclaimed any such meaning, Dr. Tyler said: "I am happy to be informed that his views on this point have been misapprehended."

But although neither the Pastoral Union nor Dr. Tyler have imputed to Dr. Taylor the sentiment that the Spirit operates on the mind in regeneration only through the medium of truth or motives; if I have been correctly informed there are those who have represented him as holding this sentiment; and those too who profess to be well acquainted with his opinions, and who

have been claimed as belonging to your party. If therefore there have been any false representations on this subject, you can judge from what quarter they have come.

But after all, do the New Haven divines maintain the doctrine of *direct divine efficiency*, in the sense in which that doctrine has been maintained by our standard orthodox divines? A direct and full answer to this question will much oblige me, and doubtless many of my readers. — What is that doctrine, as held by our standard writers? If I have correctly understood it, it is this, that the Holy Spirit, by a direct, efficacious, invincible energy, creates in the sinner a new heart, and a new spirit; — i. e. a new disposition, or new moral affections, communicating a relish for spiritual and holy objects, and causing the soul to delight in what before it viewed with aversion and hatred.

Thus President Edwards says; “The nature of virtue being a positive thing, can proceed from nothing but God’s immediate influence, and must take its rise from *creation or infusion* by God.”

Dr. Bellamy says; “In regeneration, there is a new, divine and holy taste and relish begotten in the heart by the immediate influence of the Spirit of God.”

Dr. Hopkins says; “The divine operation in regeneration of which the new heart is the effect, is immediate, or it is not wrought by the energy of any means as the cause of it, but by the immediate, power and energy of the Holy Spirit. It is called a *creation*, and the divine energy in it is as much without any medium as in creating something from nothing.”

Dr. Smalley says; “Regeneration is such a spiritual change of nature, as supposes something *created* in a proper and strict sense.”

Dr. Dwight says; “The soul of man was *created* with a relish for spiritual objects. The soul of every man who becomes a Christian is renewed by the *communication of the same relish*.”

Tell me, my brother, do the New Haven divines hold this doctrine? I had verily supposed that they considered such an influence upon the mind as is described in the foregoing extracts, to be inconsistent with moral agency, and that they were in the habit of representing those who entertained these views as virtually holding the doctrine of physical regeneration. If I have been deceived on this point, you will be so good as to correct me.

There is another difficulty which you will allow me to state. If the New Haven divines admit the doctrine of a *direct divine efficiency* in generation, how comes it to pass that they have called in question the doctrine of God’s absolute control over the moral universe, and his ability to prevent all sin in a moral system? If he can and does, by a *direct efficiency*, renew the hearts of obdurate rebels, and transform them into meek and humble disciples of Jesus, without impairing their moral agency; can he not, by a direct influence upon the minds of holy beings, preserve them from apostacy. If God can create holiness in totally depraved hearts, can he not uphold and preserve it in those hearts in which it already exists? It appears to me, that the theory of the New Haven divines respecting the divine permission of sin, rests on the assumption, that God never does exert such a *direct efficiency* on the minds of men in regeneration, as Calvinists have uniformly maintained. Please to relieve my mind from this difficulty.

But let us proceed to the consideration of the next proposition in the article of the Protest: — “that there is no other hold which this Divine Agent can have on the sinner whom he would turn from the error of his ways, but that which consists in so bringing the truths of the Bible in contact with his under-

standing and moral sensibilities, that he shall voluntarily shun the threatened evil and choose the proffered good." This is quoted from the Christian Spectator, for 1833, page 356. What is the meaning of this language? Will you not, Sir, look at it a little more particularly than you seem to have done? According to this representation, what does the Holy Spirit do in regeneration? *He brings the truths of the Bible into contact with the understanding and moral sensibilities* of the sinner, in such a manner that he is *induced* (or *persuaded*.) voluntarily to shun the threatened evil and choose the proffered good. This, we are given to understand, is *all* which the Holy Spirit can do in renewing the heart. "We know of no other effectual hold which this Divine Agent can have on the sinner, whom he would turn from the error of his ways." Pray inform me, is this the doctrine of *direct divine efficiency*, as it has been maintained by Calvinists? Can you solemnly affirm that it is? How is it that a person, believing in that doctrine, should write in this manner?

The remaining proposition in the Protest under this head is as follows:— "There is no more difficulty in accounting for the fact that the yielding sinner supremely loves God, from the impulse of a regard to his own happiness, than there is in explaining the opposite fact, of his having formerly, under the influence of the same principle, when perverted, loved his idols." This is from the Christian Spectator, for 1833, page 357. That it may be fully understood, it is important to notice what immediately follows. "The self-love that was previously in servitude to his selfish inclinations, and perverted by their unhallowed influence, now breaks away from that servitude, as his soul under the power of light and motives rendered effectual by the Holy Ghost, is made to see and feel where its true interest lies. And no sooner is this duly seen and felt, through the influence of the Spirit, than the man who is so constituted that he must have a regard to what he views as his highest good, at once chooses Christ and his service as the means of securing it." — Are we not here clearly taught, that regeneration implies no change in the *internal* or *subjective* motive by which man is influenced, — that the yielding sinner "acts under the influence of the *same principle*" as that by which he was "influenced when he supremely loved his idols?" in other words, that he has the same ultimate end, viz. a supreme regard to his own happiness. And what, according to this representation does the Holy Spirit do in regeneration? He brings "*light and motives*" before the mind of the sinner, so that he *sees* and *feels* where his true interest lies. This we are given to understand is all which it is necessary for the Spirit to do; for "no sooner is this duly seen and felt, than the man who is so constituted that he must have a regard to what he views as his highest good, at once chooses Christ and his service as the means of securing it." I ask you, Sir, is this the Calvinistic doctrine of a *direct divine efficiency* in regeneration? What do the New Haven divines mean when they speak of a *direct efficiency* of the Holy Spirit in regeneration? I ask for light on this subject, and your remarks on this article in the Protest do not emit the light demanded. They are not at all satisfactory. Indeed what light do they give on this subject? You have pretty plainly intimated that a father of high standing in the ministry, who is also a theological professor, has been grossly delinquent; you have asked me to name the men among the Congregational ministers of Connecticut who teach or hold this proposition of the Protest; and you have inquired whether the apostle James is a heretic. And what else? — My dear Sir, you must be aware, that not a few, regard the above description of regeneration as utterly inconsistent with all genuine

religious experience, and as eminently suited to lead sinners to deceive themselves with a hope of salvation which will not abide in the day of trial.

I have only to add in reference to this topic; the Pastoral Union have not charged the New Haven divines with denying the doctrine of a *direct divine efficiency* in regeneration. Nor do I charge them with denying it. How they can maintain it *consistently*, you will perceive by the preceding remarks, is what I am wholly unable to see. I proceed to the next article.

“VI. CONCERNING SPECIAL GRACE.” — “That if it is a known and revealed truth that the sinner under a present call to duty, will not act, unless God do more than he is now doing, then it is reasonable that the sinner wait until God does more; and that in all cases, the grace of God may be effectually resisted.”

I was not a little surprised by the following declaration. “You know how widely it has been reported, and by whom it has been reported, that the Professor of Didactic Theology in Yale College, in personal conversation with his friends, denies the doctrine of special grace in the conversion of sinners, and is keeping back a *public* denial of the doctrine only till the public mind shall be prepared for it.” No Sir. You mistake. I do not possess the information on this subject which you say I possess. I know no man, by whom such a report has been circulated. I do know who has been charged with circulating such a report. The charge was brought four years ago, against Dr. Nettleton. It was then promptly denied, and his accusers were called upon to exhibit the proof. But no proof has yet been adduced. That the charge should again be preferred, without a particle of proof, is to me a matter of astonishment. I now call upon you, either to retract the charge, or to substantiate it by proof. I am authorized by Dr. Nettleton to say, that he is not conscious of having ever charged Dr. Taylor with denying special grace, in any other sense than that in which Dr. Taylor has charged Dr. Tyler with being a universalist, an infidel, and an atheist. He has expressed his belief, as many other persons have done, that Dr. Taylor has in his published writings, maintained positions which lead by legitimate consequence to the denial of special grace. And Dr. Taylor has charged Dr. Tyler with maintaining positions which lead by legitimate consequence to universalism, to infidelity, and to atheism. Now suppose that I should affirm that Dr. Taylor has called Dr. Tyler a universalist, an infidel, and an atheist; would you not repel such an assertion as false and slanderous?

The language referred to by the Pastoral Union, which is supposed to involve, by legitimate consequence, the denial of special grace, is taken from Dr. Taylor's treatise on the means of regeneration. This language you think “is perfectly equivocal — no Delphic Oracle could surpass it.” (No great compliment to the writer.) But, Sir, I see nothing equivocal or obscure in passage. It appears to me, a Delphic Oracle would far surpass it. I believe it will admit of but one interpretation, without doing violence to the language. Just look at it again. “Common sense decides, that, if it is a known and revealed truth that the sinner, under a present call to duty, will not act,” (i. e. will not do his duty.) “unless God do more for him than he is now doing, then let the sinner wait” (i. e. he has a good reason for waiting) “till he does more.” This certainly, as it appears to me, is very plain language. I know not how to express my views of this passage better than to copy the following remarks from Dr. Tyler's Vindication.

“According to this statement, the sinner is authorized to believe, not only that he *can*, but also that there is no certainty that he *shall not* perform his duty; even if God should do no more for him than he is now doing; or else he is authorized to believe, that he has a good and sufficient reason for persisting in disobedience. Now every sinner under genuine conviction of sin, fully

believes, that he never shall do his duty unless God does more for him than he is now doing; and every sinner who does not believe this, betrays consummate ignorance of his own heart."

"Besides—if sinners are authorized to believe, that there is no certainty that they shall not repent, even if God does no more for them than he is now doing; then Christians may believe that when they repented, God did no more for them than he had previously done, and no more than he did for others who never have repented. *Who maketh thee to differ?* Again—If sinners are authorized to believe as above, then Christians may believe that sinners will repent and turn to God, although God should do no more for them than he is now doing. Suppose they should express this sentiment in prayer: 'Lord, we do believe that sinners will repent and be converted, even if thou shouldst withhold thy special grace, and do no more for them than thou art now doing.' But says the Reviewer, 'The grace that may attend any present call to duty, may be given in greater measure than any which preceded it.' Be it so. Still the grace which is necessary to secure repentance, has not yet been given to the sinner, who is *now* impenitent; and if it is a revealed truth, that the sinner will not repent without *that* grace, then, according to the Reviewer's statement, he has a good and sufficient reason to wait till that grace be given." This reasoning, so far as I know, has never been answered. There is as it appears to me, but one alternative; the position must be given up, or the doctrine of special grace must be abandoned.

"*That in all cases, the grace of God may be effectually resisted.*"—On this point you ask, "Do the Pastoral Union believe in the irresistible grace which Dr. Dwight so distinctly and earnestly denies? Do they protest against Dwight's Theology as boldly assailing those scriptural doctrines which constitute the long acknowledged basis of the peace and purity of the churches? Do they insist that his error on this point is subversive of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and suited to deceive many with false hopes of salvation?" Not quite so fast, brother Bacon. You exceed the speed of modern improvements. Stop, and point me to the passage in which Dr. Dwight has thus affirmed that "in all cases the grace of God may be *effectually* resisted." If he has thus affirmed, I am certainly ignorant of the fact. He did indeed object to the phrase "irresistible grace," as many others have done, who fully admit the doctrine which was thus denominated by the old divines. President Edwards says, "The dispute about grace being resistible or irresistible, is perfect nonsense. For the effect of grace is on the will: so that it is nonsense, except it be proper to say, that man with his will can resist his own will; that is, except it be possible for a man to will a thing and not will it at the same time."

The doctrine of Calvinists on this subject is, that the agency of the Holy Spirit in regeneration is effectual, efficacious, invincible, decisive, unfailling, in producing the desired effect: in other words, that sinners never so resist the grace of God as to render it impossible for God to convert them. Has Dr. Dwight denied this doctrine? Certainly not, for he has said in the very paragraph to which you have referred, "THAT THE SPIRIT OF GOD CAN DO ANY THING WITH MAN, AND CONSTITUTE MAN ANY THING WHICH HE PLEASES, CANNOT BE QUESTIONED." If this declaration of Dr. Dwight is true, the Holy Spirit can transform any sinner that he pleases into a saint, and it is not true that the grace of God *may be* in all cases effectually resisted. Do the Pastoral Union, then, "protest against Dr. Dwight's Theology, as boldly assailing those scriptural doctrines which constitute the long acknowledged basis of the peace and purity of the churches? Do they insist that his error on this point is subversive of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and suited to deceive many with false hopes of salvation?" Had there been no departure from Dr. Dwight's Theology, would you, my brother, have been so much troubled with a Protest of the Pastoral Union? Dr. Dwight does not sanction the doctrine against which the Pastoral Union have protested.

That unrenewed men do always resist the Holy Ghost, is unquestionably true. But the point at issue is, *may they in all cases effectually* resist the Spirit, and thus prevent their conversion? If every sinner may *effectually*

resist, and thus frustrate the grace of God which attempts to convert him ; then, it *may be* that not another sinner will ever be converted. You know who it is that has said, "Free moral agents can do wrong under all possible preventing influence ; using their powers as they *may* use them, they will sin ; and no one can show that some such agents will not use their powers as they *may* use them. This possibility that free agents will sin, remains, (suppose what else you will,) so long as moral agency remains ; and how can it be proved that a thing *will not be*, when for ought that appears, *it may be !*" How can it be proved, then, that every sinner *will not effectually* resist the grace of God and perish ? Has Dr. Dwight maintained any such doctrine ? Allow me to quote again his declaration, that it may be easily compared with the above. — "*That the Spirit of God can do any thing with man, and constitute man any thing he pleases, cannot be questioned.*" On this important point in theology, do the New Haven divines agree with Dr. Dwight ? Meet this question fairly, without quibbling or evasion. Do not say that the words "*may be*" denote no uncertainty ; for you know that the passage is found in a train of reasoning in which the writer is attempting to prove that if God created a universe of moral agents, there could be no *certainty* that all would persevere in holiness — that no preventing influence which God could use, would make it certain that some of them would not rebel. You will not deny, that this was the object of the writer ; and if his argument proves any thing to his purpose, it proves equally that sinners may effectually resist the grace of God and render it impossible for God to convert them.

After adding another letter in reply to your remarks on the Protest, I shall proceed to notice the contents of some of your communications which have thus long been passed in silence. Be patient, my brother ; you know it requires less time to ask, than to answer questions.

Respectfully and affectionately yours in the gospel.

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, January 4, 1840.

Letter VII.

Dear Sir, — I proceed now to notice your remarks on the last errors set forth in the Protest of the Pastoral Union, which is thus stated.

"VII. CONCERNING ELECTION.—That election is God's purpose that those should repent and believe whom he foresaw, under the most wise distribution of the means and agencies by which he could operate upon the subjects of his moral kingdom, he could induce to obey the gospel."

"On the doctrine of election," you say, "it seems to me that there is at the most as little occasion for dispute or difference between the Pastoral Union and their brethren, as on any other of the points named in this Protest." This may be, and yet there may be occasion for no inconsiderable difference. If I understand you, you see in this article of the Protest nothing objectionable ; and you seem to be filled with wonder that the Pastoral Union should take exceptions to it. You make a number of statements on this subject, in which you think all must agree. But, sir, I have learned that two persons may agree in admitting a certain general proposition, when they differ widely as to the sense in which the proposition is to be understood. I will illustrate my meaning.

Not long since, as I was informed by one who was present, a candidate for a license to preach the gospel was examined by one of our associations. During the examination he was asked what he understood by election. He replied, "It is God's purpose to convert and save only a part of the human race." To this statement no one of the association was disposed to object. And who would object to this statement? Do you think any minister of the Pastoral Union would object? Would Edwards, Bellamy, Hopkins, Smalley, Dwight, or Strong have objected? But being asked again, why God did not purpose to convert and save all men, his reply was, "we have no evidence that he was able to do it."—"I believe," said he, "that God will save as many as he can." Do you not believe, sir, that members of the Pastoral Union will object to this view of the doctrine of election? Do you not believe that Edwards, Smalley, Hopkins, Bellamy, Dwight, and Strong would have objected to this? Now it is to this view of the doctrine of election, that we do object.

Do you say that the sentiment here advanced is not adopted by any of our ministers? But, if I am correctly informed, a part of the association referred to, expressed no dissatisfaction with the answer of the candidate. Again, if I am correctly informed, the following is an article of faith adopted, within a few years past, by one of the Congregational churches of New-Haven;—"That the present system of God's moral government is the best that he could adopt to promote his own glory, and the highest good of his intelligent creatures; and that he has from eternity chosen to salvation every sinner that *he can sanctify and save* under this system." Is not the view of the doctrine of election expressed by the candidate alluded to, and in this article of faith, substantially that which has been maintained in publications which have been circulated among us? Has not the doctrine been maintained and strenuously defended, that God would make all his moral creatures holy and happy, if it were possible to him in the nature of things? Look at the following statements: "Would not a moral universe of perfect holiness be happier and better than one comprising sin and its miseries? And must not infinite benevolence accomplish all the good it can? Would not a benevolent God, then, *had it been possible to him in the nature of things*, have secured the existence of universal holiness in his moral kingdom?" Again—"Dr. Tyler maintains that God *can* secure the holiness and happiness of all his moral creatures. It follows, therefore, that God *will* secure the holiness and happiness of all his moral creatures. Of course all men will be saved." Again—"How is it that God says, Isaiah v. 4, that he has done all *that can be done* to bring sinners to repentance, when he could do more if he would." Now suppose the question to be asked, why did not God purpose to convert and save the whole human race? What must the answer be, to accord with the foregoing statements? Again—look at the following proposition which has been often repeated and vindicated: "God prefers, *all things considered*, holiness to sin, *in all instances* in which the latter takes place."—If this declaration is true, why does not God prevent sin, by securing holiness in its stead *in all instances*? Just answer that question, without evasion, or equivocation. You know that there can be but one answer; and that is, that he is *not able to do it*: for certainly God must be disposed to secure that which he on the whole prefers. This you can not, you will not deny. What, then, becomes of the doctrine of election? Why has God purposed to sanctify and save only a part of the human race? It is of no use to attempt to put an orthodox gloss upon the subject, and thus endeavor to satisfy a portion of your readers, by saying, "Whomsoever God elects to be renewed and saved, them he elects

because he foresees that it will be wise and consistent with his universal scheme for him to put forth those acts which shall secure the renovation and salvation of those individuals. — Whomsoever he passes over in his purpose of election, them he passes over because he foresees that it will not be wise, not consistent with his great scheme, for him to put forth those acts which shall secure their renovation and salvation.” — According to the doctrine of the New Haven school, why would it not have been wise for God to purpose to make all his moral creatures holy and happy? Simply because, he foresaw that he could not do it. This is taught in language too plain to be misunderstood.

You, Sir, doubtless expect me to say something in reference to your remarks on “Dr. Dana’s Letters to the Rev. Professor Stuart.” You say, — “In Dr. Dana’s ‘Letters to Professor Stuart’ — a pamphlet of which I may say that I cannot read it but with thankfulness that no Connecticut Doctor is capable of producing such a series of weak misrepresentations — I find this version of the supposed error of ‘the new theory’ respecting election, namely that it ‘subverts the doctrine of election, by resolving it into a mere certainty in the mind of God whether the sinner will voluntarily turn, or voluntarily persist in impenitence.’ Can it be — I asked myself — can it be that this is what the Pastoral Union mean to charge their brethren with believing? No — I replied — *they* certainly know better. Dr. Dana lives a great way off; and to him, looking through a glass darkly, all things may seem distorted and misplaced, and even the sun light may be gloomy; — but these brethren, who live among us, and with whom we have often taken sweet counsel, — they cannot so misunderstand, on such a subject, the opinions of their neighbors.”

In the first place, allow me to say, that I was not a little surprised at the contemptuous manner in which you speak of a pamphlet which has been so favorably received by the Christian public, and so highly commended by the periodical press, both in New England and elsewhere. I refer to the notice taken of it in the Christian Mirror; the Boston Recorder; the Congregationalist; the Biblical Repository; the Presbyterian; and the Watchman of the South. In all these journals it is highly commended. It is also favorably noticed in the Philadelphia Observer, and particularly commended for the excellent spirit which pervades its pages. You, my brother, I believe have the honor of being the first man, who has publicly spoken of it with contempt.

In the second place, permit me to say, that while Dr. Dana has *long been* a learned, able, humble, faithful, and successful minister of Christ; he has *long been* in the habit of writing for the Christian public, very much to the edification of the churches; and though he has aided the sight of his eyes *by the use of glasses*; yet I am by no means certain, that his “vision of the supposed error of the new theory respecting election” is so far from the truth, as you would have us to believe. According to him the new theory “subverts the doctrine of election by resolving it into a mere *certainty* in the mind of God, whether the sinner will voluntarily turn, or voluntarily persist in impenitence.” This you affect to regard as a gross misrepresentation. But, my dear Sir, just compare it with the following extract from the Christian Spectator for 1831, page 637. “The means of reclaiming grace which meet him in the word and spirit of God, are those by which the Father draws, *induces* just such sinners as himself voluntarily to submit to Christ; and these means all favor the act of his submission. To this influence he can yield, and thus be drawn of the Father. This influence he can resist and thus harden his heart against God. Election involves *nothing more* as it respects his individual case, except

one fact, the CERTAINTY TO THE DIVINE MIND, whether the sinner will yield to the means of grace, and voluntarily turn to God, or whether he will continue to harden his heart till the means of grace are withdrawn." — Read over this statement — ponder upon it — and ask yourself what must be its import, if fairly interpreted. God employs the best system of means which his wisdom can devise to bring sinners to repentance. He *draws, induces* them to submit to Christ. Every sinner can yield to this influence, or he can resist it. "*Election involves nothing more*, as it respects his individual case, *except one fact, THE CERTAINTY TO THE DIVINE MIND,*" — that is, the divine foreknowledge, whether the sinner will yield to the means of, grace, and voluntarily turn to God, or whether he will continue to harden his heart.

Now I ask you, Sir, is not this the very view of election which Dr. Dana has described? I ask also, whether it is possible to put a different construction upon the language quoted above, without doing violence to all legitimate rules of interpretation? And, I ask again, are you quite certain, "that no Connecticut Doctor is capable of producing such a series of weak misrepresentations" as are found in Dr. Dana's pamphlet?

But farther: If all men may *effectually* resist the grace of God, then certainly before God can purpose to renew and save any individuals, he must foresee that those individuals will cease to resist his grace, and thus render it possible for God to convert them. According to this scheme therefore, election must be founded, not only on God's foreknowledge "of what it will be wise and best for *him* to do;" but on his foresight of what *men* will do. I see not therefore, but it must be resolved, as Dr. Dana has said, "into a mere certainty in the mind of God, whether the sinner will voluntarily turn or voluntarily persist in impenitence."

Although "Dr. Dana lives a great way off," and although he has become a venerable father in the ministry, I am not sure that he has looked at this subject "through a glass darkly." He has doubtless read the Christian Spectator attentively, and I am not yet fully convinced, that he is not as capable of understanding what he reads, as the brother, who, (though greatly his junior in years,) is disposed to treat him with so great disrespect.

As you have seen fit to express so freely your views of Dr. Dana's Letters to Professor Stuart, may I not, in the third place, express the opinion, that the learned Professor, consulting his ease and reputation, may be led to maintain a dignified silence, in relation to that pamphlet.

With this review of your remarks on the Protest of the Pastoral Union, I submit to you and the reader, one of the great questions to be settled, before harmony can be restored to the ministers of this State, viz; — PREVIOUS TO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PASTORAL UNION, WERE THERE NOT SENTIMENTS INCULCATED AND PROMULGATED, WHICH WERE BELIEVED TO BE SUBVERSIVE OF THE ESTABLISHED FAITH OF OUR CHURCHES?

In your last letter you say "Let me add a few words of explanation, and I have done with this Protest for the present. First I am far from denying that there are differences between East Windsor and New Haven, or that these differences are important in respect to the illustration and defence of the doctrines revealed in the gospel. I will not now attempt to tell what the real differences are, and how they bear upon revealed truth.—Perhaps at some future stage in this discussion, I may attempt such a statement." In coming "to the root and essence of our existing difficulties," it is to be deeply regretted that you did not, in the first place, "tell what the real differences are, and how they bear upon revealed truth."—Would not this have been the most success-

ful method, which could have been adopted, "to remove misunderstanding and to unite the ministers of Connecticut more strongly than ever in those ties which seem in some danger of disruption?" But have not the communications with which you have honored me been well adapted, I do not say designed, to cast a dark cloud over the eyes of your readers, and hide from their view the real differences "between East Windsor and New Haven, and how they bear upon revealed truth?" But you intimate that there are to be future stages in this discussion, and that "at some future stage" you "may attempt such a statement." I beg you to do it. Do it fully, do it faithfully, do it in the fear of God. And do it at as early a stage in this discussion as possible. —Let minor subjects of dispute be passed in silence, until you have brought distinctly to view what, in your opinion, are the real theological differences between our brethren of the New Haven School and the members of the Pastoral Union. Tell us *how important* you conceive these differences to be, "in respect to the illustration and defence of the doctrines revealed in the gospel," and "how they bear upon revealed truth." And in doing this, it seems needful, and if I mistake not, there are obvious reasons, why you should answer the questions publicly propounded to Dr. Taylor by Dr. Woods in 1830, and which Dr. Taylor was earnestly requested to answer. 1. These questions respect the "root and essence of our existing difficulties." 2. They have not, to this day, so far as I know, been answered. 3. You have volunteered your services, and taken the lead in this discussion, for the professed purpose of removing "misunderstanding, and to unite the ministers of Connecticut more strongly than ever." There is misunderstanding on theological points, between the ministers of Connecticut, which will not, in my opinion, be fully removed until these questions are satisfactorily answered. 4. In commencing this discussion, you have put yourself in the place of Dr. Taylor, and may we not expect you to act his part in this particular. 5. In the autumn of 1829, the day after the anniversary of the Andover Seminary, Drs. Beecher, Taylor, Goodrich, Nettleton, Church, Cornelius, Hewitt, Spring, Porter, Woods, Professor Stuart, and some other gentleman, met in Dr. Porter's study, for a conference on the subjects of controversy, on which they and others entertained different opinions. In the autumn of 1830, not long after Dr. Woods' Letters to Dr. Taylor were published, in which are the questions alluded to, there was at the same place a similar meeting. The following gentlemen, and some others, were present: Drs. Day, Beecher, Porter, Hewitt, Nettleton, Church, Pond, Stowe, the four Professors of Andover Seminary, Rev. Leonard Bacon, Rev. E. Beecher, Rev. Parsons Cooke, Rev. George Howe, and Rev. Amos Blanchard. Dr. Beecher stated, "that the object of the meeting was, to deliberate on some practicable mode of discussing the subjects of controversy, on which evangelical ministers are supposed to entertain different opinions." And now, my brother, is the printed document spread out before me correct in asserting, that "after various remarks made by different gentlemen, on the evils of controversy, a new turn was given to the whole subject, and the following resolution was offered by Mr. Bacon, and seconded by Dr. Beecher:—"Resolved, as the sense of this meeting, without wishing to control the judgment of individuals concerned, that it is desirable that all farther controversy, by means of pamphlets books and periodicals, respecting the topics which have recently divided the opinions of the evangelical ministers of New England, cease, from this time, on both sides." It is further asserted, in the document before me, that you advocated the adoption of this resolution, and that it was passed, the gentlemen not assenting to it, having previously

retired from the meeting. Whether you offered that resolution as an apology for Dr. Taylor's not answering Dr. Woods' questions, or, as I am quite disposed to believe, merely to prevent the evils of controversy; since Dr. Taylor has not answered those questions, and since you have now entered the field of public discussion, and have commenced debates by asking questions, because you think "it is high time that they were asked earnestly, and answered unequivocally;" you will not, you can not object to answering yourself the questions which Dr. Woods propounded to Dr. Taylor. What I wish you to do I will express in a quotation from Dr. Woods' Letters to Dr. Taylor, pp. 103-4-5-6.

"As to the subjects of discussion introduced in these Letters, I hope you will take care not to overlook the main points. Whatever labor you may bestow upon smaller things, be careful not to pass by those which are of primary importance.—You will excuse me if I mention some of them, and suggest to you what I suppose to be necessary on your part, to meet the circumstances of the case, and the wishes of the community.

"As to the two positions, then, which you call 'common but groundless assumptions,' I wish to ask, what you take to be the real sentiments which your brethren mean to express by these positions: and whether you deny them in the sense in which they affirm them; or if not, in what sense you do deny them; and whether you hold the opposite; or if not, whether your belief really stops with the mere negative of the common belief?

"In regard to the second position, my question is, whether your theory implies that God could have prevented all sin, or the present degree of it? The question relates to moral agents actually existing; and to answer it by saying, yes, God could have prevented all sin, or the present degree of it, by not giving existence to moral beings,—would be a mere shuffle. According to your theory, was God able to prevent sin in the literal sense, (which is the first sense I have given of power,)—that is, was he able to do it, if, on the whole he had chosen to do it?

"As you appear to hold that God *could not* prevent sin, in the third sense I have given, will you inform us wherein you suppose the impossibility or absurdity consists? also whether you consider it impossible or absurd in all cases alike for God to prevent sin? and if not, then what makes the difference? And if the prevention of sin is impossible in this sense, that is, absurd and contradictory; then in what sense is such prevention of sin an object of God's desire or choice?

"Will you inform us distinctly what you mean by the *nature of things*, and in what sense and degree you suppose the power of God limited by it?

"As the nature of moral agency is much concerned with this discussion, will you give us your views of it very particularly? Do you consider it to be such, that it is wholly or in part beyond the power of God to direct and control it as he chooses? If you say, partly, but not wholly; then tell us why it is not as really an infringement upon moral agency for God to control it in part, as wholly? If you hold that God cannot control moral agency in all cases, though he can in some; then, why not in all, as well as in some? Also, how far does God direct events in the natural, social and civil world?

"You will gratify us, by showing very clearly and particularly, what that is in the nature of moral agents, which you suppose makes it impossible for God to form their characters and direct their actions according to his own pleasure? Is it any particular faculty or attribute, or their whole nature taken in one general view?

"If God can exert no influence on the minds of men, except by rational motives, can he make that influence effectual to sway their hearts, when he pleases?

"We shall wish to know, whether your theory implies, as many have supposed it does, that God has so made moral agents that they are *independent* of him, as to their moral feelings and actions? If you hold that moral agents, as such, are dependent on God; then, how far, and in what respects are they so?

"As this discussion is intimately connected with the doctrine of divine influence; we shall be gratified to know what your theory is in respect to that doctrine. You speak of the influence of the Spirit in regeneration, as supernatural. Will you inform us in what sense you use the word, supernatural? why such influence is necessary? and whether the Spirit of God in regeneration has a direct influence on the mind itself?

"As many have understood you, as agreeing substantially with the Pelagians, and particularly with Dr. John Taylor, in regard to the natural state of man, free will and conversion; will you inform us whether, and how far, this is the case?

"And as many have doubted whether you maintain the doctrine of divine decrees and divine sovereignty, in the sense in which it is commonly maintained by the orthodox, will you inform us on this subject?

"Is your theory of moral agency the same as that which Edwards maintained in his treatise on the Will?"

"I have understood you as holding, that God could not have done better than he has for any individual moral agent, and of course that he could not have converted any more sinners, than he has converted. Have I understood you right? If God pleased, and saw it to be on the whole best, could he convert any one, and every one, who is not converted? If not; what is the hindrance? And is that hindrance greater here, than has in other instances been overcome by the power of the Holy Spirit?"

"If you see faults in the reasoning in Letter VI, or if you suppose that you have been misunderstood on the points there discussed; you will particularly inform us. — Could God, according to your theory, preserve any of his creatures in a state of holiness, without the influence arising from the existence and punishment of sin?"

"Does your theory imply that the only choice which God had, was between the present moral system, including so much evil, and no moral system at all? or does it admit that there might have been other systems, and some of them excluding all evil, which were conceived by the mind of God, to which he preferred the present system?"

"As the subjects treated of in Letter VII are of a practical nature, I hope you will express your views of them with all possible plainness, not overlooking the questions found in the paragraph beginning at the lower part of p. 87. The same as to the several articles in the present Letter, in which I have shown what I apprehend to be the natural influence of your theory, compared with the common one."

"But it will be quite unnecessary for me to go over the whole ground of the discussion in order to show what I consider to be the main points. You will see what they are, and will doubtless notice them. And I earnestly hope, that you will do all in your power to remove the dissatisfaction and disquietude of your brethren, far and near, and to allay their honest fears in regard to the nature and consequences of your speculations."

Before concluding this communication, it seems proper that I should offer a few remarks:

1. On your use of the words, *heresy* and *heretic*. I have marked the places in your Letters where these words are used, but they are too numerous to be quoted. It is sufficient to say, that you have "rung the changes" on these words long and loud. We know very well, that it is easy to excite sympathy for men, and especially for those, who occupy important stations in the church, and are reputed good men, by holding them up to public view as having been denounced as heretics. And we know too, that it is no difficult matter, in this way, to bring upon those, who conscientiously refuse to countenance error, much public odium. Now I do not take upon myself the responsibility of saying, that there are no persons in community, who believe that downright heresy is inculcated at New Haven, and that the opinion has not been expressed by high authority out of the Pastoral Union and out of the ministry, that the charter of Yale College has been endangered by proceedings in connection with the theological department in that institution; but have I called my brethren of the New Haven school *heretics*, or denominated their peculiar sentiments *heresy*? No — never. Neither am I, or the Pastoral Union accountable for the opinions or expressions of individuals; and it is with me and the Pastoral Union, as a body, that you have undertaken to deal. And may not an association of ministers of Christ express their dissent from, and even solemnly protest against doctrines publicly maintained and zealously propagated, without being thus subjected to public indignation? Should the popular feeling be thus addressed? My dear sir, can you not defend your cause without a resort to such measures?

But will you say, although the Pastoral Union have not used the words, *heresy* and *heretic*, they have done that which amounts to the same thing. Allow me to say, the Pastoral Union in their Protest merely quoted and published, without note or comment, the language of their opponents, and I think you would have done better had you copied their example in this particular. — But what are *heretics*? Dr. Watts has given us the following answer: "When a papist uses the word, *heretics*, he generally means protest-

ants; when a protestant uses the word, he means any persons wilfully and contentiously obstinate in fundamental errors." Have the Pastoral Union in any of their acts represented their brethren of the New Haven school as "*wilfully and contentiously obstinate* in fundamental errors.?" For aught I know, there may be individuals in the Pastoral Union, who would not hesitate to denominate the errors described in the Protest, heresy. There may be others who would hesitate to apply to them that epithet. In the view of some it is proper to denominate any sentiment heretical, which by legitimate consequence subverts any of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel. Others apply the term only to such errors, as are in their view damnable — that is, such errors as can not be believed by real Christians. Now, sir, in commenting on the Protest of the Pastoral Union, it is obviously unjust to make them responsible, as a body, for the language which they have not used, and have not sanctioned.

2. The vote of the Pastoral Union declaring it to be inconsistent to license, ordain, &c. those who hold the errors described in the Protest, you consider as interfering with the rights and prerogatives of the district Associations and ordaining councils. You ask, "Is it right, is it orderly, is it — in the phrase of your resolution — "consistent" for certain ministers, coming together in a society, unknown to our ecclesiastical system, to forestall in that one-sided society the discussion of a question which belongs to the Association? Is it right, is it orderly, for those ministers, after such an *ex parte* discussion, to commit and bind themselves by resolutions, and then to attempt to make those resolutions more binding — if not on the conscience, at least on the weakness of those brethren who are afraid of being "inconsistent" — "by publishing them to the world?" Here, my brother, permit me to ask you one question. "Is it right, is it orderly, is it — in the phrase of the resolution — consistent, for certain ministers" to be zealously engaged in teaching and propagating sentiments which are believed to be subversive of the established faith of our churches and Associations, and then demand of their brethren, who are known to be conscientiously opposed to those sentiments, that they set to them their most solemn seal of approbation? This is requiring too much. We are willing that our New Haven brethren should think, speak, and act for themselves. We would not infringe their right of embracing such doctrines as they please, and of adopting all suitable means for propagating their sentiments; but if they go farther and demand of us that we become responsible for doctrines which we believe to be erroneous and dangerous, they infringe our rights of conscience, and they transcend the limits of justice. And what I am about to say, you will not receive as a menace, — no such thing is intended, — nor as expressing otherwise than my private judgment; if you and your associates insist upon members of the Pastoral Union becoming responsible for doctrines which they repudiate, you will meet with decided, open, unyielding opposition. This opposition will be sustained by the claims of religious liberty, by the demands of justice, by the dictates of conscience, and by the fear of God. We are willing to act on the principle of reciprocity, granting to you the privileges, which we claim for ourselves. And if we are not recreant to our vows, I ask you, sir, can we act on a more liberal principle?

Allow me here to remark, that you greatly mistake the object of the Pastoral Union, if you suppose they intended, by the vote referred to above, to interfere with the Associations, or any of our regular ecclesiastical bodies. This vote is an expression of their opinion, on the subject of licensing candidates, and ordaining and installing pastors. And have not the members of

the Pastoral Union a right to express their opinion on this, as well as on any other subject? Must they first gain permission before they express their thoughts on this grave subject? If so, to whom shall they apply for permission? If you should publicly affirm, that it would be improper to license men to preach the gospel, who had not pursued a course of theological studies, or who were destitute of natural or acquired abilities, or who embraced certain erroneous sentiments; should you suppose you were interfering with the prerogatives of our district Associations by the expression of such an opinion? And if the Association of Gentlemen, who conducted the *Christian Spectator*, had made a similar declaration, tell me, would they have been considered as having done what they had no right to do? Suppose the members of some one of our ministers' meetings, should express the opinion and publish it to the world that it would be inconsistent for Congregational ministers to license those to preach the gospel, who deny the doctrine of infant baptism, or who hold the system of doctrines maintained by the Wesleyan Methodists; would they be considered as interfering with the rights and prerogatives of our Associations? And suppose on the publication of this opinion a Baptist, or Methodist minister should say, "The question now before the public is not whether the Baptists and Methodists "are right in their speculations," — but whether they are *so far gone* in error as to justify the measures "which have been adopted, and the representations which have been uttered" — "whether in the attempt to break them down, and denounce them to the country and to posterity as heretics," the Christian community "of Connecticut, heretofore so rich in blessings for the world, shall be rent in fragments and exhaust their energies upon party conflicts;" would you not think, sir, that this Baptist or Methodist minister was, in rather a questionable manner, attempting to secure popular sympathy? — My dear sir, I think I have already shown, that the Pastoral Union had a right to protest against what they deemed to be erroneous sentiments; and had they not a right to state, what they considered to be their own duty in reference to licensing, ordaining, &c. those who maintain these sentiments? Let those who believe the doctrines against which the Pastoral Union protested, assume the responsibility of disseminating them; but why should they wish to make their brethren accountable for sentiments which they do not believe, and for acts which they do not approve?

Affectionately and sincerely,

your friend and brother,

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, January 11, 1840.

Letter XXX.

Dear Sir, — I quote the following extracts from your second Letter.

"But it was not thought best to leave truth and argument to do their own work. From the beginning of the controversy, and from before the beginning, one man has continually labored to bring other forces to bear on the result, and especially to spread far and wide the most dreadful impressions respecting 'the New Haven heresy.' To this end — being exempted by circumstances from the necessity of any other labor, — he has employed, with great zeal, all the powers of his mind, and all the personal influence which he had acquired by labors once performed in a very different service. I mean the Rev. Asahel Nettleton, whose career for the last fifteen years has been, to me, a sad illustration of the impolicy of encouraging in any circumstances, such a functionary as a professional revivalist. — The men who were his best friends in the days of his

zeal and toil for the conversion of sinners to Christ — the men who took him by the hand and helped him to rise, when others thought lightly of him — the men by whose aid, and in whose parishes he gained the reputation which gives him more than half his influence, have found that influence turned against themselves, to make them first suspected, then odious, and to cause their names to be cast out as evil. I speak not of that brother's motives, I bring no accusations against him — to his own master let him stand or fall; I speak only of facts not to be disputed. He himself will be the last to deny that his influence has had more to do with what I esteem the disastrous bearing of this controversy than any other human influence. Had the revivals, under the ministry of Dr. Taylor, at New Haven, and Dr. Beecher, at Litchfield, been conducted without the aid of an itinerant evangelist, the ecclesiastical history of Connecticut, and of the Presbyterian church in the United States, for these few years past, would have been materially different. — Other men, doubtless, felt, and might have felt without his aid, the necessity of forming a party, and of adding to the force of argument, the force of party combination, and the force of reports and whisperings scattered by epistle and personal conference over all the land; but no man having the charge of a parish, no travelling agent even, having on his hands the work of the institution which employs him, could accomplish much in this way under our ecclesiastical organization. — Only such a man as he whom I have named — travelling from one end of the country to another, and going beyond the Atlantic, to instil prejudice into every credulous or unguarded mind; gathering up reports wherever they could be found, and scattering them wherever they were likely to take root; establishing confidence and correspondences that have grown into telegraphic communications of common fame, and devoting himself to the work with the zeal of an apostle — could have brought to pass that, of which you and I and all of us are witnesses."

Speaking of the convention held at East Windsor — September, 1834; you ask, "Did not Mr. Nettleton unfold his treasure of reports and opinions, gathered from east and west, north and south, all implicating the character of brethren who were not there to plead, either guilty or not guilty, to things thus brought against them?"

Your attack on Dr. Nettleton, my brother, has inflicted a deeper wound on the feelings of many of your readers, than you are probably aware. That minister of Christ has numerous friends to whom his reputation is as dear as their own, and sure I am that there are thousands in New England "who will consider that in defending him, they defend the cause in one of its most vital points."

"One man has continually labored to bring other forces to bear on the result, and especially to spread far and wide the most dreadful impressions respecting the New Haven heresy."

What evidence have you, that Dr. Nettleton has ever called the New Haven Divinity heresy, or the New Haven divines heretics? He has no recollection of ever having used such language, and his most intimate friends assure me, that they have never heard him use it. That the New Haven Divines have, in their published writings, advanced great and dangerous errors, errors which are suited to corrupt revivals, promote spurious conversions, and thus exert a disastrous influence on the cause of evangelical religion, in his honest belief. This belief he has not hesitated to express on all suitable occasions. But he has never represented their errors in such a shocking light as they have represented the sentiments of their brethren. He has never said, that nothing but their "inconsistency saves them from being *the very worst of heretics.*" He has never charged them with *asserting* that "sin is a good thing;" and with maintaining theories which make "God the responsible author of sin" — "a deceiver" — and a "criminal tempter." He has not charged them with maintaining a principle which "by legitimate consequence leads to UNIVERSALISM, to INFIDELITY, and ATHEISM;" and "which in the hands of *Voltaire* and other enemies of the gospel has spread *infidelity* and atheism to such a fearful extent throughout Europe." No sir, he has made no such representation — nothing like it — nothing to be compared with it. What do you mean then by the sweeping charges that he has "continually labored

— to spread far and wide *the most dreadful impressions* respecting the New Haven heresy?" Suppose he has expressed his belief that some of the principles advanced by the New Haven divines, do inevitably lead to Arminian, or Pelagian conclusions; and that they are the very principles maintained by Dr. John Taylor, and other opposers of the Calvinistic system; — do you consider Arminianism and Pelagianism to be worse than universalism, infidelity and atheism? And is it worse, in your estimation, to be ranked with Dr. John Taylor, than with Voltaire and other infidel philosophers? Who is it, my dear sir, that has spread far and wide *the most dreadful impressions* respecting the opinions of his brethren? *

That Dr. Nettleton has from the beginning been greatly distressed on account of the speculations of the New Haven brethren, is true. It has been his solemn conviction, that these speculations are calculated to do great injury to the cause of Christ. This conviction, I am assured, he has again and again expressed to the New Haven brethren themselves. He has expressed it to others. He has felt it his duty to bear his testimony against what he regards dangerous sentiments, and to exert what influence God has given him to promote the cause of truth and righteousness. And has he not a right to do it? Is he not solemnly bound to do it?

And what "other forces" than, "those of truth and argument," has he brought "to bear on the result?" Has he undertaken to sway the minds of his brethren in any other way than by addressing their understandings, and presenting to them such considerations as are suited to produce conviction? And if he has exerted one fourth part of the influence which you attribute to him, (and that his influence has been great I shall not deny,) what but truth and argument have given him this power? Who are the men, whom you represent as being under his influence? — Are they men of no understandings — men who do not think and reason for themselves? Are they men who are governed by a blind impulse, and who bow implicitly to the dictation of a single individual? Are you aware, sir, what imputations you cast upon a large portion of the ministers of Connecticut?

But to return to Dr. Nettleton. What has he done? If he is to be arraigned before the public, let us have specific allegations, and not general and indefinite charges which no one can answer. It is easy to charge any man with having been, for a course of years, engaged in nothing but mischief; but who can meet such a charge? Let us have the facts and the proof of them; or some of them at least; for surely if the general allegation is true, they must be abundant, and can be easily specified.

You speak of "party combinations" — of "reports and whisperings scattered by epistle and by personal conference over all the land — of travelling from one end of the country to the other, and going beyond the Atlantic, to instil prejudice into every credulous or unguarded mind; gathering up reports wherever they could be found, and scattering them wherever they were likely to take root." — Now what does all this mean? What "party combinations" has Dr. Nettleton formed? What "reports and whisperings" has he "scattered by epistle and personal conference over all the land?" Has he circulated any false reports? If so, what are they? He has doubtless written letters to his friends, and had personal conference with them as opportunity afforded. Is this a crime? If there has been any thing improper in his communications, any thing deserving of public reprehension, let us know what it is. He has no doubt expressed freely to his friends, both in conversation and writing, his theological opinions, and his dissatisfaction with

* See an article by Dr. Taylor in the Christian Spectator for Sept., 1832.

publications which he regards as containing erroneous sentiments; and has he not a right to do it? Have others a right to speak from the pulpit and the press, and to scatter their sentiments over the land; and is he bound to be silent? Suppose he has travelled into different parts of the country, and even beyond the Atlantic. — What then? Was that of course a crime? Must he necessarily have been influenced by some sinister motive? Could he have had no other object in view than to slander his brethren, and “to instil prejudice into every credulous, or unguarded mind?” What proof is there that such has been his object? Away, my brother, with all such evil surmises. Give us facts and proofs. Is a minister of the gospel to be publicly arraigned and condemned on general and indefinite charges, without one single specification, or one particle of proof? Would you, sir, be willing to have your character thus assailed? It is my sincere desire, that it may never be thus assailed.

You ask, “Did not Mr. Nettleton, (in the convention at East Windsor,) unfold his treasure of reports and opinions, gathered from east and west, from north and south, all implicating the character of brethren who were not there to plead, either guilty or not guilty to the things thus alleged against them?” Why do you ask this question? You profess to be entirely ignorant of what transpired in the convention. Why then do you throw out the insinuation which this inquiry implies? Suppose you had been present in a meeting of ministers of whose proceedings I had no knowledge. Suppose one of your brethren who was there also had publicly spoken of it as a very interesting meeting — that the time was spent in “solemn deliberation and prayer, and that the brethren appeared to act in the fear of God and for the honor of Christ.” — And suppose I should come forward in the public prints, and should put to that brother this question: Did not Mr. Bacon occupy much of the time, in bringing false and slanderous accusations against “brethren who were not there to plead, either guilty or not guilty to the things thus alleged against them?” What would you say to such an interrogation, and such an insinuation, made confessedly without any evidence to sustain it? Instead of answering such a question, would you not be likely to demand the reason why it was put? Although I feel under no obligation to answer such questions, yet I am willing to say, that Dr. Nettleton made no statements in the convention about absent brethren which he had not often made to them, or which he is not willing to make to them in the presence of the whole world. You say, —

“The men who were his best friends in the days of his zeal and toil for the conversion of sinners to Christ — the men who took him by the hand and helped him to rise when others thought lightly of him — the men by whose aid and in whose parishes he gained the reputation which gives him more than half his influence, have found that influence turned against themselves, to make them first suspected, then odious, and to cause their names to be cast out as evil. — Had the revivals under the ministry of Dr. Taylor, at New Haven, and Dr. Beecher, at Litchfield been conducted without the aid of an itinerant evangelist, the ecclesiastical history of Connecticut, and of the Presbyterian church in the United States for these few years past, would have been materially different.”

On this statement you must allow me to make several remarks.

“*When others thought lightly of him.*” By whom was he thought lightly of at the period to which you refer? He was indeed, ridiculed, reproached, and slandered by universalists, infidels and scoffers; but by the ministers and churches of his own denomination, so far as they were acquainted with him, he was universally esteemed. Dr. Porter thus speaks of him in his *Letters on Revivals*: “About the close of the period which I attempted to describe

in former letters, the Rev. Asabel Nettleton devoted himself to the work of an evangelist. With his eminent qualifications for this work, and usefulness in it, I presume you to be well acquainted. The fact, however, which is especially to my present purpose to mention, and which probably many of you do not know, is that this distinguished itinerant, found no difficulty to labor, as an *assistant* of stated pastors, without making himself their *rival*. If in any instance he could not conscientiously coincide in the views, or co-operate in the measures of a pastor, among whose charge he was invited to labor, he did not sow dissension in that church, nor seek to detach their affections from their ministers; but quietly withdrew to another place. The consequence was, that the visits of this devoted servant of Christ *were always sought*, and never dreaded nor regretted by ministers or churches."

"*Itinerant evangelist.*"—How came Dr. Nettleton to be an evangelist? It was his purpose, for some time before he became a preacher, to be a missionary to the heathen. Accordingly, after he was licensed to preach, not expecting to remain long in the country, he commenced laboring in waste places. His labors were immediately attended with signal success. Wherever he went, revivals of religion soon commenced. His brethren in the ministry, witnessing his success, persuaded him to relinquish the idea of a foreign mission, at least for a time, and devote himself to the work of an evangelist at home, under the conviction that God had called him to this department of ministerial labor. Still it was always his purpose to labor in destitute congregations and waste places, and it was not without solicitation, as many will testify, that he consented to labor as an assistant to settled pastors. He was never complained of for thrusting himself into parishes where he was not wanted; but the complaint continually was, that it was so difficult to obtain him. And here allow me to remark, that Dr. Nettleton himself seems to have been the first man to discover the evils which would be likely to flow out of the system of maintaining an order of evangelists, as assistants to settled pastors. Accordingly when the General Association in 1820 appointed a committee, of whom Dr. Beecher was chairman, to take into consideration the subject of increasing ministerial labor in the several congregations in our connection, and when that committee met the September following, at the house of Dr. Taylor, in New-Haven, Dr. Nettleton was invited in, and consulted as to the expediency of introducing and supporting an order of evangelists. He was asked whether he would consent to act as an evangelist for the State, and was told, if he would locate himself at New-Haven, in that capacity, it was believed the churches would guarantee him an ample support. He remarked that he never had yet received a dollar from any benevolent society or public association, and that he did not choose to labor in this way. He moreover gave it as his opinion, that it would be inexpedient to undertake to introduce and support an order of evangelists. He foresaw the evils which would be likely to grow out of the system, if it were made a permanent thing; and they were the very evils which were afterwards so strikingly realized in some parts of the country. Through his influence, if I am correctly informed, the project was abandoned.

"*The men who took him by the hand and helped him to rise.*" It should be remembered, that Dr. Nettleton had been laboring almost constantly in revivals of religion, for about four years, and was extensively known as a successful minister of the gospel, before he became associated with Dr. Beecher and Dr. Taylor, or to use your language, before they "took him by the hand." How much he was indebted to them for his subsequent usefulness, I shall not un-

undertake to decide. Whatever may have been his obligations to them, I trust he is not unmindful of them. Of one thing, however, I am certain; the time has been when they, as well as many other men of distinction, have been willing to acknowledge themselves greatly his debtors. If Dr. Beecher and Dr. Taylor made Dr. Nettleton what he was, as has been claimed, why have they not raised up other men equally distinguished? Why was Dr. Nettleton, in 1825, urgently requested to come to New-Haven for the purpose of teaching a young pastor "to be an accomplished revival man"? Why did not Dr. Taylor undertake the work? And why did a distinguished man of New-Haven, in 1824, request Dr. Nettleton to take under his instruction a young brother in the ministry, and particular friend of his, that he might "learn the great art of doing good," adding, "almost all that I know on this subject, I learned from you"? Why did he not apply directly to the men who had taught Dr. N. this great art, or who had made him what he was? Besides—did your predecessor ever witness any revivals of religion among his people till he was assisted by Dr. Nettleton? If he did not, how shall we account for the fact, if Dr. N. learned the art of doing good from Dr. Taylor and Dr. Beecher? He had for four years been laboring almost constantly in revivals. I should not ask these questions, had not the representations which have gone abroad rendered it necessary. My dear sir, no man—no set of men, made Dr. Nettleton what he was. It was the remark of John Newton, that "none but he who made the world, can make a minister of the gospel." This remark is pre-eminently true, of such a minister as Dr. Nettleton. For all the success which has attended his labors, let God only be praised.

"*The men by whose aid, and in whose parishes, he gained the reputation which gives him more than half his influence.*" It is true, that the labors of Dr. Nettleton were attended with great success, in repeated instances, both in Litchfield and New-Haven. But they were equally successful in many other places, both before and after his visit to those towns. He commenced preaching in 1811. From that time to 1822, (when he was brought to death's door by the typhus fever, and when standing by his bed of death, as it was supposed, I heard from his lips facts respecting his labors and wants, which would have interested your feelings much,) he was almost constantly in revivals of religion, and so abundant were his labors, that to many of his brethren it was a wonder that his constitution could sustain them. Have you never heard of the revivals in South Salem, N. Y., in Danbury, in Monroe, in North Lyme, in Hadlyme, in Chester, in Bloomfield, in Turkeyhills, in Salmon Brook, in Bolton and in Litchfield South Farms? These occurred previous to his first visit at New-Haven, in 1815. During the same period he preached occasionally in many other places, and in almost all instances some sinners were awakened by his preaching. Subsequent to this period, have you not heard of the revivals in Salisbury, (where nearly three hundred were supposed to have experienced religion,) in Bridgewater, in Torrington, in Waterbury, in Middletown Upper Houses, in Rocky Hill, in Ashford and other towns adjoining, and again in Bolton? All these occurred between the latter part of the year 1815 and the summer of 1819. Have you never heard of the remarkable work of God in Saratoga county, N. Y., in 1819 and 1820, extending into many towns and into Union College, in which, according to the account written by Dr. McAuley, not less than 2000 souls were supposed to have been made subjects of renewing grace? Have you never heard of the very powerful revivals in Nassau, N. Y., in North Killingworth, in North Madison, and in Wethersfield,

which occurred in 1820? Have you never heard of Dr. Nettleton's labors in 1821, at Farmington and the adjoining towns; also in Massachusetts, at Pittsfield, Lenox and Lee; and in 1822 at Somers and Tolland, and North Coventry and South Wilbraham, Mass.? My dear Sir, if you had been as well acquainted with the history of Dr. Nettleton as some of your older brethren, I do not believe you would ever have affirmed that it was in Litchfield and New-Haven that he "gained the reputation which gives more than half his influence." His labors in those places, it is true, (and especially when we take into consideration the revivals in Yale College, which occurred in connection with his labors in New-Haven,) constitute an interesting portion of his history; but still it is comparatively but a small portion.

"Had the revivals under the ministry of Dr. Taylor, at New-Haven, and Dr. Beecher, at Litchfield, been conducted without the aid of an itinerant evangelist, the ecclesiastical history of Connecticut, and of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, for these few years past, would have been materially different."

As you do not tell us in what respects it would have been materially different, we are left to infer your meaning from the train of your reasoning. If I understand it, it is this;—that the controversy and division which exist among the ministers of Connecticut, and in the Presbyterian Church, is to be traced, in a great measure, at least, to the fact that Dr. Nettleton preached for a season in New-Haven and Litchfield, some eighteen, twenty, and twenty-five years ago. Truly Dr. Taylor and Dr. Beecher little thought what they were doing, when they invited and urged that brother to assist them in their labors. And I very much doubt whether they ever would have known, if you had not informed them, that so much evil was connected with this imprudent step of theirs. According to your representation, they certainly have much to account for.

"The men by whose aid, and in whose parishes he gained the reputation which gives him more than half his influence, have found that influence turned against themselves, to make them first suspected, then odious, and to cause their names to be cast out as evil."

How has his influence been turned against them? What has he done? He has indeed refused to embrace, or to countenance, sentiments which he honestly believes to be false and dangerous. And has any man a right to require him to do it? I have the best reason for believing, that Dr. Nettleton highly prized the friendship of Dr. Taylor and Dr. Beecher, and that he would gladly have made any sacrifice to retain it, but a surrender of conscience. But this sacrifice he could not make. His obligations to the Great Head of the church were paramount to all other obligations. When he found that his brethren were embracing and abetting sentiments, which he could not approve, in a friendly and faithful manner he expostulated with them, both in private conversation and by letters. Thus in 1821, he wrote to Dr. Taylor, "with all my love and respect for brothers Taylor, Goodrich, and Beecher, I must say, that neither my judgment, nor conscience, nor heart can acquiesce; I can go with you no farther." And at a later period, in 1829, when Dr. Beecher attempted to persuade him, that if he could not approve of the New-Haven sentiments, he would, at least, hold his peace, and not express any dissatisfaction with them, he said to him, "you might as well ask me to cut off my conscience and throw it away." He said also, "such is my conviction of the tendency of all these sentiments to corrupt revivals and produce spurious conversions, that if New-England should go over, I should prefer to stand alone." Such being his convictions, what was it his duty to do? Is moral principle to be sacrificed on the altar of friendship? Is he indeed worthy the name of a friend who demands such a sacrifice?

If Dr. Nettleton has manifested an unchristian spirit, or if he has resorted to any dishonorable means to promote what he believes to be the cause of truth, let it be shown. Has he treated his brethren with unkindness? Has he impeached their motives—depreciated their talents—or aspersed their character? What then has he done to render them odious, and to cause their names to be cast out as evil; unless it be to bear testimony against the errors which they have published to the world?

That the influence of Dr. Nettleton has been greatly feared by the abettors of the New Divinity, I am fully aware. I am also aware that great pains have been taken to neutralize and destroy his influence. And allow me to ask, whether no “other forces,” but those of “truth and argument,” have been brought to bear on this result? Have not opprobrious epithets been employed to stigmatize his character? Has it not been asserted in the public prints, that “Nettleton and a few others must bear the sin and shame of what would have disgraced any age of papal power and bigotry?” Has not he been called by grave divines, “a heresy hunter;” — “a busy body;” — “a mischief maker;” — “a gossip!” Has not the story been circulated from one end of the land to the other, that, “he has lost his mind,” and is “partially deranged?” (strange that such a man should exert such a powerful and extensive influence!) To deter him from expressing his honest convictions, has he not been plied with flattery and with threats? Did not a gentleman tell him to his face in 1829, “—— and I have made you what you are, and if you do not behave yourself, we will hew you down?” And did not that gentleman mention this threat to the one whom he associated with himself, and did not the latter gentleman mention it to Dr. Plummer, of Virginia, and thus make it public, when Dr. Nettleton had never mentioned it even to his most intimate friends? Did not the former gentleman also mention this threat to a clergyman now residing in New Hampshire, who informed a minister of this State of the fact not long since? Is it not true, that from that time to the present, stories have been industriously circulated in every quarter, injurious to the reputation of Dr. Nettleton? Do you not know, Sir, that at the time of the meeting of the General Association in Enfield, in 1835, a gentleman said in the house of the late Mr. Dixon, that “*Mr. Nettleton had forsaken his calling, and that God had forsaken him,*” and that “*he had done nothing but mischief for the last ten years?*” And do you not know, that use was made of this identical language, and that there is abundant proof of the fact which can be adduced? Now I ask, has Dr. Nettleton done any thing like this, to oppose the influence of “the men who took him by the hand, and helped him to rise?” Has he threatened to “hew them down?” Has he declared in the public prints, that they “must bear the sin and shame of what would have disgraced any age of papal power and bigotry?” Has he spread far and wide the report that they “have lost their minds,” and “are partially deranged?” Has he applied to them low and degrading epithets? Has he asserted that they “have forsaken their calling, and that God has forsaken them,” and that for a course of years they “have done nothing but mischief?” I ask you, has Dr. Nettleton done any thing like this? — any thing to be compared with it?

Allow me to call your attention a moment to the ten years, during which it was affirmed, that Dr. Nettleton had done nothing but mischief; — that is, from 1825, to 1835. Are you acquainted with his history during that period? Perhaps I can inform you of some facts, a knowledge of which you do not now possess. I have already mentioned, that in 1822, Dr. Nettleton was brought to the borders of the grave by typhus fever. From that sickness

he has never recovered, so as to enjoy sound health for a single day. Much of the time he has been unable to labor at all. Some part of the time he has been able to preach only once on the Sabbath, and to perform very little extra labor. At no time has he been able to engage in a systematic course of labor, such as he pursued during the first ten years of his ministry, even for a week, without entirely prostrating him. Yet feeble as he was during the period which has been specified, he was not altogether idle, and whether he was forsaken of God you may judge after considering the following facts. In 1825 there was a very interesting revival under his preaching, in two parishes, in Taunton, Ms. In 1826 his labors were greatly blessed in Jamaica, L. I., and the vicinity. In 1827 he labored successfully in Albany Durham, and Lexington, N. Y. In 1828 and 1829, his labors were greatly blessed in Virginia, and some other parts of the Southern States. During his labors in Virginia Dr. John H. Rice, in a letter to Dr. Alexander, speaks of him and the revival as follows:—"When Mr. Nettleton had strength to labor, he soon was made instrumental in producing a considerable excitement. This has extended; and now the state of things is deeply interesting. Five lawyers, all of very considerable standing, have embraced religion. * * * This has produced a mighty sensation in Charlotte, Mecklenburg, Nottoway, Cumberland, Powhatan, Buckingham, and Albemarle. The minds of men seem to stand a tiptoe, and they seem to be looking for some great thing." "Mr. Nettleton is a remarkable man, and chiefly, I think, remarkable for his power of producing a great excitement without much *appearance* of feeling. The people do not either weep, or talk away these impressions. The preacher chiefly addresses *Bible truth* to their *consciences*. I have not heard him utter as yet a single sentiment opposed to what you and I call orthodoxy. He preaches the Bible. He derives his illustrations from the Bible." In 1829, also, a great revival commenced under his preaching in Monson, Mass. In the winter of 1830 and 31, he labored for a considerable time in an interesting revival with the Rev. Baxter Dickinson, in Newark, N. J., and for some time with Doctor Snodgrass and Dr. Spring in the city of New York. In 1831, in very feeble health, he took a voyage to Europe. While in England, which was a little more than a year, he preached in various places, and not without some success. Since his return he has received letters from not a few who were awakened by his preaching, and who regard him as their spiritual father. Is this true of all American clergymen who have visited England within the last few years? In 1833 there was an interesting revival under his preaching in Enfield, when two members of Mr. Dixon's family, in whose house the above declaration was made, became hopefully pious. He preached, also, during the period of which I have been speaking, with more or less success, in many other places. And now, Sir, just look at this brief and very imperfect sketch. Remember, that during this whole period, Dr. Nettleton was in very feeble health—much of the time confined a portion of each day to his bed—never able to engage in arduous labor. And yet to what minister in New England can you point me, who was during these ten years, instrumental in the conversion of so many souls? Now this is the man of whom in 1835 it was said, and you, Sir, know by whom it was said, that "he had mistaken his calling, and that God had forsaken him," and that he had done nothing but mischief for the last ten years." This was surely "speaking harshly," and it was "judging unkindly." My brother, no earthly consideration would have induced me to make such a declaration.

But further. It was during this period of ten years, that Dr. Nettleton

breasted the storm of "new measures" which was coming in from the west. He took a stand against Mr. Finney and his supporters. In 1827 he published his review of Mr. Finney's Sermon, and his letter to Mr. Aikin, and in other ways did all in his power to check the spirit of fanaticism, which was coming in like a flood. In all this, I am aware, some supposed he was doing nothing but mischief. When it was found that his name could not be used to sanction "new measures," the most unwearied pains were taken to destroy his reputation. "All their remarks," said a distinguished divine, "are brought to a focus in the spirit of unrelenting hostility which is directed against Nettleton, and which, as I know, will destroy or neutralize his influence if it can." Some of the same stories were circulated about him, that are circulated now. It was said, "he has lost his mind"—"he is not the man he once was"—"his character has sunk wonderfully"—"he is under the frown of God," &c. &c. I know not, Sir, but you at that time sympathized with his opposers, and verily thought he was doing nothing but mischief. But there were those who entertained a different opinion, some of whom, at least, I trust you would not be willing to treat with disrespect.

The following testimonial was published in the New York Observer :

"Boston, November 8, 1827.

"It having been represented to some of the subscribers, that we disapproved of the proceedings of the Rev. Mr. Nettleton, in reviewing a sermon preached at Troy, March 4th 1827, and in opposing the sentiments and practices which it seemed intended to vindicate and extend, we regard ourselves as called upon by a sense of duty to say, that the proceedings of Mr. Nettleton appear to us to have been characterized with great intellectual vigor, correct and comprehensive views of the interests of the church, and by distinguished wisdom, fidelity, firmness and benevolence, well adapted to promote the interests of pure religion throughout the land."

Signed,

LYMAN BEECHER,
A. S. NORTON,

WM. R. WEEKS,
H. R. WEED,

JUSTIN EDWARDS,
HEMAN HUMPHREY,

C. J. TENNEY,
J. HAWES.

My dear Sir, I do not claim that Dr. Nettleton is faultless. He is a man. And no man is without his failings. But I do regard him as eminently a wise, prudent, conscientious and devoted servant of Jesus Christ; and I cannot but think, that upon mature deliberation, you will most deeply regret what you have written and spoken against him.

Your friend and brother,

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, January 17, 1840.

Letter XX.

Dear Sir — After my eighth letter had been sent to the Record, I received a note from the Editor, giving me to understand, that impatience had been manifested among some of his subscribers, on account of the length to which the correspondence had been protracted, and requesting me to bring it to a close on my part, as soon as I could "consistently with doing justice to (my) cause, and with answering all the questions which (you) would expect (me) to reply to." I immediately informed him, that I had designed to add to my series of letters four more, making twelve in all; but, that I would, if possible, in accommodation to his wishes, finish with the addition of two. In a few days I received from him another letter, in which he said, "We have heard so much complaint from our subscribers, that my friends think it will cause a considerable diminution of our subscription list, to have your series proceed

further. I regret I did not foresee how it would be, so as to give you earlier notice." In the same letter he stated, "It has been suggested, that an extra sheet might be printed for you, if you will be responsible for the expense, which could be sent to all our subscribers, and to whomsoever else you might wish."

I declined this proposal, on the ground, that if the remaining letters were printed entirely at my expense, I should choose to consult my own convenience as to the place and manner of their publication. I accordingly requested the Editor to inform his readers, that it was at his own direction my letters were discontinued in that paper, and that they might possibly receive them through another medium of communication. I, at the same time, requested him to accommodate me, at my expense, with the names and residences of those persons to whom your letters had been sent. After a considerable time, I received another letter from the Editor, in which, after giving an account of the "loud and alarming complaints," which my letters had occasioned, he said, "After having considered the matter, and consulted with others, I have concluded, if you will forward the two last letters as you propose, making them as brief as possible, to have them published, and distributed." He said also, "As I may think it best to issue the letters in an extra, at my individual expense, I shall be obliged to you to make them as brief as possible." To this proposition, I could not accede for the following reasons :

1. I did not wish to be restricted to *two short letters*.

2. I had not obtruded myself upon the Record, and I was not willing to occupy its columns any longer than my communications were admitted readily and cheerfully ; and especially, after having been given to understand, that they were exceedingly wounding, causing "loud and alarming complaints," and threatening seriously to injure the interests of the paper. It seemed to me, that no man of any delicacy of feeling, or sense of propriety, would be willing to write for a paper under such circumstances.

3. I could by no means consent to subject the Editor to the trouble and expense of publishing an extra sheet solely for my accommodation.

I have deemed it proper to state the foregoing facts and reasons, that the readers of our correspondence may understand why this and the following letters have not appeared, like the preceding ones, in the New-Haven Record.

I design, Sir, to answer directly or indirectly your questions respecting the organization of the Pastoral Union, and the founding of the Theological Institute of Connecticut ; and I indulge the hope, that my answers will be in a good degree satisfactory ; at least, that they will correct some of your misapprehensions, and lead you to think more favorably of the conduct of your orthodox brethren, than you have done for years past. You are aware, that an intelligent judgment cannot be passed upon their proceedings in associating together and in establishing a new theological seminary, without first considering the circumstances in which they were placed. That mistakes may be corrected, and the condition of our ecclesiastical commonwealth rightly understood, allow me to call your attention, for a short time, from the Pastoral Union and Theological Institute of Connecticut, and to occupy it with some other topics which are intimately connected with the professed object of this discussion.

1. *The Theological Department of Yale College demands our consideration.* If I am correctly informed, the first indications, discovered only by a few persons, that the New-Haven divines were beginning to adopt opinions at variance with those which commonly prevailed among the orthodox, appeared in 1820, '21 ; and the project of reorganizing and enlarging the Theological

Department of Yale College was started in May, 1822. You say, "The course taken by the Corporation of Yale College, twelve years before [the Institute was founded] when the Theological Department of that institution was reorganized and placed upon its present footing, was referred to [at Vernon,] as showing what might have been expected in a parallel case; the corporation, before proceeding to any decisive measures, brought the proposal not only to the General Association, but to every one of the District Associations, for advice and approval, and waited till the churches through their pastors had given their approbation to the proposed arrangement." That this subject was brought before our associations, I do not doubt; but that "the corporation waited till the churches, through their pastors, had given their approbation of the proposed arrangement," is not so evident.

Are you quite sure, that the Corporation of Yale College brought this subject before the Associations, or that the Associations would have approved of the plan, had they known what theological sentiments would be inculcated in that department? Could they have foreseen what has taken place, I do not believe an Association in the State would, at that time, have sanctioned the procedure. You, doubtless, believe, that this subject was brought before the Associations by the Corporation, and I will not say that it was not; but I have before me a certified copy of the document which was sent to the Associations, and in answer to which they communicated their views respecting the proposal. This document is dated at Yale College, May 6, 1822; but does not appear to have been prepared, or forwarded, in the name, or by the authority, of the Corporation of Yale College. It has attached to it no name. And do the Corporation, when they submit proposals to clerical bodies, and "wait till the churches through their pastors have given their approbation," send anonymous communications? Was not this application to the Associations "for advice and approval," made by gentlemen at New-Haven, some of whom, at least, are now connected with the Theological Department of Yale College; and made, too, before the Corporation had acted on the subject of re-organizing and enlarging the Theological Department of that institution? And was not the duty of approving of this design, in personal address, urged upon one or more of the Associations, by one or more of those gentlemen? Permit me to quote a few extracts from the document referred to:—

"In soliciting the co-operation of the clergy and the donations of the religious public for the accomplishment of this great design, it is thought proper respectfully to state some of the reasons which demand its adoption." — "1. The primary design of the College deserves consideration." — "2. The continuance of the Theological Department on an enlarged scale cannot interfere with existing Theological Institutions." — "When it is considered, that most of the literary institutions of our country are in New England, that here revivals of religion are placing increasing multitudes of youth at the disposal of the churches, that all other parts of the United States are looking to us as the Seminary of the churches in the country, it will not be thought too strong to affirm, THAT ONE OR TWO THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS CAN NOT LONG BE ADEQUATE TO THE JUST DEMANDS OF PROVIDENCE ON THE PIETY AND TALENTS OF NEW ENGLAND. Nor finally will this Department interfere at all with the funds of other Institutions. For as to *students*, an increase of their number in *charity* students, is but a consumption of their funds, and in other students is but a bare repayment of expenses; and as to the *community*, they look to a different portion of it for pecuniary aid from that on which we must rely for the extension and support of this Department." 3. The facilities for supporting a Theological Department in Yale College are deserving of consideration." "4. The literary and moral influence of a Theological school will be highly salutary on the undergraduates."

* The Rev. Dr. Chapin in reply to an inquiry of mine on this subject, writes as follows:—
 "Anonymous communications by the Corporation of Yale College!!! I know not but they have sent a million — but I do not believe they have sent one. Why should they?"

Now, by whomsoever this application to the Associations was made, what was its design, and what responsibilities did the Associations assume in approving of the proposed arrangement? It has been more than once intimated, that the Theological Department in Yale College was the legitimate child of the Associations, and that they were bound to support it; and as the Theological Institute of Connecticut was founded without the formal approval of the Associations, though a number of them unsolicited passed resolutions in its commendation after it was established, it has been said that it ought not to be respectfully noticed by those bodies, and that its founders should be considered as having acted a disorderly part. What then was the object of those, who, in an anonymous communication, appealed to the Associations in behalf of the Theological Department in Yale College, in making the appeal? Was it to make the Department a child of the Associations, to put it under their supervision and control, and to have them responsible to the public for its management? Nothing like this is intimated in their communication. "In soliciting the co-operation of the clergy and the donations of the religious public [they] thought proper respectfully to state some reasons which demand its adoption." Does it not appear, that the simple and only object was to secure the influence "of the clergy and the donations of the religious public, in re-organizing and enlarging that department," to be entirely independent of the pastors and churches of this State? I ask you, Sir, as a member of the Corporation of Yale College, could the Corporation themselves have proposed to the Associations to take this theological school under their supervision and control? Is not all authority which can be exercised over it in the possession of the Corporation? And are they not bound by law to retain that authority in their own possession? Can they delegate any measure of power to individuals or associations to act in relation to that concern? What then have the pastors and churches of Connecticut to do with the Theological Department in Yale College? Can they by authoritative action exert the least influence in the management of its affairs? Have the Associations, or Consociations, of this State ever been, at least in our day, consulted by the Corporation relative to the appointment of professors, or respecting any other transactions of that board? Did the Corporation ever submit to the consideration of the churches, or pastors of the churches an official report of their proceedings? And do you believe that the Associations, in approving of the establishment of that school, thought of binding themselves and successors to sustain it at all events? Perhaps two-thirds or more of the present pastors of our churches have been settled since 1822, when this application was made, and know nothing of the "advice and approval" of which you speak; and are they obligated to cast out, as illegitimate offspring, all other theological institutions and cleave to that of Yale College as the only child of promise? No, Sir. The Theological Department in Yale College is not so much the child of the Associations, as is the Theological Institute. The former is under the exclusive control of a Corporation composed of eight officers of our State government, and ten clergymen invested with power to fill all vacancies in the clerical part of the body; the latter is the property and under the control of a large proportion of the pastors of our churches and members of our Associations who annually appoint the trustees of the Institute; the former is allied to the State; the latter is closely allied to the churches.

Yale College has ever been a favorite object with the Congregational ministers of Connecticut. They founded it and they have patronized it as their own institution. And, so far as I know, as a literary institution, it is still

dear to them; and to none is it more so, than to members of the Pastoral Union. The ministers of this State, you will cheerfully acknowledge, have afforded important aid in rearing that seminary to the elevated station which it now occupies among the literary institutions of the country. Its influence is felt in every city, town, village, hamlet, and sequestered neighborhood in Connecticut, and extensively in other parts of the land. The man who can avail himself of this influence, may increase an hundred fold his power of controlling the views and feelings of the community. Universities in Europe, with one, at least, in this country, as they have been the means of corrupting churches, and of spreading moral desolations around them, solemnly admonish us, that a few men, aided by the influence of such an institution as Yale College, in connection with the press, can easily revolutionize the theological sentiments of an extensive region, unless they are openly, boldly, perseveringly, and with a spirit of self-denial opposed. And now, Sir, is it to you surprising, that when the Theological Department in Yale College was put into operation, and strange doctrines came from it to the ears of the religious public, that many intelligent persons were alarmed and filled with anxiety? *And, if there was no design to change the features of our New England orthodoxy, and if in the opinion of the New-Haven divines, there was no great difference in the theological views between them and their brethren, would not effectual measures have been adopted, by the appointment of Professors, or otherwise, to diminish, if not to remove entirely all occasion of solicitude?* But allow me to ask the following questions, with an earnest request that you will, if possible, give satisfactory answers.

“When the Theological Department was re-organized and put upon its present footing,” were not its Professors on the side of what has been denominated “new divinity?” Have not all the gentlemen who have been elected Professors in that Department since its re-organization, been of the same type in theology, and disposed to cast their influence on that side? Has not that theological school been made a powerful engine in promulgating the peculiar sentiments of the New-Haven divines? For years past, has any gentlemen been elected a clerical member of the Corporation, who did not favor those sentiments? Can any minister, who is conscientiously and openly opposed to the peculiar views of the New-Haven divines, be considered a candidate for membership in the Corporation, or for office in the Theological Department? What safeguard have the public on this subject? Be not displeased, my brother, that in your own language I interrogate still farther. What is this Theological Department? “Is it not an organization?—the organization of a party?—organized for party ends?—organized to accomplish ends to which mere argument was inadequate, and which could not be reached by the working of our ecclesiastical system?” And since your brethren of the Pastoral Union did suppose, that they and all who harmonize with them in their views of divine truth, were effectually excluded from all participation in the management of that seminary, and that they were driven to the painful necessity of providing for themselves; have they indeed committed a great offence in establishing a new theological institution, as they believe, on better principles, with an improved organization, and far more congenial to the spirit of Congregationalism.

2. *The subject of creeds deserves consideration.*—In your second letter you say; “The convention at East Windsor adopted a new confession of faith, now known as the creed of the Pastoral Union. If any convention, or permanent

society of ministers on the other side of this controversy, had formed a new confession of faith, how many inferences unfavorable to their orthodoxy would have been derived from the fact; and how would the fact with the inferences have been proclaimed throughout the land. I will not attempt to derive from your new confession any inferences unfavorable to your orthodoxy. I will only ask you to inform the public why a *new* confession was thought necessary? The attempt has been made of late, you know, by some of your associates, to produce the impression on the public mind, that the Savoy Confession, assented to by the Synod at Saybrook in 1708, is now the standard of orthodoxy among us; and that it is to be taken, not as embodying a certain 'system of doctrine,' but as binding in every word. I do not impute that notion to you, for I have heard you declare publicly the contrary; but I may ask you, whether those who co-operated in forming this new confession, and in making it the basis of the Pastoral Union, did not at the time take the same ground which you take? Why a new creed, if the Savoy Confession is our standard? — Perhaps it will not be thought impertinent if I ask, in what respect the new 'creed is better than the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly, that old and familiar summary of Christian doctrine. It is shorter than the Catechism, and in that respect it is better, if it is to be imposed, as a creed, word for word, upon posterity. It is a very respectable formulary, one which, if I understand it aright, I should be ready to subscribe; but wherever it differs from the Catechism either in arrangement or in statement, I think the Catechism is by all means to be preferred."

"If any convention or permanent society of ministers on the other side of the controversy, had formed a new confession of faith," I do not believe, that "many inferences unfavorable to their orthodoxy would have been derived from the fact," *provided the confession was fully and explicitly orthodox, and its framers were known to be deeply convinced of the importance of maintaining the sound doctrines which it embraced.* Do you believe, Sir, that inferences unfavorable to orthodoxy would be derived from an exchange of creeds, provided the former were vague and indefinite, and the latter full and lucid in expressing the doctrines of grace? Suppose the church in Yale College should become dissatisfied with their present "Confession of Faith," and should exchange it for the "Articles of Agreement," adopted by the Pastoral Union; what inferences in relation to orthodoxy would be derived from the fact?" That you and the reader may judge, allow me to quote these formularies.

"THE CONFESSION OF FAITH OF THE CHURCH IN YALE COLLEGE.

You, [and each of you] solemnly profess your belief that there is one God, in three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; self-existent, independent, eternal, unchangeable; infinite in power, wisdom, holiness, goodness, and truth: — that by him all things were made; and are governed according to his own most wise, holy and good pleasure: and that you are his creatures, and under the most righteous and solemn obligations to serve and glorify him with all your powers while you live. You also profess your belief, that the scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the Word of God; revealed to mankind by the spirit of truth; and containing every rule of faith, and practise which is obligatory on the consciences of mankind. — Thus you profess and believe."

"ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT OF THE PASTORAL UNION.

1. That there is one, and but one, living and true God.
2. That the word of God, contained in the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only perfect rule of faith and practice.
3. That agreeable to these scriptures, God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth.

4. That in the Godhead there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory.

5. That God created man after his own image, consisting in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness.

6. That the glory of God is man's chief end and the enjoyment of God his supreme happiness. And that this enjoyment is derived solely from conformity of heart to the moral character and will of God.

7. That God, according to the counsel of his own will, hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, and that all beings, actions, and events, both in the natural and moral worlds, are subject to his providential direction; and that God's purposes perfectly consist with human liberty, God's universal agency with the agency of man, and man's dependence with his accountability; that man has understanding and natural strength to do all that God requires of him, so that nothing but the sinner's aversion to holiness prevents his salvation.

8. That it is the prerogative of God to bring good out of evil, and that he will cause the wrath of men and devils to praise him, and that all the evil which has existed, and will forever exist in the universe, will eventually be made to promote a most important purpose, under the wise and perfect administration of that Almighty Being who will cause all things to work for his own glory, and thus fulfil all his pleasure.

9. That Adam the federal head and representative of the human race, was placed in probation, that he disobeyed the divine command, fell from holiness, and involved himself and all his posterity in depravity and ruin. And that from the commencement of existence, every man is personally depraved, destitute of holiness, unlike and opposed to God, and that, previously to his renewal by the Holy Spirit, all his moral actions are adverse to the character and glory of God; and that, having the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, he is justly exposed to all the miseries of this life, and to eternal damnation.

10. That sin consists in the moral corruption of the heart, the perverseness of the will, and actual transgressions of the divine law.

11. That God from eternity, elected some of our fallen race to everlasting life, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, not for any foreseen faith or obedience in the subject of election, but according to his own good pleasure.

12. That the only Redeemer of the elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who being God, became man, and continues to be both God and man, in two distinct natures and one person forever.

13. That except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God; that repentance, faith, and holiness are the personal requisites of salvation in the Gospel scheme; that the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of the sinner's justification; that this righteousness is received by faith, and that this faith is the gift of God; so that our salvation is wholly of grace; that no means whatever can change the heart of a sinner and make it holy; that regeneration and sanctification are the effects of the creating and renewing agency of the Holy Spirit; and that supreme love to God constitutes the essential difference between saints and sinners.

14. That the atonement made by Christ, in his obedience and death, is the only ground of pardon and salvation to sinners, and that this ground is sufficiently broad for the offer of pardon to be sincerely made to all men.

15. That as it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe, the gospel is adapted to the moral agency and the wants of sinners, but not conformable to their dispositions, and that the object of preaching the Gospel is to display the glory of God in the redemption of sinners.

16. That all true believers are kept, by the power of God, through faith unto salvation.

17. That the special ordinances of the gospel, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, are designed for those only who make a credible profession of their faith in Christ, and unite themselves to his visible church; and that professing believers, who have households, are to bring them also to the ordinance of baptism.

18. That a Christian Church ought to admit no person to its holy communion, before he has time to exhibit, by his fruits, credible evidence of his piety.

19. That there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, and that all must stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of the deeds done in the body.

20. That the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

Were the Pastoral Union to exchange these "Articles of Agreement," for the "Confession of Faith of the Church in Yale College." I do not know but there might be inferences unfavorable derived from the fact; but were that church to abandon their present "Confession," and adopt these "Articles," in the place of it, do you really believe, that "many inferences unfavorable to their orthodoxy would be proclaimed throughout the land?"

You request me "to inform the public why a *new* Confession was thought necessary." — Were a company of professing Christians organized as a distinct church, would it not be singular to request them "to inform the public why a *new* Confession was thought necessary?" I presume your brethren when about to form the Pastoral Union, believed that agreement in sentiment was the only stable bond of their contemplated association, and that they owed it to each other and to the Christian community to make an explicit declaration in their own language of their views of the doctrines of the Gospel; and especially as they contemplated the establishment of a new Theological Seminary. Respecting the opinions of ministers in this State in regard to the Savoy Confession being the standard of orthodoxy among us, I do not know that I have any information which you do not possess.

Since you, Sir, have introduced the subject of creeds, and have been free in your remarks respecting that of the Pastoral Union, you will allow me to ask, how it has happened, that writers of a certain school have of late years so frequently assailed creeds and confessions as standards of orthodoxy or guards against error? When Unitarianism was beginning to infect many of the churches in Massachusetts, creeds and confessions, as standards of orthodoxy, or guards against error, were represented as worse than useless. So it has been of late, to some extent, among us. As a specimen of what has been published on this subject, I quote the following: —

"Among the ordinary uses of creeds and confessions, the following may be enumerated:

1. They are used as forms in making a public profession of faith in the Gospel. Such is their customary use in our churches; and to such a use, provided the form is not exceptionable, I know not how any reasonable man can object.

2. They are used as terms of communion;—as when the position is taken, no man shall be received into our church, who will not subscribe or assent to our formulary. In respect to this it ought to be remembered that no formulary which is designed for such a use, ought to include any thing beyond those points, the understanding and belief of which is essential to a credible profession of Christianity.

3. They are used as standards of orthodoxy and guards against error, and securities for uniformity of belief in the ministry or among churches. As to the utility of creeds, when employed for such a purpose, I must be allowed to express a doubt." — *A Manual for Young Church Members. By Leonard Bacon, p. 175.*

It appears, then, that you would have all our churches adopt confessions of faith which would present no barrier to membership to hopeful Christians whatever may be their religious tenets; and you would dispense with all creeds as standards of orthodoxy, or guards against error. Permit me to inquire, whether it was in conformity to these opinions, that, a few years since, the "Confession of Faith," adopted by the First Church in New-Haven was exchanged for the present "Profession of Faith?" That intelligent and highly respectable church will not consider me, in making this and some other inquiries, impertinent, inasmuch as their pastor has felt it his duty to express his views of the creed of the Pastoral Union, and to propose questions in relation to it.

May I not request you "to inform the public, why a *new* confession was thought necessary." And will you allow me to ask, whether the present "Profession of Faith" of your church is not more in accordance with the peculiar views of the New-Haven divines than the formulary for which it was exchanged? I understand, that copies of this "Profession of Faith" have been extensively circulated, that it has already been adopted by a number of churches, and that by a portion of the religious community it is considered a specimen of what a church creed should be. You will hence permit me to examine it in connection with the old confession, in some of its particulars.

Before the exchange alluded to, persons on making a profession of religion and uniting with your church, I conclude, publicly assented to the following among other declarations.

"You believe — *that (God) preserves and governs all his creatures, and overrules all their actions for his own glory; and that in whatsoever comes to pass, he is accomplishing his eternal purposes, according to the counsel of his own will.*" Is not this a direct contradiction of the theory, that God could not prevent all sin, or the present degree of it, in a moral system? Is not this in the new "Profession of Faith" intentionally evaded by saying, that God's "*purposes extend to all events?*" And again, *that "he exercises a righteous moral government over all his intelligent creatures?"* And may not a temporal king over his subjects, or a father over his children; and yet be defeated, and utterly unable to control or govern their actions?

"*You believe that God CREATED man upright.*" The modern theory, if I understand it, is, that God cannot *create* holiness,—that the image of God, in which Adam was created, means simply that, he was constituted a moral agent,—and that holiness and sin are alike *acquired*? Hence in the new creed, it is said; "*You believe that man was originally upright.*" How he became so, whether by his own, or God's act, or both, or neither, we are not told.

"*You believe that God in his mercy has not left all mankind to perish forever, but out of his mere good pleasure, has from eternity elected some to everlasting life.*" The doctrine of election from eternity is not included in the new "Profession of Faith"!

"*You believe that without a change of heart, wrought in the unregenerate by the special divine agency of the Holy Spirit, who is very God, no man can be an heir of eternal life; and that the soul which is once made partaker of renewing and saving grace, will never be permitted so to fall away, as finally to perish.*" The words "*dead in sin*" and "*regeneration*" found in the old confession are omitted in the new. The *special agency* of the Holy Spirit, and the *final perseverance of the saints*, so clearly expressed in the "Confession" are neither expressed nor implied in the "Profession"!

"*You believe that baptism is to be administered to unbaptised adults, who profess their faith in Christ, and to the infant children of any, who are members of the church.*" Infant baptism is omitted in the new creed!

"*Thus in the presence of Almighty God, you solemnly profess and believe.*"

"Perhaps it will not be thought impertinent, if I ask in what respect the new creed is better than [the old one, or] the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly, that old and familiar summary of Christian Doctrine. It is shorter than the Catechism, in that respect it is better; — but wherever it differs from the Catechism in arrangement and statement, I think the Catechism is by all means to be preferred." I doubt not, sir, that there are hundreds and thousands of intelligent members of our churches, who would deeply regret to have the doctrines above noticed expunged from the Confessions of Faith to which they assented "in the presence of Almighty God." But why this exchange of creeds, which has obtained of late in some of our churches? Can you present a clearer evidence of a change in theological views, than to have long established formularies set aside? In this, is there not evidence of the working of an organization designed to change the features of our orthodoxy?

3. *The circumstances and character of our religious periodical press demand consideration.* Seldom has there been a large body of clergymen, who were so evangelical, and so harmonious in their views of divine truth, and in their operations, as the Congregational ministers of Connecticut, for a considerable

period before the commencement of our present unhappy dissensions. The Connecticut Evangelical Magazine first published in 1800, and the succession of comparatively pure and powerful revivals of religion, which began about the dawn of the present century, together with less prominent instrumentalities, were greatly blessed to the ministry and to the churches of this State. At the time of my ordination, twenty-one years ago, differences in sentiment, or in practice among our brethren were scarcely known. When any concern of a public nature came before them, they examined it faithfully and kindly; and if it met with their approval, for obvious reasons they committed it principally to the management of the ministers at Hartford and New Haven as occupying central stations; and cordially co-operated with them. This harmony in views, and union in efforts, were clearly manifested in relation to the religious periodical press. I need not tell you, that the first periodical of this character in the form of a newspaper was the Religious Intelligencer, published in New Haven first in 1816; that for a number of years it received the general, if not universal support of the Congregational ministers and churches of Connecticut; and that for a considerable time before it was discontinued, its influence was decidedly in favor of "New Haven theology." The Christian Spectator, a monthly publication, was first issued in 1819. I have always supposed, that there was perfect harmony among the ministers of this State in originating, and in supporting it, till it changed its theological character; that, as it was originally designed, to use its own language, to "inculcate" what "are termed the doctrines of grace which have ever prevailed in the great body of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches," they regarded it as their own organ of communication to the religious public; and considered themselves obligated to sustain the Association of Gentlemen by whom it was conducted. They patronized the work, as far as practicable circulated it among their people, and many of them enriched its pages with their productions. Often were they applied to, as its friends and supporters, to augment its list of subscribers. And conducted with ability as it was, it in process of time exerted a great influence on the ministry and the churches. But as it was entirely or principally under the control of gentlemen at New Haven, they improved it, and the influence which it had attained, for the promulgation and defence of their peculiar views of theology; till at length, when it assumed the quarterly form, it was, if I have been correctly informed, and as its pages clearly intimate, closely shut up against communications in opposition to "New Divinity." In connection with the operations of the Theological Department in Yale College, it became a powerful engine in diffusing far and near the opinions which have distinguished that Department.

The Connecticut Observer, in 1825, was originated by a convention of our brethren, who appointed a committee to select an Editor, and exercise a supervision over it. As it was designed to be a religious newspaper for the churches of this State, the worthy brother who was its Editor until the last year, considered it his duty to maintain a neutral position in relation to existing controversies. This paper was supported principally by present members of the Pastoral Union and their congregations, till they made an unsuccessful application to the Committee and Editor for the privilege of occasionally occupying a place in its columns in defence of those principles of our Fathers' which were constantly assailed. Whether the Committee at a subsequent period maintained the same regard for neutrality, and the wishes of the former Editor of the paper, the present readers of the Connecticut Observer may decide.

You know, my brother, there was a period previous to the organization of

the Pastoral Union, when the religious periodical press in Connecticut, under the control of Congregationalists, was much employed in disseminating "New Haven theology," and that your orthodox brethren could gain access to no religious periodical in this State where they might defend what they deemed to be truth of vital importance against assaults of dangerous error. And you know too, that in our day when periodicals are so numerous, they who are driven to the necessity of communicating to the public through the medium of pamphlets are well nigh denied the liberty of the press. I ask you Sir, was not this the case with the ministers whom you have arraigned before the public, as having become partizans without sufficient ground of provocation? Did not you and your associates control the press of our denomination in Connecticut, and improve it to *your own party purposes*? And did not Dr. Pond, the worthy Editor of the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, published at Boston, meet with interference, from the same quarter, in conducting that work?

In speaking of the meeting of the General Association, at Vernon, in 1834, you ask; "Was it not then evident, for the first time within your memory, that there were parties in the General Association of Connecticut? Was it not manifest that the Pastoral Union was an organized party, and that its first and most powerful tendency was to compel all those who agreed in not belonging to it, and in not going along with its measures to act as another party?"

I ask you, whether, without proceeding farther, I have not furnished conclusive evidence, THAT, PREVIOUS TO THE FORMATION OF THE PASTORAL UNION, THERE DID EXIST, IN THIS STATE, TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, A POWERFUL ORGANIZATION, WITH MANY FACILITIES FOR THE PROMULGATION OF PECULIAR SENTIMENTS, AND FOR THE REVOLUTION OF THE CHURCHES? Look at the Theological Department in Yale College,—look at the alterations in the confessions of faith,—look at the circumstances and character of our religious periodical press,—and look especially into the *Christian Spectator*, for 1833, pp. 104, 105.

When you made the interrogations relative to the meeting at Vernon, had you forgotten, that you and your associates had already recognized, and published yourselves to the world as a party. In the review of the *Works of Leighton*, you took for granted the existence of parties among us, and offered your advice to each party. That you and those who sympathize with you had long constituted a party, and had long been engaged in the accomplishment of party purposes, there is much reason to believe. Whether the Pastoral Union should be viewed in the light of a party, may be thought worthy of farther consideration.

Your brother in the faith and hope of the Gospel.

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, February 10, 1840.

Letter X.

Dear Sir—I will now proceed to answer indirectly many of your inquiries by a simple statement of facts. The systematic, efficient, and combined operations of the Theological Department in Yale College, the periodical press, and other causes, had for a considerable time exerted a powerful influence on the ministry and churches, especially of Connecticut, in favor of "New Divinity;" when, in 1831, a few of our brethren associated together for the

purpose of circulating Doctrinal Tracts. This attempt to rear a feeble barrier in defence of orthodoxy, was, as I suppose, unsuccessful, and few, if any, tracts were circulated. In the spring of 1832 there was a proposed arrangement to resuscitate the Connecticut Evangelical Magazine, with the doctrinal character which it formerly maintained and without a controversial aspect. Persons, who had as yet kept themselves aloof from the controversy, were for two reasons induced to favor the proposed arrangement. 1. They approved of the sentiments and spirit of the Magazine, and they believed that the circumstances of the churches demanded the influence of such a periodical. 2. They were aware that a portion of their brethren felt themselves oppressed, and, as they judged, not without reason; and believing the reaction would be in proportion to the pressure, they thought by the resuscitation of the Magazine a necessary relief might be afforded, and an unhappy explosion prevented. They also indulged the hope, that pastors of your opinion and feeling, under the then existing circumstances, might approve of its circulation among their people. In this, however, they were disappointed. From that quarter the proposal met with decided disapprobation and opposition. By individual enterprise the Magazine, however, was recommenced with a limited circulation and was conducted to the general satisfaction of its patrons, and, so far as I know, without increasing the opposition first manifested toward it.

You say; "The attempt had been previously made, without success, to form a new organization, by the name of Pastoral Union, in each associational district, with a general union, constituted by delegation from the several districts. A new creed, designed to be the basis of this organization, was formed by a committee or convention, assembled at Hartford, and was sent to some individual supposed to be trusty in each district, who was to obtain signatures to the creed, and to take other measures to complete the arrangement. This attempt was in January, 1833, but the project in that form and at that time, appears to have failed. The ministers, taken at home in their parishes, and in their habitual intercourse with their brethren, would not embark in a scheme which implied nothing less than a separation of the Congregational churches of Connecticut into two contending and contemptible sects."

I trust, my brother, you will be gratified in having the prominent mistakes in the above extract corrected. This I will do by a communication of facts so far as they came within my personal knowledge, and so far as I retain them in memory. In January, 1833, a conference of ministers on the state of our churches, at the suggestion and earnest request, (as I was informed at the time,) of the venerable Dr. Perkins, was invited at Hartford. Two pastors from each district association in this State, and a few from the vicinity in the State of Massachusetts, were requested to meet together on that occasion. The senior pastor of the church in Ellington, (whom you notice so particularly,) and the pastor of the church in North Coventry, were selected from Tolland County Association. The reason why the former did not attend, he has never told me. About twenty ministers, one or more from all, or nearly all, the district associations, if I mistake not, were present. After prayer and a free conversation on the condition of the churches, they resolved, that in their judgment it was expedient to follow the example of our brethren in Massachusetts, in organizing for this State a Pastoral Union. Articles of agreement, as the basis of such an organization, were presented and adopted. A committee was appointed to prepare documents on this subject to be laid before the district associations, and to adopt those measures for the accomplishment of the object, which they might deem needful and proper. A brother in each

association was requested to receive the documents when prepared, and present them to the consideration of the association to which he belonged. I have yet to learn that this conference of ministers did not desire and hope that all our brethren would be embraced in this contemplated Union, who could *ex animo* subscribe a Confession of Faith like the one said to have been drafted by Governor Treadwell and published by the Connecticut Missionary Society for the benefit of our new settlements; or like the creed of the Andover Seminary. At least this was my desire and expectation. The practice lately approved by some of subscribing creeds "for substance of doctrine," was not then before my mind. Indeed when I had contemplated it in the established church of England, I did not imagine that it would be adopted and defended among us Congregationalists. The documents I received, and, in simplicity of heart, presented them for the consideration of our association. So soon as presented, a brother, who prefers the theology of New-Haven to that of East Windsor, stated to the association, that he had been informed the design of the contemplated organization was to divide the churches. Surely brethren most opposed to "New-Haven theology," "would not embark in a scheme which implied nothing less than a separation of the Congregational churches of Connecticut into two contending and contemptible sects." The majority of the association did not suppose the scheme implied any such thing, or that any such thing was intended by it. When I found that the motives of the ministers who composed the conference at Hartford were thus impugned and their conduct thus misunderstood and misrepresented, I moved, that the subject be indefinitely postponed, and did not advocate a farther consideration of it; and the association, while they were disposed to treat the proposal, and those who made it with much respect, in view of the feelings and representations from a certain quarter, finally judged it expedient to waive the subject. A similar scene was acted in some other associations. An impression was made on many minds in different parts of the State, that nothing less was designed by this proposed organization than a division of the churches into two sects. And the consequence was, that the documents were not laid before some of the associations. Hence, as you say, "the project in that form and at that time appears to have failed." But its failure in this way, together with the opposition manifested to the circulation of doctrinal tracts, and the resuscitation of the Connecticut Evangelical Magazine, and other occurrences, which need not be mentioned at this time, led your aggrieved brethren to feel, that as you and your associates occupied the field for controlling the religious public, you designed to retain it exclusively, and that if they acted at all in self-defense, they must have some farther action by themselves.

The committee appointed by the conference of ministers at Hartford, in discharging the duties of their appointment, invited, as I have been informed, about fifty pastors of churches in different parts of the State to meet in convention at East Windsor on the 10th of September, 1833. In making the selection they doubtless designed to have the convention composed of ministers, who believed that dangerous errors were disseminated among us, and that there existed in this State, to all intents and purposes, a powerful organization designed to disseminate some of these errors; and probably they intended to secure a representation from each association. Though I doubt not their intentions were good, yet I think they erred in not inviting a larger number. And this error may have resulted in part, at least, from the fact, that they did not know that so many of their brethren were aggrieved and alarmed, as it

afterwards appeared. I think it probable they had been misinformed respecting the views and feelings of "good Father Bartlett," and I know they had been respecting the views of some other ministers who are now members of the Pastoral Union, and efficient friends of the Theological Institute.

You inform me: "The preparations and arrangements for this meeting were all made with the profoundest secrecy." And soon after you say: "You know more about this than I do, for you were one of the actors, as I suppose, and I have never had the privilege even of hearing about it from one who was there." Pray tell us then, how you learned that "the preparations and arrangements for the meeting were all made with the profoundest secrecy?" I did not know till the receipt of your second letter, that the preparations for the meeting, or the meeting itself was designed to be a secret. And that you and some others did not gain earlier information of these transactions, may it not be imputed to the fact that we had no control, at that time, of the religious press in Connecticut? We are not so much surprized at mistakes in your account of this meeting, as that you should venture to publish an account of it, when you was not there, and "never had the privilege even of hearing about it from one who was there."

You ask: "Were there none present in the convention but *pastors*?" According to my recollection there were none present as members of the convention, but ordained ministers of the gospel, and but one without a pastoral charge in Connecticut.* Again you ask: "Was not some part of those two days of deliberation occupied with disclosures and developments about brethren who were not there to answer for themselves, and for whom there was no voice to speak one word? Were not those absent brethren charged with the rejection of great truths which they had again and again professed, in every form of profession? Were they not charged with keeping back their real opinions, in order to prepare the public gradually for the reception of errors which as yet could not be broached with safety?" "Would you not have acted more wisely and becomingly, if you had acted with a little more openness?" "Would you not have been quite as likely to secure not only the approbation of the churches, but the blessing of God on your proceedings, if you had at least permitted those men, upon whose condemnation as errorists and deceivers all your proceedings rested, to hear what was alleged against them, and to be heard in explanation and defence?" "If any of these questions imply ignorance and misapprehension on my part, I pray you remember that the secrecy in which those proceeding were enveloped, will excuse my ignorance and may apologize for some misapprehension."

I cannot conceive, Sir, "that the secrecy in which those proceedings were enveloped will excuse your ignorance," much less will it apologize, ignorant as you acknowledge yourself to be, for your propounding publicly these and similar questions. If you have not confidence in your brethren sufficient to authorize the belief, that they "acted wisely and becomingly," can you not believe they avoided the commission of those offences with which they are implicated by your inquiries? I should consider myself justified in passing in silence all questions of this character; but lest from my silence it should be inferred, that I would evade a reasonable inquiry, I will say, that in that meeting there was no "prayerful calumny," — no slandering of absent brethren — according to my remembrance, no unkind expressions — and I presume not

* The same letter missive was sent to one other who had not a pastoral charge, viz. President Day.

a word was uttered respecting any individual, which the person who uttered it would not be willing to repeat to the individual himself. I do not know whether we should "have been quite as likely to secure not only the approbation of the churches, but the blessing of God on our proceedings," had we adopted different measures; the approbation of the churches and the blessing of God on our proceedings have been thus far secured beyond our expectations at that time.

In giving an account of the proceedings of this Convention, I shall copy from an official document.

After the meeting was constituted; "A committee of six were appointed on the subject of organizing a Pastoral Union for the State, who reported in favor of such an organization, with the recommendation of a Constitution and Articles of Agreement, as the basis of the Union. The resolution proposed by the Committee was adopted unanimously, and the Constitution brought in by them, after mature deliberation, article by article, was unanimously adopted — which is in the following words, viz :

ART. I. The name of this Association shall be the Connecticut Pastoral Union.

ART. II. The object of this Union shall be the promotion of ministerial intercourse, fellowship, and pastoral usefulness, — the promotion of revivals of religion, — the defence of evangelical truth against prevailing errors in doctrine or practice, and the raising up of sound and faithful ministers for the supply of our churches.

ART. III. The Articles of Agreement, adopted by our brethren, convened at Hartford, January 9th, 1833, and which, as amended, shall be the doctrinal basis of this Union.

ART. IV. Those pastors of the state, who have already subscribed these Articles, or may at the present meeting subscribe them, shall be members of this Union. And subsequently to the first annual meeting, no persons may become members but by nomination of some member and a vote of two-thirds of the members present, at any annual meeting, and by signing the Articles of Agreement; except such as may be invited by the Committee of Arrangements previous to the first annual meeting.

ART. V. The Union shall meet annually at such time and place as shall be designated in the By-Laws, for the election of officers, and the transaction of necessary business.

ART. VI. At each annual meeting, a Moderator, Scribe, and Committee of Arrangements shall be chosen by ballot, who shall continue in office till others are chosen.

ART. VII. A Recording Secretary shall also be appointed, who shall hold his office till another is chosen, and who shall keep a faithful and accurate record of the Constitution, the members, and acts and votes of the Union.

ART. VIII. Special meetings may be called by the Moderator, or Recording Secretary, at the request of the Committee of Arrangements, or any five members, by publishing a notice in some periodical publication, or by personal notice to each member, at least one month previous to the proposed meeting. And no meeting which is not thus notified, except the annual or adjourned meetings, shall be considered regular.

ART. IX. The Union may at any time adopt such measures respecting the establishment of seminaries or periodical publications, as they shall judge will conduce to the general objects of this Union.

ART. X. This Constitution, with the exception of the Articles of Agreement, may be altered or amended at an annual meeting of the society, by a vote of two-thirds of the members present; such alteration or amendment having been proposed to the Union, and left with the Recording Secretary, a year previous to its adoption."

"The expediency of establishing a manual labor Theological Institute, came up next in order, and having been long and solemnly discussed and submitted to God in prayer, the question was at length taken, and the resolution unanimously adopted, that it is expedient to establish a manual-labor Theological Institute in this State."

The convention having adjourned without day, the Pastoral Union was organized by the appointment of the officers prescribed in the constitution. A committee, previously appointed on this service, reported a plan for the regulation of the contemplated Theological Institute, which, after a careful consideration of each article separately, was adopted, and is as follows :

ART. I. The seminary shall be called the Theological Institute of Connecticut.

ART. II. Its primary object shall be the education of pious young men for the ministry of the Gospel, in connection with which there may be a department for teaching the sciences preparatory to, or connected with, a collegiate course of study.

ART. III. The general management and oversight of the seminary shall be vested in a Board of Trustees, to consist of at least twelve Ministers and eight Laymen, who shall be appointed annually by the Pastoral Union of Connecticut. A majority of the Trustees shall be a quorum to transact business at any meeting duly notified.

ART. IV. After the requisite funds shall be obtained, the seminary shall be furnished with a President, and such Professors, and distribution of labor as the Trustees shall deem expedient.

ART. V. The candidates for admission to the Theological Department shall be persons of accredited piety, and members of some Congregational or other evangelical church. They shall have a diploma from some college, or furnish evidence of literary and scientific attainments, satisfactory to the Trustees, or to their Committee, in connection with the Faculty of the Seminary. The qualifications for admission to the Literary Department shall be a fair moral character.

ART. VI. The Board of Trustees shall be authorized to determine the location, of the Institution; and to obtain, if practicable, a Charter of Incorporation, enabling them to hold property and possess the other powers of a corporate body. They shall make the necessary purchases; prepare accommodations, as they may be needed; appoint officers; and solicit, or appoint agents to solicit, funds for the accomplishment of the objects of the Institute. They shall be authorized to appoint a Librarian and make the necessary By-Laws for the regulation of the Library, and the Institution generally. They shall also appoint a Treasurer for the Institute, who shall give satisfactory bonds for the faithful performance of his official duties.

ART. VII. The members of the Institute shall be examined semi-annually, by the Faculty, in their several studies, and once a year in the presence of the Trustees, or a Committee appointed for that purpose. The annual examination shall be held _____ week in _____

ART. VIII. Every Trustee and officer in the Institute, shall, on entering upon his duties, subscribe the creed of the Pastoral Union of Connecticut. He shall also declare his full assent to it every year during his continuance in office. The Faculty shall make this declaration to the Trustees, and the Trustees to the Pastoral Union. And in default of such declaration, their office shall be considered vacant, and such vacancies shall forthwith be filled, according to the provisions of the Constitution.

ART. IX. The Trustees are authorized to call special meetings of the Pastoral Union, if they judge that the interests of the Seminary require such a measure. The Faculty and Trustees shall also report annually the state of the Institute to the Pastoral Union.

ART. X. This Constitution may be altered or amended by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at any annual meeting, provided such alteration or amendment shall have been laid over from a previous meeting."

After the adoption of this constitution, the trustees of the Institute for the then year ensuing were chosen, a board of commissioners were appointed for the purpose of doing any preparatory business touching the Theological Institute; to appoint the first meeting of the trustees, and make report to them of their doings; and the meeting was adjourned.

This account of the proceedings of the convention at East Windsor was published in 1833; but it appears that you did not know of the fact till you had published your second letter. You verily thought that the constitution of the Pastoral Union was "as much unknown to the public as a masonic chapter." And you appear, from your frequent allusion to our supposed secrets, to think, that the concerns of the Pastoral Union and of the Theological Institute are conducted with "the profoundest secrecy." Before you commence another series of letters, accusing us of improperly withholding information, be so good, my brother, as to examine what we have spread before the public. You will find in the Connecticut Evangelical Magazine forty-eight pages filled with this matter. The Inaugural Address of the President, and the Address of Mr. Riddel at the laying of the corner-stone, both of which were published, will afford you information respecting our proceedings. The columns of the Watchman and the Congregationalist contain a history of our transactions for a few years past. Reports of the trustees have been annually published both in the newspaper and pamphlet form, giving in detail, (even to all the money received and how expended,) an accurate account of their proceedings. While the Pastoral Union, and the trustees of the Institute have not obtruded themselves on the public, they have been particular in unfolding to public view their acts and their plans of operation. If, after consulting public docu-

ments, you should still be suspicious that there are some things yet to be revealed, please to meet me at the Theological Institute, and I assure you we will find out the secrets if there are any. But do not again impute to us the delinquency of withholding information to which the religious public are entitled. It is an ungenerous imputation.

In speaking of the constitution of the Pastoral Union you say, "One feature of that constitution, however, is well known. Membership in the Pastoral Union is by election. Why is this? Why was a principle so novel, and so fitted to produce unkind and party feelings introduced into the constitution of the Pastoral Union? Why do you not set open your doors to every Congregational pastor who may be willing to subscribe your constitution and standards of orthodoxy? If your object is to establish and perpetuate a party — if your object is to divide the Congregationalists of Connecticut completely and forever — this principle is, in respect to such an end, a wise one. On what other ground it can be vindicated, I am yet to learn."

Is membership by election in organized bodies a novel principle? Please to examine farther the constitutions of such bodies. While you condemn the Pastoral Union for introducing into their constitution this principle, many other associations may fall under the same condemnation, some of which I doubt not are very dear to you. The Pastoral Union of Connecticut, elect the trustees of the Theological Institute, who are a corporate body entrusted by the churches with property and sacred and weighty interests. The Fellows of Yale College are a corporate body, composed of eight officers of our State government, and ten clergymen, not elected by nearly a hundred pastors. But how are they elected? It is well known that vacancies in the clerical part of the corporation, are filled by the corporation itself. Suppose I should now interrogate you in your own language. "Why is this? Why was a principle so novel, and so fitted to produce unkind and party feelings introduced into the constitution" of Yale College? "Why do you not set open your doors to every Congregational pastor who may be willing to subscribe your constitution and standards of orthodoxy," if you have any?

Do you believe, that there is a pastor of a Congregational church in the State, who is desirous of co-operating with his brethren in accomplishing the objects of the Pastoral Union, that has been denied the privilege? Do you believe any such pastor ever will be refused? And why should those ministers, who manifest their disapprobation of the Pastoral Union, and who would not belong to it if they could, complain because membership is by election? Why do not those persons in community, who will not be associated with any ecclesiastical society, complain that membership in these societies is by election? My dear Sir, you are one of a small number who have a theological seminary under their exclusive control; and can you not entrust the supervision and control of the Theological Institute to a large number of your brethren?

You say, "when I wrote that letter, [your second letter,] it was my impression, confirmed by the opinion of the only member of the Pastoral Union on whom I could call for information, that the constitution of the Pastoral Union and that of the seminary at East Windsor had never been published. Since that time there has been put in my hands a pamphlet of eight pages, printed in 1833, containing some extracts from the minutes of the convention which formed the Pastoral Union, together with some extracts from the minutes of the Pastoral Union and the Board of trustees of the Theological Institute. Among the extracts I find the constitution of the Pastoral Union and the constitution of the Theological Institute. But I look in vain for an exposition

of the reasons why the new organization was deemed necessary, or why a new theological seminary was wanted in Connecticut." Did you expect to find in these constitutions, or extracts, "an exposition of the reasons why the new organization was deemed necessary, or why a new theological seminary was wanted in Connecticut"? I do not know that it is customary to accompany such documents with an exposition of the reasons why they were adopted. But were not reasons why a new theological seminary was wanted in Connecticut, early given to the public, and have they not met your eye? In another place you allude to an Appeal to the Public by the Trustees of the Institute. Allow me to quote a few extracts from that Appeal.

"We do not deny, that there exists serious dissatisfaction in relation to the Theological School at New Haven; and that this is *among the reasons* which have given rise to the new Institution. The grounds of this dissatisfaction, we now feel ourselves called upon frankly to state.

"1. Many have been dissatisfied, that the Theological School at New Haven, has no more connection with the ministers and churches of the State. Being an appendage of the College, it is under the entire control of the Corporation; a Board which, as at present constituted, is deemed altogether unsuitable to be guardians of a Theological Seminary." "We do not complain of the manner in which this Board is constituted, so far as it relates to the Academical Department merely: but only in reference to the Theological School. The principle for which we contend, is, that a Theological Seminary ought to be under the control of a distinct Board of Trustees, composed of ministers and members of churches, who are amenable to some ecclesiastical body. The Trustees of the Institute are appointed by the Pastoral Union, and are amenable to them. There is of course, a connection between the Seminary and the ministers and churches, which would not exist, were it under the control of an independent and irresponsible Board.

"2. Another ground of dissatisfaction, with the New Haven School, as at present organized, is the want of sufficient security against the introduction of heresy.

"3. The Theological views maintained by the Professors, have given great and extensive dissatisfaction.

"4. Another ground of dissatisfaction, is, the great importance which the Professors have attached to their peculiar views, and the charges of dangerous error, which they have brought against their brethren.

"But while we frankly acknowledge, that the facts which we have stated, are among the reasons which led to the establishment of the Theological Institute; we wish the public to understand, that there are other considerations by which we are influenced in the prosecution of our enterprise.

"The growing demand for ministers of the gospel, and the rapid increase of theological students, occasioned by the efforts of education societies, and by frequent revivals of religion, seem to us to call for an increased number of Theological Institutions.

"We believe also, that as there is a liability in such institutions to become corrupt in doctrine, their number ought to be so increased, that they shall operate as a check upon each other, and that no one shall become overgrown. If there were but one such seminary in New England, and if with its large endowments, and extended patronage, it should become the seat of heresy, who can estimate the evils of which it would be instrumental. And here we cannot but advert to the fact, that the history of all ages admonishes us, that large and overgrown institutions are peculiarly liable to corruption. By increasing the number, we diminish the danger from this source, and throw around the churches, additional safeguards against the inroads of destructive error.

"There is still another consideration which has had no small weight in our minds. Until recently, the subject of physical education has received but little attention; but its importance is beginning now to be ceeply and extensively felt. Facts have been disclosed, which go to show, that the destruction of life and health in our literary and theological seminaries, occasioned by the neglect of bodily exercise, is truly appalling.

"It appears from the testimony of a large number of the most respectable teachers in our country, that of those who deserve the character of close students, full one half, if not more, injure themselves by an injudicious neglect of exercise; and that of these, full one-fourth, if not a third, lay a foundation for feebleness and disease which go with them through life, and greatly diminish both their usefulness and enjoyment. This evil surely calls for a remedy, and we know of no remedy which promises to be more successful than that provided by manual labor institutions. Such is the Institution under our care; and if the plan shall succeed according to our wishes, it will possess the two-fold advantage, of contributing to preserve the lives and health of the students, and of enabling them at the same time, to defray, in part, at least, the expenses of their education. Is not this part of the plan worthy of encouragement?"

With the document from which these extracts are taken before you, did you "look in vain for an exhibition of the reasons why the organization was deemed necessary, or why a new theological seminary was wanted in Connecticut"? With this document at command were you authorized to assert, that "*all (our) proceedings*" rested on the "*condemnation*" of brethren "*as errorists and deceivers*"? The trustees do not profess to assign *all* "the reasons which have given rise to the new institution." Reasons not mentioned, are known to have had much influence on the minds of some of the founders of the Institute. In the communication dated at Yale College, May 6, 1822, and addressed to the associations in behalf of the theological department of that institution, it is said, "*It will not be thought too strong to affirm, that one or two theological institutions cannot long be adequate to the just demands of Providence on the piety and talents of New-England.*" This sentiment, which was published at New-Haven, in 1822, was acted upon at East-Windsor in 1833. Some members of the Pastoral Union were confident that the number of theological seminaries in New-England ought to be increased and that it would be increased; and that the valley of the Connecticut in which is the centre of as dense a "population of evangelical churches as is found in the eastern states, would sooner or later be favored with a school of the prophets. And they considered themselves called upon by the providence of God to aid in the establishment of such a school."

"But how the Institute, or the Union," you say, "is more connected with the churches than other voluntary associations, I am yet to learn." If you mean by "voluntary associations," our Missionary, Bible, and Tract Societies, I do not know why you institute the comparison. But if you, by "other voluntary associations," mean, as I conclude you must, some other Congregational theological seminaries, it appears to me, that it is very easy to discover the difference. The churches select their pastors, and they may prefer to select, as a number of churches in the State have recently done, pastors who will be members of the Pastoral Union. Members of the Pastoral Union annually elect the trustees of the Institute, which are to consist of at least twelve ministers and eight laymen. In the board of trustees the churches must always be represented by, at least, eight of their members. And in the annual election of that board, the churches act "through their pastors." The faculty of the Institute are responsible to the trustees, and the trustees are amenable to the Pastoral Union, and the Pastoral Union, by virtue of their pastoral relations, are accountable to the churches. And is the theological seminary under your control thus connected with the churches? Have the churches any lay-representation in the corporation? Are the lay-members of the corporation necessarily members of our churches? Are they necessarily of our denomination? Are they necessarily believers in divine revelation? And in the election of the clerical members of the corporation, "the churches — what can they do?" "The ministers — what minister of Connecticut, as such, has any thing to do with it." Is not the body which controls this seminary independent of the churches, and irresponsible to them? And how does it comport with the spirit of Congregationalism, to have an independent, irresponsible, self-perpetuated body to manage the dearest and most momentous interests of the churches? Pardon us, my brother, if we are wrong in believing that there is a better way.

Your friend and brother,

"GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, February 25, 1840.

Letter XX.

Dear Sir,—You ask me “to observe, historically, the bearing of the Pastoral Union, and of the Theological Institute, on our ecclesiastical affairs.”

You say; the first meeting of the General Association, after the memorable convention of September, 1833, was held at Vernon, (June, 1834,) a few miles from East Windsor. Instantly it appeared that a new era had commenced. The meeting was signaled by an attempt to make the General Association endorse implicitly, and without a particle of official information, the doings of the East Windsor Convention.”—“The brethren who had been concerned in establishing the new institution, and who were desirous to have the General Association sanction their doings, were invited and entreated to come forward, then and there, with a frank exposition of the reasons which had moved them to set up a new theological school in Connecticut, and of their plan, their intentions and their hopes. Reference was made to the fact that Dr. Tyler the president of the new institution, was in the house, and it was requested that he, as one competent to testify, would make such a statement in behalf of the institution as might enable the Association to take cognizance of it, and to form an opinion of its merits.”—“And did not the Pastoral Union party—I know not by what better name to call it—submit to that faint, cold notice of their great enterprize, rather than expose their plan, their hopes, and their reasons, to the judgment of their brethren?”

Since the publication of your third letter I have applied to a number of gentlemen residing in different parts of the State, who were present in the meeting at Vernon, and most of them members of the Association, for their recollections of what transpired on that occasion; and their letters, in reply, are now before me. And allow me to say,

1. I think you must be incorrect in asserting, that “the meeting was signaled by an attempt to make the General Association endorse implicitly, and without a particle of official information, the doings of the East Windsor convention.” Will you affirm that such an endorsement was requested by any person? Or do you claim, that a recognition, in the “Report on the state of Religion,” of the existence and circumstances of the Theological Institute, is virtually an endorsement of the doings of the East Windsor convention?” Has it been so considered for five years past when the Institute has been annually thus noticed by the General Association? Do you say that members of the Pastoral Union endorse “the doings” of the Theological Department in Yale College, when they vote a respectful notice of that Department as inserted in our “Reports on the state of Religion?” No Sir, a recognition of the existence and circumstances of the Theological Institute, does not imply an endorsement of “the doings of the East Windsor convention.” And the brother who moved an amendment of the report, which you had drawn up, by inserting a notice of the Institute, informs me, that he “wished no commendation of the Institute, but insisted that it ought to be mentioned in the report as it was.” “*Without a particle of official information.*”—Previous to this period, official information of the origin, design, and circumstances of the Institute had been given to the public and extensively circulated. In relation to it, various articles had appeared in the public prints, and the Legislature had granted it a charter of incorporation; and do you say, that there was “an attempt to make the General Association endorse implicitly, and *without a particle of official information,*” &c.? Do you claim, that the Trustees of the Institute should have

communicated directly to the General Association respecting their seminary in order to make the information official? Has the corporation of Yale College to this day ever communicated to the General Association respecting the Theological Department in that Institution? Am I right or am I wrong in saying, that at Windsor, in 1823, the Theological Department in Yale College was first introduced to the notice of the General Association, without official authority, by a member of that body, as was the Theological Institute at Vernon, in 1834, and that there would have been no more unpleasant excitement in the one case than in the other had it not been for the warm opposition of a few individuals at Vernon? Or do you claim that information cannot be official, unless it comes to the General Association through the medium of a District Association? The Theological Institute is located within the limits of the North Association of Hartford county, and since 1834, it has been respectfully and kindly noticed annually by that body in the report of the state of religion within their bounds which they have sent up to the General Association; and at Vernon the delegates from that District Association assured the General Association, that the omission that year was through inadvertance, and they requested that the seminary might be respectfully noticed in the general report. It appears to me that here are found many particles of official information.

2. Dr. Tyler, the President of the new Institution, was in the house and was competent and *ready* to give any official information which could be reasonably required; but he was not invited to do it; and the reason why members of the Association, who were also members of the Pastoral Union did not claim for him the privilege of doing it, was not because they preferred to "submit to that faint, cold notice of their great enterprize, rather than expose their plan, their hopes and their reasons, to the judgment of their brethren." They had already "exposed their plan, their hopes, and their reasons, to the judgment of their brethren;" and they would have rejoiced to have done it again "then and there." had a *suitable* opportunity been afforded.

That this meeting of the Association was of an unpleasant aspect, is not to be denied; but who contributed most to give it that aspect, is now the point at issue, since you have at this late period come out as an accuser of your brethren. Did not a delegate from New Haven West Association contribute full his part? You may wish to publish for the edification of the churches a more complete account of the proceedings of this meeting; and therefore allow me to direct your attention by way of inquiry to a few transactions of that occasion, which you have not noticed.

1. Was not the meeting signalized by an extraordinary and unsuccessful attempt to make the General Association censure the Middlesex Association, for noticing in their report of the state of religion within their limits, disorders which had occurred among them? Was not the language of censure designed to be passed in substance as follows: From one of the Associations a gloomy and desponding picture of the state of religion is given: but if our brethren will have confidence in God, cease their complaining, and labor with diligence for the conversion of souls, they will not have an occasion to send up such a report. Were not the harmony and serenity of the meeting much disturbed by this attempted censure? And who was forward in making the attempt?

2. Was not the meeting signalized by a successful opposition to a proposal to reprint the Saybrook Platform, which was then out of print? As an objection to reprinting that book, did no member of the Association say, that the Savoy Confession contained doctrines in which he did not believe? Did no

member in substance say, I did not know that this Association had a Confession of Faith, I thought the Bible was our confession? To avoid sanctioning all the doctrines embraced in the Savoy Confession, was it not proposed by one of your associates, to print the Heads of Agreement without the Confession? Did not this decided opposition to reprinting and circulating the Constitution of our churches, occasion much alarm and disturbance in the meeting? Was not the disturbance so great as to induce a member of the Pastoral Union who had advocated the motion to reprint the Platform to move its indefinite postponement? And who was forward in this opposition?

3. Was not the meeting signalized by a formal vote to erase from the Minutes of the Association all clerical titles? Was not much time occupied, as it has proved, unprofitably, in the discussion of this subject? And who was forward in the discussion?

4. On the day in which the meeting at Vernon terminated, was not the prophesy uttered, that the Pastoral Union would collect funds sufficient to endow one professorship, that that endowment would be transferred to Yale College, and that their Theological Institute would become a Grammar school? And who was the prophet?

Previous to the publication of your account of this meeting, my brother, I expressed to you my opinion, that evil and only evil would result from calling up to remembrance unpleasant scenes which long ago transpired, and making them matters of record and of public notoriety. If justice to members of the Pastoral Union who were members also of the Association at Vernon, would have allowed, I should have suffered all you have written respecting this meeting to pass in silence.

The short discussion in the Association at Enfield, in 1835, on the subject of noticing the Theological Institute in the Report on the state of Religion, I do not think worthy of a place in the history of our polemical transactions. I was surprised that some of the friends of the Institute were not satisfied with the notice of it which the Report contained, more at the remarks made in reply to them, and most of all that any spectator should express a desire to take part in the discussion.

I will now proceed to a consideration of the questions with which you conclude your Letters. Full, and may I not hope, satisfactory answers have already been given to some of these questions, and it will not be necessary for me to refer to them at this time.

You inquire; "Was not the Pastoral Union formed for the purpose of putting down the "New School brethren" by other means than argument, because argument was felt to be inadequate to the end?" — No Sir, the members of the Pastoral Union, I trust have a more important object in view than that of "*putting down*" their brethren. Their object is to promote the cause of truth and the interests of Christ's kingdom. Because they feel it to be their duty to bear testimony against what they deem to be errors in doctrine, must they necessarily be influenced by a desire to *put down* those by whom these errors are embraced? Is it your desire to *put down* every man from whom you differ in opinion, and against whose errors you feel it your duty to protest? If so, then it would seem, that the object of your Letters is to *put down* all the members of the Pastoral Union. Argument has not been "felt to be inadequate" to the refutation of the peculiar views of the "New school brethren." On the contrary, it is fully believed by the members of the Pastoral Union, that these views have been triumphantly refuted by those who have been engaged in the recent theological discussions. While arguments

and books of your orthodox brethren remain unanswered, is it not untimely for you to talk of our resorting to "other means than argument, because argument was felt to be inadequate to the end." Why has not Griffin on Divine Efficiency been answered before this late period? Why has not Dr. Wood's Letters received another reply besides that ill-tempered caricature of an answer published as an anonymous article in the Christian Spectator? Why has not Mr. Dow's Pamphlet been answered? And why have many other publications of like character been passed in silence?

You ask; "If your party had been able to control the General Association, are you certain that the Pastoral Union would ever have been called into being?" I have yet to learn, that the Pastoral Union could not have controlled the General Association, had they in the appointment of delegates to that body abandoned the principle of rotation and adopted that of election. As yet sufficient evidence has not been adduced to convince me, that a majority of the Congregational ministers of Connecticut have adopted the "New Haven theology;" and that the Theological Institute has not among the ministers of this State as many friends as the Theological Department in Yale College. The members of the Pastoral Union have no wish to make their brethren, who differ from them, responsible for opinions and acts which they do not approve. Consequently had they been sure of always being a majority in the General Association, they would not have wished that body to establish a new Theological Seminary in opposition to the views and feelings of a large and respectable minority.

You inquire; "Has not the uniform tendency of the Pastoral Union, thus far, been towards division?" So soon as the orthodox began to act in self-defence and in defence of the theological sentiments of our Fathers against the systematic and efficient exertions of their "New School brethren" to change the features of New England Calvinism; the cry of "*division of the churches*" was raised. That cry of "*division*" has often been heard since, and you, Sir, in your Letters, have given the conjectured "*division*" of our "churches into two contending and contemptible sects," a prominent place. Allow me to ask, why were not thoughts of division entertained at an earlier date? And permit me to ask again, what do you mean by this question? What have the Pastoral Union done? Have they said any thing about division? Have they taken any steps toward division? Am I to understand you, that if the members of the Pastoral Union do not abandon the ground which they have taken, their "New school brethren" are determined either to secede from them, or cast them out of their ecclesiastical connection? Is this your meaning? And is this the determination of your brethren? If so, let us distinctly understand it. If you do not yet understand the views which the Pastoral Union entertain on the subject of a division of the churches into two sects, you may learn them from the following:

Extract of a letter from a Trustee of the Theological Institute to the Rev. Dr. Sprague of Albany, dated Nov. 11, 1833.

"It has been falsely reported, that the ground which we took in establishing a new Seminary, was to withdraw all fellowship with ministers of the New Haven school, and to call on the churches to separate themselves at once, and to treat them in all respects as we do the Unitarians, in our Christian intercourse. But I need not say, that this is a misrepresentation, designed to raise a prejudice in the public mind, with the hope of defeating the object. Others have heard, that a certain anonymous pamphlet was distributed at that Convention [Convention at East Windsor] containing the sentiments which form the basis of their proceedings. It is true that pamphlet was distributed at the close of the Convention, as it was since at the close of the Convention of Hartford North; but the contents of that pamphlet had no more to do with the proceedings of the one than of the other. And I doubt very much, whether many of the members of

that Convention knew a word of its contents until after they had returned to their homes. Whatever may be the private opinion of individual members of that Convention, concerning the doctrines of the New Haven school: the ground which they have taken in establishing the new Seminary is this—that the ministers whose doctrinal views are expressed in the Confession of Faith published by the Pastoral Union of Connecticut, have the same right to establish a Theological Seminary, and to educate young men for the ministry, and to publish their own sentiments, as they have at New Haven, Andover, and Princeton. We claim only the same privilege of doing our own business in our own way, as the founders of other Theological Seminaries have done before us. Nothing more, nothing less. If they ask for our motives, each member is of age and will answer for himself.”

An extract from Dr. Tyler's Inaugural Address.

“Our object is not, as has been supposed, to rend the churches, or to break up any of the existing ecclesiastical relations in the State. And why should it be thought, that our enterprise has any necessary tendency to such a result? Has it come to this, that we cannot maintain and inculcate our opinions without alienating our brethren from us, and forfeiting their confidence? Must we sacrifice our principles, and surrender what we believe to be the truth of God, or cut in sunder the bonds of Christian fellowship?”

Such, so far as I know, has been the uniform testimony, not only of the Trustees of the Institute, but of the members of the Pastoral Union; and I have discovered no intimation of change in views and feelings on this subject. I presume it is the present expectation of every member of the Pastoral Union to continue connected with a District Association, and related to the General Association so long as he is an inhabitant of Connecticut. I express it as my deliberate opinion, that if the division of which you have so frequently spoken, takes place, it will be effected by your seceding from us, or by your casting us out of your ecclesiastical connection. But you ask; “Has not the uniform tendency of the Pastoral Union, thus far, been toward division?” I deeply regret the want of harmony which exists among us, and I fear what may be its results. “But if our religious community is divided into parties, on whom does the responsibility lie, of having caused divisions? On those who adhere to the views maintained by the Fathers, or those who have introduced innovations?”

You say; “Since the date when the Pastoral Union was formed, there has been in Connecticut no doctrinal discussion between “New School” and “Old School;” yet has there not been an increase of party alienation, more painful, and far more rapid, than when the controversy was in progress?” You will recollect, that the Pastoral Union was formed in the autumn of 1833. In June, 1837, your own party in the General Association of Connecticut declared; “The churches in connection with the Association are generally peaceful and harmonious. And though among ministers there are shades of difference in theological views, yet they are not such as need to prevent, and we are happy to believe they will not prevent the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.” In 1838, Dr. Taylor made, in the New School General Assembly, the following statement; “The churches (of Connecticut) are harmonious; I suppose, among ministers there has never been less difference of theological opinion than there is to-day. I know we are considered abroad as differing widely, and there are those among us who think differently; but I give you this as my opinion. What are called shades of difference are being considered of less importance among us.” When in 1839 you asked the question; “Since the date when the Pastoral Union was formed—has there not been an increase of party alienation, more painful, and far more rapid, than when the controversy was in progress?” Had you forgotten the above statements? And had you forgotten the solemn manner in which you had, in your third Letter, called the Pastoral Union to account, and the severe censure which you had inflicted upon them for contradicting these statements.

In the close of your last Letter you ask; *What ought to be done?* This is a very serious question. I did intend to suggest a few thoughts in reference to it; but I have concluded it is best for the present only to repeat your own declaration: “Over this question let us meditate and pray, as men to whose weakness and blindness are entrusted in the mysterious providence of God, interests of eternal moment.” And may God guide us in our meditations, and answer our prayers.

Your brother in Christ.

GEORGE A. CALHOUN.

Coventry, March 4, 1840.

The reader will make the following corrections.—Page 13, line from bottom 20th, for originated read originated”; p. 15, b. 8, for *to any*, r. *at any*; p. 16, t. 21, for *on r. aver*; p. 28, b. 5, for *devalved* r. *developed*; p. 34, b. 4, for *The &c.* r. *That self-love or the desire of happiness, is the primary cause or*—p. 35, t. 11, for *primary* r. “*primary*”; p. 37, b. 11, for *but* r. *put*; p. 40, b. 17, for *generation* r. *regeneration*; p. 42, b. 13, insert the before passage; p. 44, t. 6, for *will* r. *may*; p. 53, t. 24, for 1834, r. 1833; do. b. 14, for *in* r. *is*; p. 58, t. 7, after *gives*, insert *him*; do. b. 21, for *de* r. *be*; do. b. 4, insert *all* before N. England; do. b. 5, the word *all* should be erased; 65, b. 21, *gentlemen*, r. *gentleman*; 69, t. 21, before *eternity* insert *all*.

